

R
094051

JPRS-UKO-85-003

5 February 1985

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 15, October 1984

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release.
Distribution Unlimited

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

19980302 054

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

6
101
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.

5 February 1985

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 15, October 1984

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

CONTENTS

The Great October Revolution and the Revolutionary Renewal of the People	1
The People's Controllers' High Civic Duty (K. U. Chernenko)	13
With a High Degree of Exactingness (M. Solomentsev)	22
Toward a Purely Social Mode of Production: Nature of the Leap and Stages of Stabilization (V. Mazur)	41
Indicators of Socialist Management: An Economist's Outlook (D. Valovoy)	55
Laws Must Be Followed Unswervingly and Economic Management Updated (Le Duan)	69
Russians in the First International (R. Konyushaya)	85
Communists and Problems of the Contemporary Period	99
May French-Soviet Friendship Become Stronger (Jacques Duclos)	116
Multinational Corporations and the Philippines (Merlin M. Magallona)	123

Artistic Image and Knowledge of Reality (M. Rukavitsyn)	134
History and Lessons of World War II (S. Tikhvinskiy)	138
When the Secret Becomes Obvious (Yu. Novopashin)	147
Bookshelf	152
JPRS Index	154

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 15
October 1984

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author(s) :

Editor(s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : October 1984

Signed to press : 15 October 1984

Copies : 902,000

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

THE GREAT OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND THE REVOLUTIONARY RENEWAL OF THE WORLD

AU062138 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 84 (signed to press 15 Oct 84)
pp 3-12

[Text] No one historical event has so powerfully and profoundly influenced mankind's development as the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. There has been and is no political force or social movement in the world that has not felt the effect of the October Revolution in one form or another or that has remained untouched by that global process of revolutionary renewal, the beginning of which was heralded 67 years ago by the shot from the Aurora.

Speaking on 25 October (7 November) 1917 at a conference of the Petrograd council of workers and soldiers deputies, V. I. Lenin clearly defined the task of the revolution, which has been accomplished under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party: "In Russia we must now engage in building a proletarian socialist state" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 35, p 3).

The progressive American journalist Albert Rice Williams--witness to the unforgettable October days--shared the impression made on him by this strictly defined and practical aim of Lenin's: "Just a few simple words, but behind them lie whole eras of mankind's past and future! On these words was stamped the great aim of the Revolution--the rebirth of the whole of mankind. They channeled the mind and energy of the people into building a completely new society based on new economic principles and ethics."

Having made the first breach in the world system of imperialist exploitation, the October Revolution laid the foundations for the radical and revolutionary transformation of all--both material and spiritual--aspects of life in human society. A reading can be taken of the contemporary era in the history of human civilization since 25 October 1917.

Overthrowing the bourgeois landowning system in Russia, fulfilling Lenin's task of building a proletarian socialist state and establishing a fundamentally new social system over a considerable area of the globe--a system without exploitation and oppression--all this has entailed social and political changes on a worldwide scale. With the victory of the October Revolution, a true spring was begun in the history of the world's peoples; the revolutionary potential of the international workers class and of all the

working people was awakened; and new forces, which earlier stood aside from active political life, entered into aware historic creativity. In all this, in Lenin's opinion, lies the international significance of the October Revolution in the broad sense.

At the same time, according to Lenin, the October Revolution has had international significance in the narrow sense--as a direct motivating force in the process of the socialist renewal of the world as a source of revolutionary experience that is invaluable in its richness ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." vol 41, p 3).

The first to lay a path to a new society in practice, the October Revolution revealed the general laws of socialist revolution and of the formation of a system free of exploitation of man by man. It also provided a clear and definite answer to the question which had troubled whole generations of fighters for the cause of the liberation of the workers class--"How To Achieve Socialism" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." vol 36, p 51). It is precisely in this sense that Lenin understood the "international significance or historical inevitability of what has happened in our country being repeated on an international scale" and pointed out that "in certain very basic aspects of proletarian revolution all countries will inevitably have to do what Russia has done" (ibid., vol 41, pp 3, 13).

This does not mean, of course, as bourgeois and reformist ideologists try to make out, that the experience of the October Revolution has been turned into some kind of "model" or "standard" for all countries and peoples making the transition to socialism. Lenin and our party have always emphasized the necessity to understand, study and apply the laws reflected in the October Revolution and they have never urged making a stencil copy of this revolution or attempting to utilize every, including specific, feature of the October Revolution in other countries that are different from Russia. The laws inherent in every socialist revolution, irrespective of the level and particular features of capitalism's development or the geographical position of a given country, are dictated by objective conditions existing within society and are conditioned by the same exploitative essence of a system that socialist revolution is called upon to end. This common nature of the laws of revolution aimed at destroying all forms of class oppression and creating a social system free of exploitation of man by man in no way signifies the negation of its specific features in different states. It is totally obvious that as a result of society's internal development, each revolution always has its own characteristics which reflect the national reality of a given country--its economic structure, historic traditions, level of the population's preparedness for evolution and so forth. But irrespective of the nature and degree of differences of this kind, "these features affect everything except the central issue" (ibid., vol 39, p 272).

Thus Lenin posed the question. Therefore, it is posed by all consistent revolutionary forces and communists who, following Lenin's teaching on revolution, regard their task not as locking themselves within the narrow framework of national specifics, but as applying the general and fundamental principles of scientific socialism to that originality of relations between

classes and parties and to that originality in objective development toward socialism and communism that are characteristic of each individual country.

And in this sense the experience, accumulated during the socialist renewal of society, of political and socioeconomic transformations in Soviet Russia in the post-October period, the general and fundamental principles of Marxist-Leninist teaching on socialist revolution which have thereby been tested in practice and the laws of the transition to socialism have become an inexhaustible treasurehouse of revolutionary theory and practice and a great school of socialist creativity for other countries and peoples. As Lenin foresaw, the experience of Soviet communists and pioneers of a new society has not been forgotten--revolutionary forces the world over constantly turn to this experience; "It has gone down in history as an achievement of socialism, and it is on this experience that future international revolution will build its socialist edifice" (ibid., vol 36, p 383).

Through the very course of things, Lenin noted, the peoples have learned to "look upon Russia as the center of attraction" (ibid., vol 42, p 72). Working people the world over regarded revolutionary Russia as a prototype for their own future.

Under the powerful influence of the October Revolution, bourgeois-democratic revolutions were carried out in Germany and Austro-Hungary, as were socialist revolutions in Hungary, Bavaria and Slovakia and the peoples of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia gained national independence. An armed uprising flared up in Bulgaria. Throughout the world the working people's solidarity movement with the victorious proletariat in the young Soviet republic developed. Class conflicts in England, France, Belgium, Italy, the United States and Japan became more active, and this struggle for the national liberation of peoples in colonies and dependent countries began.

In the first post-October years there were many grounds for hoping that the revolutionary fire would spread to other regions of the world and that the example of the Russian workers class would also be followed by its brothers in a number of West European countries. Loyal to the concrete-historical approach, Lenin never stated any period of time in which revolutions in these countries would be accomplished. On the contrary, he noted that, "West European revolution, perhaps, will pass more smoothly, but nevertheless many, many years will be required to reorganize the whole world and the majority of countries" (ibid., vol 38, p 155). "We began this," wrote Lenin. "Precisely when and over what period of time the proletariat of what nation will bring this to its conclusion is immaterial. What is important is the fact that the ice has been broken, the way is open and the path is clear (ibid., vol 44, p 150).

One of the main factors which held back the rates of development of revolution in the West lay in the absence or weakness in the overwhelming majority of countries at that time of revolutionary Marxist parties capable of utilizing conditions favorable to the workers class taking resolute action, leading the masses to win state power and achieving a socialist renewal of life. The invaluable worldwide historic service of the October Revolution lay in the fact that it provided an answer to the question of how to develop the

international workers movement and also completely new guidelines for the activities of this movement.

The very practice of the struggle for the vital interest of the working people demonstrated the historical correctness of the Marxist-Leninist, bolshevik direction of this movement, which ensured the proletariat's gaining of power and the breaking of the weakest link in the imperialist chain and opened up prospects for building socialism and communism.

The groundless, utopian nature of social-reformists' calculations that the socialist renewal of society could be achieved without a qualitative leap and without the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat and bitter class battles, with all the accompanying difficulties and sacrifices, but by means of smooth, evolutionary development and the peaceful development of capitalism into socialism, became obvious to a significant number of the international workers class. In his time, Lenin subjected calculations of this kind to biting criticism, citing as an example the apology for a socialist who "would be ready to recognize social revolution if history led up to it as calmly, peacefully, smoothly and precisely as a German express train approaches a station. A sedate conductor opens the carriage doors and announces: 'Social Revolution Station. Everyone must alight!'" (ibid., vol 34, p 321).

The entire experience of the October Revolution and of subsequent revolutions that have either been victorious or suffered temporary defeat has convincingly shown that this kind of idyllic path leading to socialism does not exist in nature and that the struggle for the socialist renewal of life requires the maximum expenditure of effort on the part of the workers class and its allies and their showing bold revolutionary initiative at the necessary moment, their mastering the art of operating under both legal and illegal conditions and their subordinating every method and means of struggle to the tasks of the revolutionary restructuring of society--preparing the masses for taking over state power, implementing radical social transformations, consolidating the victory of the workers class, repelling the inevitable counterrevolutionary intrigues of the class enemy and organizing the building of socialism and communism.

The victory of the October Revolution has clearly shown that it is impossible to walk this path successfully without the revolutionary party of the workers class, the party of the new, bolshevik type. It has given powerful impulse to the policy of drawing a line between the revolutionary elements of international social democracy and opportunists and has facilitated and accelerated the process of forming new, Marxist-Leninist parties in many countries of the world. The appearance of the international communist movement has injected fresh life into the world's ideological-political life and raised the struggle for its socialist renewal to an unprecedented level. The activities of this movement in dozens of countries on all continents have themselves become a most important factor of social progress.

In the final analysis history has cruelly mocked the social reformists and opportunists who declared the October Revolution "illegal" and "unsocialist," and it has debunked the Trotskiyites' prophesies, which were imbued with lack

of faith in the Russian workers class. Over the course of many years, various figures have foretold the collapse of Soviet power and the impracticability of socialism in the USSR without socialist revolution in Europe and help from the West European proletariat. In actual fact, as veteran of the communist movement, R. Palm Datt has written: "The reverse has happened: As a powerful socialist state, the Soviet Union has had to help the West European proletariat, which, having once followed the social democrats, found itself under the heel of fascism."

The Great October Revolution has had the most profound effect on the whole of mankind's spiritual life and has shaken to the very foundations the system of ideological world outlooks forced upon the masses for centuries and based on acceptance of exploitation and violence, oppression and poverty. Having wrenched the means of production from the hands of the landowners and capitalists; turned factories, plants, the land, railways and banks into the property of all the people--public property; and undermined the "stability" of the world capitalism once and for all, the October Revolution exposed the myth to hundreds of millions of people of the stability, inviolability and "sanctity" of capitalist ownership and of the necessity of the bourgeoisie's existence for the management of contemporary production.

With the victory of socialism the problems of truly fulfilling man's rights to a happy childhood, education, work, accommodation and old-age pension; liquidating national discrimination and oppression; establishing social justice and the spiritual liberation of the individual; making genuinely humane use of the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution; and preventing new wars, as well as the problems of further developing human civilization, have become the center of the ideological antagonism between the forces of reaction and progress. Socialism has clearly gained the upper hand in this conflict, since capitalism has shown its inability to advance any positive ideas capable of capturing people's minds and hearts or of drawing them to it. Bourgeois ideology has reached a historic impasse. It simply has nowhere to lead the masses.

The Great October Socialist Revolution has entailed a radical turnabout in the whole system of international relations, having put an end to the complete sway of unequal relations between states, such relations being characteristic of capitalism. Since the very beginning of the existence of the first state of the victorious proletariat in the world, its foreign policy has been devoted to defending the interests of the working masses and peace and friendship between peoples.

Even half a century before the victory of the October Revolution, Marx scientifically substantiated the historical inevitability of the fact that "a new society will appear in opposition to the old society with its economic poverty and political folly, a society whose international principle will be--peace, because all people will have one and the same ruler--work!" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 17, p 5).

Translating these theoretical propositions into the practical language of real policy, the land of the soviets, the location of "the birth of the new society," proclaimed a principle earlier acknowledged by all sober-minded

forces of peace as the only real basis for international life. Proceeding from the possibility of socialism originally triumphing in one or several countries, Lenin scientifically substantiated and formulated the principles of the peaceful coexistence of two systems.

Consistently and purposefully implementing this Leninist principle makes it possible for the Soviet Union to ensure the most favorable external conditions for the successful fulfillment of national economic tasks and the comprehensive progress of socialist society. At the same time the implementation of this principle exerts a healthy influence on the whole world situation and a revolutionary influence on the working masses in nonsocialist parts of the world and also contributes to the growth of influence of realistically minded groups and trends in the enemy camp. As early as on the eve of Soviet power, Lenin set the task of "more deeply splitting the pacifist camp of the international bourgeoisie from the hardened bourgeois, aggressive bourgeois, reactionary bourgeois camp" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 44, p 408). Forcing the principle of peaceful coexistence on imperialism despite the opposition of extremist circles makes it possible to restrain the forces of extreme reaction and war which strive to overcome their internal contradictions by building up international tension and unleashing wars and local conflicts. It also helps to strengthen all peace-loving and democratic forces and to further develop the class, anti-imperialist struggle on earth. Thus, the policy of peaceful coexistence is indissolubly linked with another great principle of socialism, to which the motherland of the October Revolution has always been and continues to be loyal--proletarian internationalism, solidarity with the struggle of all forces of social and national liberation on earth.

The revolutionary renewal of the life of human society, which began in October 1917, signified the death sentence for capitalism as a world system. However, imperialism has not renounced its attempts to halt the course of history at any price, to have done with the challenge thrown it by socialism and to return the world to the times when it held complete sway. Since the first days of the victory of the October Revolution the arsenal of methods of struggle against the new social system and against the land of the soviets has included direct attempts to smother socialism with the aid of armed interventions, diversions and provocations; the organization of terror, sabotage and actions by forces of internal counterrevolution; economic blockade; and the erection of a "cordon sanitaire" around our country. After the failure of these attempts, international reactionaries gambled on German imperialism, assisting the formation of Hitler's military machine in every possible way, a machine that was called upon to crush the Soviet Union--the stronghold of real socialism--and to deprive the working masses and the oppressed peoples of the world of an inspiring example.

By defending their motherland and the achievements of the October Revolution in the Great Patriotic War, the 40th anniversary of victory in which all people of goodwill on earth are preparing to celebrate, the Soviet people not only defended the historic choice they had made in 1917 and their own independence and freedom, but they also saved all of mankind from the danger of enslavement by fascism, which represented the most open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, chauvinist and aggressive elements of

financial capital, which intended to subordinate the whole planet to their will and turn the human race into dumb slaves. Mankind rightly saw the heroic struggle of the Soviet people as its only hope for deliverance from the nightmare of fascist oppression and for the salvation of civilization. Even people as remote from politics and the revolutionary movement as A. Einstein, for example, realized during the war that the victories of the Soviet Army, which had crushed the Hitlerite hoards, had not only defended the "amazing achievements" of the Soviet Union, but had also "pushed back the deadly threat to the future development of human progress."

The triumph over fascism, a decisive contribution to which was made by the Soviet Union, convincingly demonstrated the historic advantages of socialism over capitalism and proved in practice, both to allies and opponents of the cause of the workers class, that, despite the great obstacles put in its way by imperialism, the motherland of the October Revolution had been able to fulfill the Leninist task of building a socialist state in an incredibly short period of time and had also achieved two mutually connected aims: to form a powerful economic base for socialism and to forge the political, moral and ideological unity of the Soviet people. The triumph of socialism in the USSR and the utter defeat of the fascist invaders gave fresh impetus to the struggle of the working masses for the revolutionary renewal of the world and created a reliable support for this struggle. The forces of peace, progress and socialism broadened and grew stronger, the influence of communist and workers parties increased and the positions of imperialism weakened.

The formation of the world socialist system is the most important component of the worldwide historic process of making the transition to a new society since the October Revolution. Socialism has transcended the bounds of one country. The existence of the community of socialist states, united by the common aim of struggling against exploitation and for the triumph of communism, is an extremely important factor in contemporary world development, the main obstacle in the path of imperialism's adventurist policies and a powerful stronghold of all progressive forces on earth.

Before the eyes of a single generation, socialism, which has emerged the victor in a whole group of countries in Central and Southeast Europe, Asia and Latin America, has liquidated evils of the past such as crises, unemployment, inequality, fear of the future and social and economic oppression. On the basis of public property, the systematic growth of the economy in these countries is ensured and programs are implemented that are aimed at strengthening a dynamically developing, socially just society and comprehensively satisfying the needs of the workers class and all the working people.

The formation of the new man is a contribution, colossal in its significance, made by the October Revolution and the formation of developed socialism in the Soviet Union to the process of the revolutionary renewal of the world. Revolutionary renewal in itself is not only overthrowing the capitalist system; liquidating the exploitation and oppression of many by man, the illiteracy of the masses and poverty and backwardness; and improving the material well-being of the working people. It is also socially and spiritually emancipating the working people, liberating the gigantic creative

energy of the working people and cultivating in people internationalism and socialist patriotism, an active civic position, a vital interest in all state and social affairs and an enterprising, creative attitude toward work. The new Soviet man is not only some remote ideal, but is also a reality of today. This very fact draws the close attention of millions of people on all continents and enhances the prestige of socialism in their eyes.

At the contemporary stage of perfecting developed socialism, still more large-scale, diverse and complex tasks arise before the successors to the October Revolution and the present-day generation of Soviet people. As a result of the profound socioeconomic transformations implemented under the party's leadership, the restructuring of the whole aggregate of social relations is being completed in our country on the collectivist principles internally inherent in socialism. Also, gradual progress is being made toward communism in the process of perfecting developed socialism. In order to fulfill a task of paramount importance as soon as possible--that of forming a highly efficient economy, which is the basis for more fully satisfying the material and spiritual needs of the Soviet people and increasing the power of our state--the party has adopted a course of comprehensively introducing the latest achievements of science and technology into production, perfecting the forms of management and even further developing the initiative and working activeness of the masses.

Firmly complying with Lenin's behests, in particular his direction that socialism mainly influences the course of world development with its economic successes, our party and all the Soviet people successfully fulfill these new tasks and regard it as their patriotic and international duty to increase the historic achievements of the socialist revolution by their selfless labor. Without a doubt, all this will raise the whole process of the revolutionary transformation of the world to a new level.

The close political interaction between fraternal countries and their comprehensive cooperation in matters concerning the economy, science and technology--cooperation based on relations of genuine equality and comradely mutual aid--are a factor of paramount importance in consolidating socialism's positions in the world and broadening its influence upon the minds and hearts of hundreds of millions of people. The formation and establishment of interstate economic relations of a new type, which has found its concrete embodiment in the integration process within the framework of CEMA, is one of the major achievements of the socialist community.

The top-level economic conference of the CEMA member countries held in Moscow in June 1984 was a most important event in the development of relations between the fraternal countries and in the deepening of their integration for the purpose of further accelerating economic growth and improving the people's well-being. Its resolutions open up new, favorable prospects for the accelerated development of the national economy of these countries and of the socialist community as a whole, for the increased might and further enhanced prestige of world socialism and for positive changes in the whole world situation.

The course adopted by the ruling circles of American imperialism prevents establishing healthy principles in international political and economic life and consolidating and deepening the positive changes achieved during the period of detente. With the assumption of power by the present U.S. administration, aggressive militarist tendencies have become determining factors in the policies of this country, thereby increasing the already serious threat to universal peace. Having openly proclaimed a policy of preparing for and unleashing a nuclear war and striving to break the military strategic balance that exists in the world and to gain military superiority over the socialist community by means of deploying first-strike missiles and developing space weapons, the Reagan administration counts on resolving the historic dispute between two social systems with the aid of such a monstrous "argument" as a worldwide nuclear catastrophe.

The Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries offset the increased threat of war with a policy aimed at preserving and strengthening peace, lessening international tension, bridling the arms race and developing all-around cooperation between sovereign states. Acting in the interests of detente, disarmament and peace and defending the vital interests of all mankind, the Soviet state proposes reaching agreement on a whole complex of measures capable of actually lowering the level of military confrontation, excluding the use of force and the threat of force from international life and preventing the militarization of outer space. The USSR is in favor of honest dialogue and serious negotiations in order to find a solution to the problems upon which the future of mankind depends. The motherland of the October Revolution is always open to cooperation with all countries which, for their part, are prepared to help strengthen peace and international security, rid mankind of the nuclear threat and strengthen trust between peoples through practical acts.

The consistently peace-loving, flexible and constructive foreign policy of the Soviet Union and of the entire socialist community reveals the indissoluble nature of the very concepts of "socialism" and "peace," as well as the organic nature of the policy of peace for socialism, a policy that is conditioned by the very essence of the socialist system. The unshakable loyalty of world socialism and the whole communist movement to the principled Leninist tenet: "...Peace between peoples, the end of brigandage and violence--precisely this is our ideal..." (ibid., vol 26, p 304) is thereby confirmed.

The effectiveness of socialism's foreign policy, which is ensured by the economic and defense might of the USSR and the entire socialist community, the solidity of the alliance between the fraternal countries and the unity of their actions, is that it is a decisive force capable of making the aggressive, adventurist circles of imperialism see reason and returning international relations to the normal channel of peaceful coexistence. Our country has no need of military superiority; it does not aspire to it. But we will also not permit anyone to break the military balance that has been achieved.

The Great October Revolution, which laid the foundations of the present might of world socialism, has led to a qualitative renewal of the cause of struggling for peace and for the salvation of human civilization from the

catastrophe of war. Thanks to the existence and constant strengthening of world socialism and to radical changes in the correlation of forces in the world, the fatal inevitability of wars, characteristic of the eras when the exploitative classes held complete sway, has disappeared. Mankind can prevent a nuclear missile war and save our planet from destruction. All peace-loving, progressive, democratic forces must rally together for this and act in unity to bridle the forces of aggression and militarism.

The peoples now have no task more important and urgent than that of defending peace. This task is indissolubly and dialectically mutually connected with the task of the revolutionary renewal of society. "Now," noted Comrade K. U. Chernenko, "aspiration to social progress is indivisible from the struggle for lasting peace throughout the world. This is why the Leninist idea of peaceful coexistence remains the cornerstone of socialism's foreign policy and the demand of all democratic, peace-loving forces. To withdraw from the dangerous brink and eliminate the threat of a nuclear missile catastrophe--this is what the peoples demand. And we Leninists will do everything possible to save the future of mankind."

The new arrangement of forces in the world, which took shape as a result of the defeat of fascism in World War II and the historic achievements of the socialist community, has exerted a powerful revolutionary-transforming influence on the situation, living conditions and struggle of the international workers class. Inspired by the example of socialism, the working people in developed capitalist countries have been able to extort a number of concessions from capital, having somewhat improved their material position and having achieved a certain democratization of social life and the ensuring of their trade union rights.

The exploitative, inhumane nature of capitalism, however, has remained unchanged. The evils and defects organically inherent in it have also not disappeared of their own accord. The serious crisis phenomena and slumps which struck the world capitalist system at the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s to a considerable extent reduced to naught many of those social achievements won by the workers class in the countries of developed capitalism at the cost of many years of persistent class battles. The level of unemployment and inflation, unprecedented since the crisis of the 1930s, the rise of the cost of living, the virtual bondage in debt of millions of people, patronage's offensive on the rights of trade unions and the increasing limitation of bourgeois-democratic rights and freedoms--all this deprives the working people in capitalist countries of hopes of improving their situation and helps to activate the struggle in defense of their rights, against the power of the monopolies and for the revolutionary transformation of society.

The communist parties are in the vanguard of this struggle. Overcoming various difficulties, many of which are the direct result of interference by imperialist special services and their attempts to weaken the communist movement as an international force, a force cemented together by a common ideology and common program aims, the fraternal parties resolve complex problems put forward by the present stage of the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress.

It is precisely communists who make a decisive contribution to the rallying of all peace-loving forces and to the cause of mobilizing them to struggle against the threat of a nuclear catastrophe and against the absolute power of the monopolies--the main source of war.

The strengthening of the role and influence of world socialism in the postwar period has created fundamentally new conditions for developing the national liberation movement. Relying on aid and support from the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community, the peoples in colonial and dependent countries have won freedom from imperialist oppression in a stubborn battle. Imperialism's colonial system has virtually ceased to exist. In the place of collapsed colonial empires more than 90 new, independent states have sprung up, in which more than 50 percent of the world's population lives. The fact that these states participate in aware, historic creativity, pursue a policy of nonalignment, actively oppose the aggressive encroachments of neocolonialism and courageously uphold their right to independently resolve their own fate, narrows the sphere of imperialist domination and strengthens the forces of peace, democracy and social progress on earth.

Among the liberated countries there has appeared an important group of states with a socialist orientation that have embarked upon a path of gradually liquidating the positions of the imperialist monopolies and the local large bourgeoisie and feudal lords, ensuring the people's state command heights in the economy and a transition to the planned development of productive forces and encouraging the cooperative movement in the countryside. At the basis of the progressive changes in the social life of these countries lie the enhanced role of the working masses and the gradual strengthening of the state apparatus with national cadres loyal to the people. In this respect the formation of vanguard Marxist-Leninist parties acquires decisive significance. Loyal to the principles of proletarian internationalism, the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries develop close, equal cooperation with states of a socialist orientation and give them disinterested aid in creating the foundations of a new society.

The first victorious proletarian revolution in history, which was accomplished in Russia under the leadership of the Leninist party, is the source of the world's profound social renewal, has set the working masses in motion on all continents and still continues to enrich them with invaluable experience in their struggle against oppression and exploitation.

The October Revolution was and remains an inalienable component of the contemporary struggle for peace and social progress, since the tasks of the era it began--the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism on a worldwide scale--are far from exhausted. The October Revolution is our contemporary because the general trends of the social development it has revealed and the laws of revolutionary creativity operate in the conditions of the contemporary world despite all the colossal changes that have taken place. The October Revolution is also our contemporary because of the multifaceted experience accumulated during the revolution and because socialist creativity lives on in the immortal teachings of Lenin. Constantly developing on the basis of analysis and generalization of the latest experience of history and

the struggle of the masses, Leninism--the Marxism of our era--continues to show the way of struggle and victory to tens and hundreds of millions of people.

The ideas, lessons and achievements of the October Revolution and subsequent decades of socialist creativity in our country retain their worldwide historic relevance, exert a powerful, revolutionizing influence on the course of world development and stimulate the actions of the masses for the sake of great aims--the defense of peace, the true renewal of society and the ensuring of the happiness and well-being of the working people.

"The formation of the new world follows difficult and at times tortuous paths," Comrade K. U. Chernenko has pointed out. "But the wind of revolution and Lenin's ideas continue to swell the sails of social progress. And in this lies the hope of mankind."

No one can hold back the ship of the socialist renewal of the world.

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

CSO: 1802/3

THE PEOPLE'S CONTROLLERS' HIGH CIVIC DUTY

PM051959 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 84 (signed to press 15 Oct 84)
pp 13-20

[K. U. Chernenko's 5 October 1984 Speech at the All-Union Conference of People's Controllers]

[Text] Dear comrades:

You have gathered together to discuss extremely important questions, the questions of the further energizing and raising the effectiveness of people's control. The CPSU Central Committee believes we have assembled at a very good time. Here is why. We have entered a period when life is peremptorily putting forward new and increased demands for the quality of work of all the links that form the system of management of our society. People's control is an integral and, I would say, irreplaceable, part of this system. Thus, the demands of the time extend to you in full measure--to raise your activity to the level of the great tasks facing us.

Relying on our powerful material and spiritual potentials, we are concentrating our efforts on developing in every possible way all branches of industry, agriculture, transport and construction, on speeding up the intensification of production, on ensuring a new upsurge in Soviet science and technology, education, health care and the material and cultural standards of the people. The present complicated and tense international situation obliges us to strengthen the country's defense capability and to raise the combat readiness of our Armed Forces.

We have come close to frontiers which, in a certain sense, will be a turning point. It is a matter of the qualitative improvements which have been prepared by the whole course of our development and the enormous creative work of the party and the people which was conducted on the basis of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent Central Committee plenums.

The time has ripened for such improvements. They have become essential in the development of productive forces and in their reorganization on the basis of scientific-technological progress. Nor can we manage without such improvements in economic and management planning. Our economic machinery must be significantly improved. The people's welfare must be raised to a

qualitatively new stage. Of course, all of this is unthinkable without the conscientious, interested and initiative-minded work of Soviet people--of one and all. This means that an improvement is essential here too: the labor and social activity of the masses must not simply grow as before, but, in the literal sense of the word, it must multiply.

Comrades, all of this forms the living fabric of the process which we call the perfection of the socialism which has been built in our country. The attention of the party and its Central Committee is now riveted, and its thoughts are now turned precisely to the problems which are arising in this connection. This is the main thing which directs the preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress and the work on the new edition of the party program, and, correspondingly, on the latest five-year and longer-range economic and social development plans.

We are faced with making great decisions and approving great plans. This means that we must concern ourselves in advance with the guarantees for their fulfillment.

Prominent among these guarantees is people's control which has been established in a Leninist fashion. Let us say it directly: A very great deal in the further progress of our country depends on the work of people's control. Both all our past experience and the scientific theory of socialism impose such a conclusion.

As we all well know, Vladimir Il'ich Lenin attached enormous significance to the organization of effective control and the mass involvement in it of workers and the working people. He saw in this not simply one of the many sectors of the political and organizational activity of the party, the soviets and the trade unions; his thoughts went further and deeper, inextricably linking people's control with the very essence of the socialist system and with its democratic nature.

Let us glance at the history of the formation and development of socialism in our country. It is easy to notice that the problem of control constantly came to the fore as one of the most pressing problems at each of the most responsible sections of that path. As the October Revolution approached, Lenin's idea of workers' control was placed among the mobilizing slogans of the revolutionary proletariat. Under conditions of civil war and economic devastation, the young Soviet system, as it embarked upon building a new society, moved forward confidently, armed with Lenin's clear behest that "auditing and control was the main economic task" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 35, p 188). During the NEP [New Economic Policy] years, when in the economy the question of victor and vanquished was being decided, the party's concern for genuine people's control based on class principles was once again in the forefront. It was at this time that, expressing the most vital need of the socialist society that was growing stronger, Lenin brought out a work of programmatic importance: "How To Reorganize the Rabkrin [Worker-Peasant Inspectorate]." The work of our state and public control organs, based on Lenin's ideas, is, decade after decade, making a substantial contribution to the cause of socialist construction.

It is clear to everyone that a society based not on spontaneous but on planned and organized principles would not get far without a systematic check on how the aims that it has mapped out are being implemented in practice. We have come a very long way in socialist construction. The country has entered the stage of advanced socialism. In achieving this, people's control has played a noticeable and--I say again--a unique and irreplaceable role.

It is entirely logical that precisely in modern conditions, precisely at the stage of developed socialism, the rights and possibilities of people's control are being considerably expanded. And, of course, its responsibility increases. That has been given distinct expression in the USSR Constitution and in the Law on People's Control which was passed on the basis of it. But the most important thing is that this has a tangible and fruitful effect on our day-to-day practice in state administration and economic and public affairs.

Comrades, you represent a force of 10 million people's controllers. Ten million--is that many, or few? It is, of course, an impressive figure. It indicates that your work has assumed a great scope, and that participation in it has, indeed, become a mass phenomenon. That is good.

But let us take into consideration not only what has been achieved. Let us compare the present situation with the highest requirements of the scientific theory of socialism. Lenin taught that, in a socialist society, control work must become something truly nationwide.

At the dawn of the Soviet system, looking into the future, he wrote that control must be "implemented at first by worker organizations and then by the entire population one and all" (op. cit., vol 36, p 75). He stressed the words "one and all." Now, too, the party also poses the question in Lenin's way. This is the very aim toward which people must aspire. Each person must recognize himself or herself to be a people's controller--note that, each Soviet person. Each one must think and act in conformity with this lofty civic duty.

I think you understand me correctly. It is certainly not a matter of increasing the number of people working on people's control in its thousands of committees, although we know perfectly well that you have a few full-time workers and especially on the rayon and town levels. The important thing here is not figures. What is important is the essence of the matter: the fact that the development of people's control represents one of the necessary directions for deepening socialist democracy.

Our democracy gives each person the right and makes incumbent on each person the duty to actively prove himself to be master in the country. And you know for yourselves that taking part in control teaches people both how to use this right and to recognize this duty. That is the main strategic, if you like, viewpoint from which the party looks on the need to involve more and more millions of working people in your work. May they become real and exacting people's controllers, if not directly by name then in the spirit and content of their social activity, even if at first this is within the framework of their own labor collectives. May they, and I shall say this in Lenin's words,

"gradually move on from the most simple occupations to fulfill more important roles in state affairs" (op. cit., vol 40, p 201).

A priceless quality of our democracy is its reality. Indeed, the party attributes enormous significance to its real development and deepening. You well know how seriously this question was posed at the April 1984 Central Committee plenum. Its decisions are aimed directly at making the work of the soviets more active. The task here lies in ensuring that these mass organs of state power should really learn to use all their constitutional powers. The party considers this same task to be a pressing one for the trade unions as well and also for the Komsomol and the labor collectives and, in the same way, for people's control. All in all, it is a matter of developing the creative strength of the people's socialist self-government to its full extent. This is where the meaning of perfecting the political system of our society lies and that is how it draws nearer to the ideal of socialism.

In general, comrades, reaching the highest norms of socialism is what must become our rule. One must not forget about them when assessing what has been achieved. Both today's practice and plans for the future must be measured against them. In your activity this is, one could say, the first commandment, for in the final analysis people's control exists in order to help expose and eliminate everything that goes counter to the nature of socialism and is divorced from its principles.

Take, for example, a principle of socialism, sacred for us: from each according to ability, to each according to his labor. This is the very foundation of the social justice which none other than our working class, our people, for the first time in history turned from a dream into living reality. But, while conscious of all the grandeur of this accomplishment, one must not forget that it has to be both guarded and developed. We have sufficient experience which teaches us that observance of the principle "according to his labor" requires special concern. Otherwise, this means its violation, which substantially harms our economy, deeply angers Soviet people and conflicts with our understanding of justice.

What are these phenomena? The tendency to leveling is a tendency toward ennobling the loafer and the wastemaker. At the same time it is to insult and hurt the good and conscientious worker. You know that it is still not rare for a bonus, for example, to be paid out in equal amounts to both the production frontrunner and to the laggard. Unfortunately, many close their eyes to this. Even people's control sometimes passes over such instances, classing them, evidently, as trivialities and details. In fact, however, they are crude departures from the fundamental principle of socialism.

Those who put all their strength into their work should always and everywhere be guaranteed tangible preferences in wages, in allocation of housing, free travel vouchers and other social benefits. I am repeating what I have already had occasion to say; but I repeat it especially before you, because it is the task of people's control to constantly see how the obligatory norms of the socialist system of distribution are being observed in practice and to check how the "measure of consumption and the measures of labor," to use Lenin's words, are being tied together in concrete terms.

Now, about the notorious "living above one's means" or to call it by its proper name, parasitism, with all its immoral and in some cases criminal implications. Let us speak plainly! We have not yet succeeded in putting an end to these phenomena. There are still unreformed people who try to and who have succeeded in building their own prosperity at the expense of others, at the expense of society. It is clear that this is incompatible with any norms of our socialist way of life.

In recent years, we have really gotten down to putting our house in order, so to speak. The task is precisely formulated: to put an end to bribe-taking and speculation, to the squandering and theft of socialist property, to abuse of office. We have sharply stepped up the struggle for strengthening law and order, for improving the work of our law enforcement agencies and for raising the responsibility of executives for the overall state of organization and discipline. In this direction the central bodies of the party and state have taken quite a few practical measures, in some cases quite severe ones, as for example in the case of a number of workers in Krasnodar Kray, Uzbekistan and Rostov Oblast.

Our people approve this line and support it. [Applause.] But the question we now face is this. Do all realize that this line must be supported constantly, systematically, and not just in general, not just by solemn declarations but by specific deeds? This question is also addressed to you, comrade leaders and people's control activists, to you especially, because the people, seeing phenomena which insult their dignity and conscience, have every justification for wondering where on earth their own, i.e. specifically people's controllers, are looking. The same demand is of course also made of the soviets of people's deputies, of the law enforcement agencies and other state and social organizations. But this in no way diminishes the responsibility which lies on your shoulders. It is your plain duty to resolutely exert the great powers invested in you where so far the fight against shortcomings and scandals is only being waged in speeches rather than deeds.

Serious concern, comrades, is being aroused by the poor results of the measures that have been used for many years against alcohol abuse. The yearning for alcohol ruins people's health, brings misfortune into the home. Drunkenness causes no little harm to production and, in general, casts a shadow on our way of life. Clearly the time has come to turn to more persistent and more carefully thought out actions in order to free society from this great evil. I am sure that people's control also will do everything in its power to ensure that the struggle against drunkenness is effective and does not just amount to formal "measures."

Control involves primarily face-to-face work with people. Practice proves how important here is an approach which is skillful, strict, exacting and, at the same time, sympathetic. Groundless distrust and suspicion are forbidden for representatives of people's control.

The work of control cannot be reduced merely to revealing large and small flaws in our life and allowing the guilty no quarter. As we all recall, Lenin stressed that control is called upon "not only and even not so much to catch

and expose, but to be able to correct things," "to carry out the necessary practical changes in time and to implement them in practice" (op. cit., vol 44, p 127).

It is particularly important to catch omissions in time and to prevent them from growing into major failures. Stress must be placed on the most careful study of the reasons for defects and abuses, to study them and, on this basis, collectively to seek measures to prevent negative phenomena. Of course, all checking must without fail be seen through to the end and there must be no withdrawal until the situation is corrected. This means that checking, warning and correction of shortcomings must be combined in the work of people's control.

A considerable, if not the overwhelming, part of your activity, comrades, is connected with problems of the economy and concern for raising its efficiency. This is natural, as the economic sphere is key for us.

In this sphere now, the number one task is to worthily complete the current five-year plan. We have managed to overcome quite a few past omissions, but in order to cope with the planned tasks and the socialist pledges which have been taken, very serious efforts are still essential. We also expect such efforts from people's control. It should ensure the maximum use of existing reserves. Such reserves lie primarily in the further improvement of the organization of labor, the strengthening of discipline and a regimen of thrift.

The struggle we have unleashed for accuracy and organization in work has produced palpable results. There has been an improvement in the observance of enterprise contract obligations. There have been considerable reductions in idleness, lateness and absenteeism. Production has immediately and noticeably benefited from this. However, as before, some deliveries are not made and some working time is lost. For these two reasons, both last year and this year we have lost billions of rubles of industrial output.

There is still an unsatisfactory level of organization in capital construction. Construction work is frequently done at a low quality level and completion dates are not met. This has serious detrimental effects on our production plan and on the working people's personal interests. In many places, disruptions and poor work in construction exacerbate the shortage of housing, school premises, kindergartens and nurseries. As you know, recently the Central Committee Politburo outlined a whole range of measures aimed at correcting the state of affairs in capital construction. It is important that these measures should be unconditionally implemented. Here we are counting on the active assistance of people's control.

One of the signs of disorganization in economic affairs is a squandering, noneconomical attitude toward raw and other materials and energy. I am sure it hurts each one of you to see most valuable equipment left to rust in factory yards, piles of fertilizer that were not taken to the fields in time and ill-tended torches burning up countless cubic meters of grass. Such economic irresponsibility plainly calls for the active intervention of people's control.

We have positive experience in the struggle for economy. Let me just quote some. In the past three years, savings of fuel and power have accounted for half the increase in their output. In the case of rolled ferrous metal, they exceeded the entire increase in its output. People's control made a considerable contribution to these achievements. So, comrades, let us develop them in every way!

Economizing must become the immutable law of our entire economic life. But today I should particularly like to draw your attention to how important it is to ensure strict observation of this law in agriculture. The harvest is won by arduous labor and there can be no justification for anyone who permits even small losses of it in harvesting, transporting and storing. Right now, there should be very thorough concern for preserving the gathered crops and concern for not losing what has been achieved in animal husbandry. All necessary measures should be taken to provide good wintering for the increased numbers of farm animals. People's control can help a lot and do a lot in this.

The volume of our consumer services, retail trade and passenger travel is growing rapidly, comrades. Yet the working people are still, justifiably, quite dissatisfied with how matters stand here. The ground for this dissatisfaction often lies in gross violations of procedure and norms which are essential in serving the population. Certain enterprises and institutions, which are supposed to create conveniences for people, doom them to a real Road to Calvary and cause them to waste a vast amount of valuable time and nervous energy. People's control does not fail to pay attention to these disorders that poison our life, but inasmuch as they persist it is apparently necessary to act more energetically in this area.

We now have enough experience to know beforehand under what conditions discipline will be really strong and work will be harmonious. Success is achieved by putting a total end to disorganization and economic irresponsibility and combining educative measures with precise organization of labor and production. Take, for example, the leading cost accounting brigades. They have forgotten what absenteeism is and they know the worth of the people's ruble. Here an economic attitude to work, mutual assistance and exacting checking on each other are combined. Here, one can say, everyone is in charge and everyone is a controller.

The organization of such brigades is part of the great and painstaking effort to create the economic conditions necessary for an accelerated intensification of the national economy. This work now covers many fields, including the conducting of a large-scale economic experiment in a number of sectors, in the course of which, as we know, the elements of a new economic mechanism, which make it possible to correctly assign rights and responsibilities between the central organs of government and production enterprises are being worked out. It is a question of seriously improving planning and management structure and the powerful levers of the personal interest and responsibility of every worker in his job.

The party attaches vast significance to this important work. A commission of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on the improvement of management and

enhancement of the efficiency of the national economy has been formed and is operating. The drafting of detailed, well thought out proposals for the restructuring of the economic mechanism, as you well understand, is a matter of primary importance.

Comrades, you know from your own experience that the influence and prestige of people's control increases manifold if it receives all the necessary support from party committees and soviet bodies. The party and the state view people's control as a most important sector of our party-wide and statewide affairs and consider day to day assistance to it as one of their responsible tasks. All the more because in this way the role of people's control as a school of management, a school of inculcating the active stance as a citizen of Soviet people, is enhanced.

This is why the party insistently demands a most attentive, most respectful attitude for people's controllers from all of its committees and from managers who are party members. They must be thoughtfully helped to acquire the Leninist work style, the skill of relying on the collective in any matter great or small and on the knowledge and experience of those around them, and to take their mood and requests into account. Every people's controller should be an example of high political and professional standards, a model of honesty, principle and incorruptibility. The people's controller acts not only on behalf of the people, but also in the interests of the people, of every worker. For that reason his appraisal and conclusions, his every step, must be irreproachable, both from the point of view of being businesslike and fair and, of course, from the point of view of our socialist legality.

I have already said that people's control personnel and their scouts must always see things through to the end and, as Lenin taught, consider checking of actual implementation of paramount importance. It is in this that they most of all need the help of party committees and soviets of people's deputies. What is needed first and foremost is a businesslike, a swift reaction to the signals and suggestions from people's control.

The efficiency of people's control will indubitably increase noticeably if it closely cooperates with the organs of party control and with commissions of the soviets of people's deputies and public control activists.

It is no secret that sometimes real control is replaced by control on paper. It happens that a countless multitude of information, reports and written explanations is demanded from enterprises and organizations. As a rule, such papers are compiled by people using unsuitable means to check on the work. As a result, formal replies for the record are engendered and sometimes, in the words of Feliks Edmundovich Dzerzhinskiy, there is skillful lying. There must be resolute struggle against such bureaucratic distortions.

It would certainly not be out of place to help people's control in the coordination of various kinds of checks. There is great lack of coordination and muddle there at the moment. It happens that one commission has hardly left a factory before a second one arrives and before you have time to turn round, so does a third one. And all with the same questions. Such practices get on the nerves of the labor collectives and impede their work. In short,

the organization of inspections must be put in order. This would also make it possible to raise the responsibility of both the checked and the checkers.

Generally speaking, comrades, with the necessary support and assistance of party and administrative organs, our people's control can do much to improve the work of the state apparatus, to ensure that there is no place in it for formalism, excessive paperwork and red tape.

And on for another subject: the attitude toward people's controllers and their comments and proposals on the part of those whose work they check. The absolute majority of officials, as you know, accept the checks, conclusions and advice of people's controllers in a principled and self-critical manner. But, as you also know, there are officials who, to put it mildly, have no respect for people's controllers and take their recommendations virtually as an encroachment on their authority.

This is contrary to our party position. The CPSU has striven and continues to strive to ensure that the people's control organs should act more boldly and resolutely against everything that contradicts the interests of our society, against any attempts to act to the detriment of those interests and against the law. In the struggle against these attempts, wherever they occur and whatever their source, the people's controllers have a most eminent role. Permit me to express the conviction that they will always fulfill it worthily.

The control service is special and requires people with special character. They are distinguished by a keen eye for economies, by capacity to delve deeply into matters and to find out about everything objectively and to the last detail. Prejudice, arrogance and vanity are alien to them.

I sometimes think comrades, about the fact that a people's controller can find himself in difficult situations. Let's say a check has been made and has yielded material for serious censure to be directed against the administration and for impartial criticism of one's own bosses. Say what you like--this demands courage, firmness of spirit and staying power. These qualities are also indispensable when somebody suddenly and painfully gets through your equanimity with some mean little question such as: What's the matter with you that you want to stand out?

Always, everywhere and in all circumstances the people's controller is a fighter. And may he be an unbending fighter! [Applause.]

I want to assure you, dear comrades, that the party thinks highly of your great, honorable and very necessary work. It relies firmly on the strength of people's control and on its help in resolving responsible tasks, which face us today and will still be facing us tomorrow. [Tumultuous, prolonged applause.]

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

CSO: 1802/3

WITH A HIGH DEGREE OF EXACTINGNESS

AU111510 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 84 (signed to press 15 Oct 84)
pp 21-36

[Article by M. Solomentsev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Party Control Committee under the CPSU Central Committee]

[Text] Our Soviet society is developing progressively and dynamically. Impressive successes have been achieved in the fulfillment of the economic and social tasks set by the Communist Party. The country's national wealth has increased and its production and scientific-technical potential has likewise increased. Our motherland's defense might has been strengthened. The level of well-being and culture of the Soviet people has risen. At the basis of all these successes lies the selfless work of our people closely rallied around the Communist Party and its Leninist Central Committee.

The leading role of the party has further increased in the struggle to implement the political line of the 26th CPSU Congress. Thousands of threads connect the party with the people. The CPSU fulfills its historic mission together with the masses and in the interests of the masses. It devotes unremitting attention to the problems of further deepening socialist democracy, improving the work of the soviets of people's deputies and of the trade union, Komsomol and other social organizations, and enhancing the role and responsibility of the labor collectives. The party consistently and persistently perfects its organizational, ideological and mass political work.

The past period has also been fruitful in the sphere of the CPSU's theoretical activities. The materials of the 26th Party Congress and of subsequent Central Committee plenums and the works and speeches of Comrade K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, have enriched Marxist-Leninist theory and practice with important propositions and conclusions on developed socialism and the strategy and tactics of its perfection. Realistic, well-considered characterization of the degree of socioeconomic maturity reached by Soviet society and its increased potentials and precise definition of the prospects of further development on the way to set aims will find expression in the new wording of the party program being drawn up for the 27th CPSU Congress. Proposals concerning possible alterations and additions to the Party Statute also have to be generalized and prepared.

Communists and all Soviet people understand how important it is, while looking forward into the historically foreseeable future, to fully implement the ideals of socialism. A collective, creative search for the best possible means of fulfilling immediate tasks and unremitting concern to increase organization and discipline are characteristic of the sociopolitical atmosphere in which our people live and work. The singlemindedness and great sociopolitical activeness of the working masses are the life-giving source of our strength and the guarantee that the regular current and long-term tasks of socialist and communist construction will be fulfilled.

I

Improving the organization of and strengthening party, state and production discipline and public order is indissolubly connected with control and verification of fulfillment. Control is an inalienable component of the party's leading activities and an indispensable condition for the efficient functioning of state and social organizations.

This was confirmed with fresh force at the All-Union Conference of People's Controllers held recently in Moscow. The clear, well-argued speech with which Comrade K. U. Chernenko addressed the participants of this conference--representatives of the 10 million-strong army of scouts--contains a comprehensive program for further perfecting the system of socialist control operating in our country and making more effective use of this powerful weapon in the hands of the party and people.

Every individual connected in one way or another with control and verification of fulfillment--and this is virtually the whole party aktiv and all the leading cadres--invariably turns to the Leninist ideas on organizing control and to the principles, forms and methods of implementing this control. All the vast experience accumulated in this sphere convinces us that without control and verification of fulfillment, it is impossible to manage social affairs, successfully implement party directives and fulfill plans for the country's economic and cultural development.

Emphasizing the importance of organizing and perfecting comprehensive control in all spheres of party, state, economic, social and spiritual life, V. I. Lenin wrote: "The actual fulfillment of party tasks and of commissions, requirements and tasks set by the Soviet authorities must be verified as closely as possible" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 39, p 307).

The practice of socialist construction has confirmed the indisputable correctness of Leninist theses on control as one of the laws of the formation and development of the new social system and on the most pressing necessity for such control until the highest phase of a unified communist system has been reached.

Lenin's directions concerning the organization and implementation of socialist control acquire particular relevance in contemporary conditions, when productive forces and the material and spiritual wealth of the people have

grown in the country on an unprecedented scale and when the party is fulfilling the grandiose tasks of perfecting developed socialism and showing tireless concern to strengthen the country's defense capabilities and to safeguard peace and the security of peoples. Fulfilling large-scale and complex tasks under present-day concrete historical conditions requires strengthening the scientific methods of party leadership of the country's economic and sociopolitical life, perfecting the economic mechanism, establishing the Leninist style of work everywhere and, consequently, enhancing the role and importance of the socialist control.

In the general system of political, organizational and educational measures implemented by the party, party and socialist control is, as a whole, becoming an increasingly effective instrument in deepening the real democracy of our system and strictly observing social justice.

As is well-known, social progress is subject to the laws of dialectics. Developing and resolving contradictions that actually exist is both the substance and source of perfecting socialism. Communist ideals and new, progressive trends do not gain the right to life per se, but in a sharp, uncompromising struggle against what is old and outdated and against certain manifestations of an ideology that is alien to us and vestiges of a private ownership psychology.

This is why one should emphasize the increasing significance of control in resolving contradictions, overcoming difficulties that arise for subjective and objective reasons and liquidating certain phenomena inappropriate to the essence and ideals of socialism.

As an effective form of eliminating shortcomings, control gives the necessary dynamism to the multiplan process of perfecting developed socialism.

It is precisely for this reason that the organs of control must be consistent and decisive when establishing all that is progressive, cultivating conscious discipline and communist morality and introducing model order to all spheres of economic and social life.

A special place in the system of socialist control is occupied by party control, which is determined by the communist party position as the leading and guiding force of our society. The party consistently and systematically develops and strengthens democratic centralism and strives for unity of will and action and strict observance of the Leninist norms of party life. The monolithic cohesion of the party, its successful leadership of socialist society and the growth in the activeness and independent action of communists have been achieved thanks to the perfection of political, organizational and educational work, the development of criticism and self-criticism and the rise in the level of control and verification of fulfillment.

The strength of party control primarily lies in the fact that it is of a political nature and is invariably implemented from the positions of general party and state interests. This means that no departmental impediments and no parochial or personal interests can hinder establishing the true state of

affairs and elucidating the causes of negative phenomena in any sphere of social and socioeconomic life.

The strength of party control lies in its mass and all-embracing nature. There are now 433,000 primary party organizations in the party invested, as is well-known, with the right to control, which attests to its great potentials. Party control also draws its strength from the fact that it is implemented by people with high party qualities, people who are self-disciplined, people who have voluntarily taken upon themselves the difficult duties of a communist and who consequently fulfill these duties in an aware and responsible manner.

The strength of party control also lies in its sharpness and effectiveness. Violations of party and state discipline and irregular behavior by workers are objectively appraised regardless of who the person may be or the position he may hold. Those guilty of violations bear full responsibility, right up to exclusion from the party, and the shortcomings disclosed are eliminated with party persistence and adherence to principle.

It should be noted that positive changes have taken place in recent years in work connected with implementing party control. These changes have been achieved as a result of implementing the CPSU Central Committee Resolution of 11 August 1981, "On Further Perfecting Control and Verification of Fulfillment in the Light of the Decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress." This resolution determined ways of increasing the effectiveness of control and verification of fulfillment as a most important component part of the party's organizational and mass political work and as a tried-and-tested means of improving the activities of party, soviet and economic organizations and increasing the responsibility of the cadres for the matter in hand.

The steady implementation of the Leninist principles of organizing control, such as democratic centralism, mass character, comprehensiveness, objectivity, systematicness, publicity, exactingness, trust in and sensitivity toward people, is the unshakeable foundation of further perfecting all control work and verification of fulfillment. Lofty examples of implementing the Leninist norms of party life and ensuring unity of political and organizational leadership are provided by the party Central Committee. The decisions of the Central Committee and the activities of the Politburo and the Central Committee Secretariat are characterized by the scientifically substantiated arrangement of vital tasks connected with the domestic and foreign policies of the party and the state, thorough analysis of the fulfillment of earlier adopted directives and high and exacting evaluation of the work performed by leading cadres.

A creative approach to the organization and implementation of control and the skillful concentration of forces on the main aspects and tasks emanating from the decisions of the 26th Party Congress and subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums and from the resolutions of the Central Committee and the Soviet government are particularly necessary under contemporary conditions.

The further rise in the level of control and verification of fulfillment is attested to by the practice of the work of the party committees, primary party organizations and party control organs. Their attention to problems such as

observing the principles and norms of party and state life, ensuring the effective utilization of scientific production potential and all factors concerning the intensification of social production, and perfecting the forms and methods of the planned management of the national economy and its individual units has intensified. Party control is increasingly aimed at constantly improving the style of work of party and state organs and ensuring the unconditional fulfillment of party directives and the decisions of the Central Committee.

New impetus is being given to the fulfillment of the main task of party control--defending the purity of party ranks and strengthening their unity and cohesion. The slogan of the party's ideological, organizational and moral-political unity has never been removed from the agenda, although its substance has changed during different historical periods. In contemporary conditions, communists interpret it as an indispensable requirement for further enhancing the leading role of the party in all spheres of life of Soviet society, and as an appeal to rally its ranks around the Central Committee and mobilize forces to successfully fulfill the tasks set by the party for perfecting developed socialism and strengthening organization, discipline and order.

In his speech to voters from the Kuybyshev Electoral District in Moscow, Comrade K. U. Chernenko said: "The party and state, as you know, have intensified the struggle against such disgraceful phenomena as the squandering of state means, eyewash and abuse of one's official position, and embezzlement and bribe-taking. This is not a temporary campaign. This is a policy that will be pursued constantly and strictly. No allowances are being or will be made for anyone in this respect. No one should harbor illusions on this score."

The party control organs--the Party Control Committee under the CPSU Central Committee and the party commissions under the central committees of the communist parties of the union republics and the CPSU kraykoms, obkoms, district committees, gorkoms and raykoms--are called upon to operate systematically and purposefully in this matter, not to allow any campaign-like activities, to show irreconcilability in the struggle against disorderliness and irresponsibility and to resolutely eradicate phenomena alien to our party morals and to the Soviet way of life. As practice shows, the conditions for abuses are created wherever party adherence to principle is substituted by indulgence, lack of control, subservience, meretriciousness and ostentation, and wherever no concern is shown for developing sharp criticism or giving proper appraisal to faults that bring the title of communist and, what is more, leader, into disrepute. It is precisely for this reason that there have been serious breaches of party and state discipline in Uzbekistan, Krasnoyarsk Kray and Rostov Oblast.

Let us also cite other cases. Ignoring Soviet laws and the requirements of party and state discipline, some economic leaders of the management of the Bratsk Hydroelectric Power Plant Construction Trust have permitted the embezzlement and squandering of state property. They resorted to falsifying documents, distorting accounts and other illegal acts. This was helped to a considerable extent by lack of control on the part of the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification and local organs.

Certain officials who were bound to promptly put a stop to violations themselves entered into illicit relations with the now convicted workers from the Bratsk Hydroelectric Power Plant Construction Trust and used their official positions for selfish ends. As was reported in the press, the leading workers from the local organs and central institutions found guilty were called strictly to account, right up to being excluded from the party and removed from their posts.

Something similar happened in the Kiev Kristall Production Association. The head of this association, V. I. Tsyba, systematically abused his official position and violated the norms of communist morals. The association failed to observe order in its bonus payments system. Workers who criticized these and other negative phenomena were subjected to victimization.

The Party Control Committee dismissed Tsyba from the party. Other workers found guilty of violations were also called to account. The former secretary of the association's party committee, A. F. Lyamparskiy, received a strong reprimand for his unprincipled attitude, which was entered on his registration card. The organs of the procurator's office instituted criminal proceedings in the association against cases of bad management, squandering of state means and write-ups.

During checks recently carried by the Party Control Committee under the CPSU Central Committee, some other leaders who had embarked upon the path of committing abuses, deceiving the party and state and violating party ethics and morals were also inevitably and severely punished. Of course, there is only a handful of people like these in the vast army of leading cadres cultivated by the party, who give all their strength and knowledge to fulfilling the most complex tasks of socialist construction. A principled appraisal of the slightest deviations from the norms of party life is therefore all the more necessary. No compromise with regard to those who hinder our progress or to whatever is alien to the party and its Statute--such is the moral-political line of our party.

A comprehensive approach to developing society as a unified and integral social organism is characteristic of CPSU policy at this stage. The organs of party control are faced with large-scale and multiplan tasks, which presupposes covering a broad range of problems, ensuring the fulfillment of program and statutory requirements and party and government directives and improving the style of work of party, soviet and economic organs.

A meeting of the aktiv of the oblast party organization was recently held in Murmansk, at which the problem of the condition of state discipline and the necessity to increase exactingness toward the leading cadres was discussed. The report and discussion reflected the materials of the check conducted with the participation of workers from the Party Control Committee under the CPSU Central Committee on the work in various spheres of activity of the oblast party organization.

Communists and the working people of the oblast persistently struggle to fulfill the plans of the 11th Five-Year Plan. At the same time, it was noted

in speeches given at the meeting of the aktiv that in a number of party organizations, insufficient attention was devoted to ensuring the stable fulfillment of plan tasks and that no struggle was being waged against unsubstantiated amendments to plans, eyewash and write-ups, various kinds of encroachments upon socialist property and black-marketeering and bribe-taking. Why has this happened? The participants in the meeting were unanimous in their reply to this question: the importance of control and verification of fulfillment of party and governmental directives was frequently depreciated and decisions made by that oblast party organizations themselves were not backed up by strong organizational activity. The necessary exactingness was not shown toward communists and primarily leading workers, regarding the matter at hand.

Cases of the breaching of party and state discipline, as well as the norms of communist morals were sometimes not given publicity, and liberalism and tolerance were shown in the hearing of specific cases of misdemeanors.

It is to be supposed that self-critical acknowledgment and principled condemnation of permitted shortcomings will help the obkom, gorkoms and raykoms, as well as the primary party organizations in Murmansk Oblast, to achieve the proper organization of control of fulfillment and to increase exactingness toward the cadres. There is no doubt that all this will help to improve the moral-political atmosphere within the oblast party organization and will act as a firm basis for achieving better results in economic and cultural construction.

The aims of increasing production efficiency, strengthening the discipline in fulfillment and perfecting management and work style have been met by the comprehensive checks carried out by the Party Control Committee in the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry and at a number of enterprises in this branch, as well as in some all-union industrial associations under the Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment and Control Systems, the Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry, and others.

Party control over the fulfillment of party and governmental directives concerning the further intensification of social production and the acceleration of scientific-technical progress is being more actively and substantively implemented. Thus, in the course of checks carried out by the Party Control Committee in conjunction with the USSR Committee of People's Control and the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, it was established that the plans envisaged by the directives of the 25th and 26th CPSU Congresses for developing the production of cement using new energy-saving technology--the so-called dry method--had not been properly fulfilled. They were outside the control of A. I. Yashin, USSR minister of the construction materials industry, and V. I. Chudin, USSR minister of construction, road and municipal machine building. As a consequence of this, for many years the construction of new, and the reconstruction of existing enterprises was delayed, new lines in cement production were not put into operation, wastage was permitted and equipment fell into disuse.

The party committees of the corresponding ministries also failed to sound the alarm on this matter. It seems that their secretaries, V. A. Dolganov and Yu. N. Donskoy, forgot that, in accordance with the CPSU Statute, the party committees of ministries are called upon to implement control over the work of the apparatus in the fulfillment of party and governmental directives and they failed to show the necessary exactingness toward those who disrupted the fulfillment of important state tasks.

The officials who permitted carelessness and lack of control were, of course, called to account on both the party and official levels. However, the chief result of this and other checks was not simply reduced to disciplinary measures. The intervention of control organs must introduce serious corrections to the activities of the economic management apparatus and the party committees under the ministries and help to draw lessons from permitted mistakes.

II

The results yielded from the work of the party control organs depend to a decisive extent upon the systematic and thorough nature of checks carried out, the depth of analysis of the causes of negative phenomena, the validity of conclusions and the concreteness of proposals introduced. This is all the more important in view of the fact that the volume of information made available to the party control organs is extremely great and its sources very diverse. All this dictates the necessity for a scientifically substantiated approach to the planning and organization of control work.

The major problems of internal party life and of the country's economic and sociopolitical development must primarily draw the attention of party control. The fact that thoroughly prepared materials and concrete proposals concerning problems of general party and state significance are increasingly frequently submitted for examination by the Central Committee, party committees at various levels and state and economic organs should be noted as a positive feature in control work of recent years.

In accordance with the CPSU Central Committee directive, the Party Control Committee has studied, for example, the problem of utilizing stocks of uninstalled equipment in the national economy. As a result of work done, leaders guilty of breaching order in the ordering, purchase and installation of equipment were called to account on the party level. At the same time, other causes of an increase in warehouse stocks of equipment were also disclosed. The main results of the check were submitted to the CPSU Central Committee. The Central Committee adopted a comprehensive decision aimed at eliminating shortcomings in the planning and utilization. The work of the planning organs and of all interested ministries and departments is channeled in this direction.

In connection with the Party Control Committee's study of the problem of utilizing valuable and rare metals, it was established that the leaders of the Ministries of the Aviation Industry, Communications Equipment Industry and Electronics Industry, as well as many associations and enterprises in these branches, did not ensure the zealous utilization of secondary resources or of

metal waste products. The USSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy has not developed the production base necessary for this. The check carried out by the committee has made it possible to draw the attention of leaders not only of the aforementioned ministries, but also of the USSR State Planning Committee, the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply and the USSR Ministry of Finance, to this very important sector.

There is no doubt that a most important task of control is to bring about positive and concrete changes in the work of ministries, departments, institutions, enterprises and organizations whose activities have been checked. This is possible only if the control organ takes a firm and principled stand on every matter and persistently and consistently does everything necessary to eliminate the shortcomings revealed, as well as their causes.

It is clear that the organization of control checks, and particularly the analysis and generalization of their results, must fully meet high scientific requirements. It is a question of strictly authenticating facts and thoroughly understanding the nature of cause-and-effect connections, motivations and interests. In order to understand a complex and difficult problem, Lenin taught, "one must not take individual facts, but the whole aggregate of acts relating to the problem in question, without any exception" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." vol 30, p 351).

The maximum objectivity of the results of verification and the validity of the decision taken completely depend on the degree to which documents received are studied and on how closely the opinions and arguments of those who are acquainted with the state of affairs and who bear responsibility for this state of affairs are listened to and considered. Party control does not tolerate formalism, superficiality, or excessive fuss. Here thoughtfulness, lack of bias, adherence to principle, trust in and sensitivity toward people, and an invariably respectful attitude toward their merits are what is particularly required. Called upon to guard the norms of party and state life, the organs of party control are bound to set an example of a creative approach to the cause, the democratic discussion of questions that arise, and the adopting of substantiated, just decisions.

The problem of where and in what organ to discuss the results of party verification is also highly important. And in what case will the greatest effect be achieved? It is frequently deemed expedient to convey material for examination and the adoption of a decision to the appropriate party committee, soviet of people's deputies, ministry, department or party organization. Sometimes, apart from problems connected with the personal responsibility of officials, the necessity arises to eliminate shortcomings in the work of enterprises, individual subsections of ministries and departments, planning services, supply services and so forth. This system of resolving concrete matters increases the responsibility of the leaders of party, soviet and economic organizations and is of great educational significance.

Of course, even in a case such as this, the control organ does not remain on the sidelines. Its representatives frequently participate in a session of the party committee bureau or of the ministry or department collegium and then

take close interest in the fulfillment of planned measures by way of implementing control. For example, decisions adopted by the Party Control Committee are considered fulfilled only when all measures planned in accordance with the verification materials have been implemented. In a number of cases, information on this is carefully checked in order to establish its authenticity. As a rule, the party commissions also work in this way at the instruction of the corresponding party committees.

Eliminating shortcomings in the work of ministries, departments, enterprises and organizations is the main aim when examining the problem in the control organ itself. Repeated checks are carried out in this respect. Not so long ago, the Party Control Committee was once again compelled to return to the problem of shortcomings in antialcohol propaganda conducted by means of the cinema. The fact of the matter is that the leaders of the USSR State Committee for Cinematography and a number of cinema studios did not draw the necessary conclusions from the first examination of this problem carried out several years ago. Having initially put some effort into this work, they later let the matter drift. Proper concern for creating films revealing the ruinous nature and social damage caused by drunkenness was not shown. Some cinema films have once again been full of colorful scenes of drinking bouts, sometimes falsely interpreted as an inalienable and inoffensive part of national customs and rituals.

Not only shortcomings in the activities of the USSR State Committee for Cinematography came to light in the process of verification, but also the lack of participating, and sometimes even the indifference, of workers in institutions and organizations called upon to implement antialcohol propaganda. That is why this problem is repeatedly discussed in the Party Control Committee on a broader basis and with the participation of representatives of the All-Union Trade Union Council, the Komsomol Central Committee and the ministries of health and education. A serious and pointed talk has been held. Participants spoke of making fuller use of the potentials of the Soviet cinema and interested departments in this important matter.

One topical task of party control is that of taking preventive measures--anticipating mistakes and shortcomings. This is achieved in many ways: thoroughly analyzing the causes of certain negative phenomena, acting systematically, and constantly verifying fulfillment--from the moment a decision is adopted right up to its practical fulfillment. Publicity and the objective elucidation of the results of verification are no less important. However, the benefit of timely, comradely criticism of individual omissions and slips, which can grow into serious shortcomings, should be particularly noted.

Here are two examples. Shortcomings in the production of contemporary mining equipment and in the utilization of progressive methods of organizing production at certain enterprises under the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry came to light during one check.

When examining this problem, the Party Control Committee under the CPSU Central Committee drew the attention of the ministry leadership to the necessity of implementing urgent measures to eliminate the shortcomings noted.

It was pointed out at the same time that the appropriate ministries and departments must increase the help given miners in meeting their needs for new, highly productive technology and equipment.

And here is another example. The CPSU Central Committee and the Party Control Committee have received a considerable number of signals concerning shortcomings in the matter of acquiring academic degrees and titles. One of the heads of departments of the USSR Higher Degree Commission has been dismissed from the party for blatant violations of state discipline and abuse of his official position. The committee has not begun to examine the question of the activities of the Higher Degree Commission as a whole, although a detailed discussion has been had with its chairman, V. G. Kirillov-Ugryumov. Serious observations on the work of the Higher Degree Commission have been put to him and his attention drawn to the necessity of increasing the responsibility of workers in the Higher Degree Commission apparatus and of its expert councils and eliminating possible loopholes for getting into science through the "back door." It is to be hoped that this talk will help to eliminate existing shortcomings.

In everything concerning control and verification of fulfillment, it is always a golden rule for us to comply with the behests of Lenin, who sets a shining example of combining theoretical propositions on control with their implementation. Every day the chairman of the Council of People's Commissars found time, and sometimes a considerable amount of time, to verify fulfillment. It is precisely the indissolubility and fullest possible merging of creative, administrative functions with control that characterized all Vladimir I'lich's multifaceted activities.

This dual formula of organizational and administrative activity is particularly binding in our day. However, unfortunately, one frequently comes across cases of the leader of an institution or department being ill-informed as to the state of affairs--at times, even in the most important sectors of their activities. Underestimation of the importance of the direct participating of a leading person in control is still observed, and attempts are made by some leaders to place this most important function squarely on the shoulders of deputies, assistants and apparatus workers.

Everyone knows that affairs are run more successfully in the collective where the leader possesses the quality of exactingness as well as other necessary attributes. However, is exactingness possible if the leader does not control the fulfillment of decisions taken by higher organs and himself?

These apparent truisms have to be discussed because it is precisely the breach between administrative, organizational work and control that is the prime cause of many shortcomings, disruptions in plans, failures to fulfill decisions and breaches of party and state discipline.

There can be no talk of great exactingness wherever control on the part of leading workers is weakened. The matter sometimes leads to curious incidents. One remembers one leader's telephone call to the Party Control Committee. "We have taken an important decision here," he said, "and are afraid that it may not be fulfilled by those to whom it is addressed. Will

you take the trouble to verify this?" Of course, appeals to control organs for help are both possible and understandable, especially if the interests of the cause really require this. In this particular case, the request came from the leader of a department who, being completely within his rights, could and, what is more, was obliged to ensure fulfillment of the decision taken without passing his responsibility on to anyone else.

Weak control and insufficient exactingness are attested to by the faulty practice that still persists in many organizations of adopting repeated resolutions, orders and instructions on the same problems. Basically, this is a kind of indulgence of negligence and carelessness. Different decisions and orders look like twins and contain many common principles. They do not define concrete tasks and the period in which they are to be fulfilled with the maximum precision and the executors are not named. Surely this is a manifestation of bureaucratism, the perniciousness of which Lenin warned many times. As is well-known, he determinedly opposed "vagueness and lack of clarity in the matter of what each individual has been assigned, and the consequent complete lack of responsibility" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." vol 45, p 153).

The contemporary leader is not only obliged to constantly implement control and verification of fulfillment of concrete decisions, but also to maintain a respectful attitude toward control from below and to criticism by subordinates. Experience shows that things usually go well with such leaders.

On the other side of the coin, whoever shows intolerance of observations, takes revenge for criticism, is excessively presumptuous and has a tendency to arbitrariness, and ignores practical advice from his subordinates finds himself faced with serious failures in his work. Features like these are negative both for the cause and for the leader personally. Whoever lacks the ability to relate to criticism in the party spirit and to react to it in a practical way must seriously reconsider his position and learn to guide himself, or else he will inevitably lose the right to guide other people.

The right to criticize is simultaneously the right to control. In contemporary socialist society, criticism serves as an original means of feedback attesting to the existence of certain shortcomings and the necessity to eliminate them. And what can be more natural for a leader than to carefully heed signals, check the validity of the alarm raised and adopt measures to put a stop to disorder and breaches of discipline.

The party committees and their control organs receive letters and all kinds of omissions and disorders, callous attitudes toward people, and cases of bureaucratism and red tape. And often this is not the first appeal by concerned, interested people. They have also spoken at meetings and approached the local authorities. But no one listened to them--they were waved aside: these are just trivial matters, they were told, there are more important things. Meanwhile, it is precisely an intolerably indifferent attitude to seemingly unimportant trifles that sometimes leads to their becoming major errors, shortcomings and conflicts having a detrimental effect upon the moral-psychological climate in the collective. A sensitive attitude toward the individual, a frank talk and a warning made in time help to nip the

unhealthy process in the bud. Preventive work and the ability to prevent a conflict situation is one of the most important aspects of control work and a direct responsibility of every leader.

There are also cases where a leading worker who has distinguished himself well but who has been insufficiently educated in the party attitude gets carried away by the administrative side of the matter and ignores the opinion of the party organization and its secretary. Things are sometimes brought to the point where the question is put in the form of an ultimatum: "Me or him." However strange it may be, this kind of unworthy maneuver sometimes pays off. Not a great deal is needed to prevent this from happening: Workers in the appropriate party committee and its party commission should calmly and without bias work out why two leaders "cannot work together," give a principled appraisal of frictions that have arisen, help to eliminate these frictions and organize harmonious joint work between officials who trust one another.

As an analysis of breaches of party and state discipline shows, their causes are in many ways connected with serious oversights in ideological work, especially among leading workers, and the depreciation of party exactingness in the verification of fulfillment.

For example, for a long time in the Kaunas Construction Assembly Trust, write-ups in state accounts flourished, state-financial discipline was violated and material and financial resources were squandered. All this was done with the knowledge of or at the instruction of the manager, K. Yu. Grigaytis. Statements on this matter were sent to the republican and central economic organs, but they were only superficially and formally examined there without the necessary conclusions being drawn.

Making use of this fact, the leaders of the trust began to persecute the authors of the letters--honest, conscientious workers who were opposed to waste and money-grubbing. Forced to intervene in the matter, the Party Control Committee called the administrators who had overstepped the mark to order: the manager of the trust, Grigaytis, was dismissed from the party; other officials party to the permitted deviations from the requirements of the law and to crude suppression of criticism were strictly called to account on a party level.

In connection with this and similar cases, the following should be particularly noted. Complacency, lack of self-criticism and aspirations of ostentatiousness are also dangerous because they help to spread subservience and boot-licking, violate normal mutual relations between people and do not rally but divide them. Hence the unhealthy collisions and frictions which, to be honest, should have no place in the labor collective.

An atmosphere of genuine comradeship, good will, adherence to principle and mutual trust is established wherever the right attitude to work, control and criticism are not proclaimed, but are steadily implemented and serve as an effective means of educating communists and all working people.

III

Control in the socialist society is exercised "from above" by the leading party and state organs and "from below" by the rank-and-file communists and nonpartymembers. The true democratic nature and power of control lies precisely in its mass character and its comprehensiveness. The party spares no effort to develop and activate in every possible way the work of the party, trade union and Komsomol organizations in intensifying the public control. The organs of people's control, the obligations of which include a systematic verification of the actual fulfillment of the party and government directives, have great possibilities.

The soviets of people's deputies are being directed toward a more active fulfillment of their control functions. They are called upon to strictly control, directly and through permanent commissions of deputies, the implementation of Soviet laws, the fulfillment of the economic and social development plans and the activities of the enterprises and organizations in their territories regardless of the latter's departmental subordination.

All this is in accord with the Leninist strategy of communist education and of including an ever larger number of working people in the management of the affairs of the society and state. "Party organizations, the soviets of people's deputies, trade unions and Komsomol," it was emphasized at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "must combine the enlightenment of the masses with their active participation in the management of the affairs of the society and state, that is, in the organization of control." In this way, the party consistently implements Lenin's instructions to introduce the verification of participation," to "verify whether all are participating and what are the results of participation from the viewpoint of training the participants in the affairs of state administration" ("Leninskiy Sbornik VIII," p 26).

The existing system of socialist control has been tested by time and it has proven its vitality and effectiveness. But, as follows from a number of documents of the party and its Central Committee, a further perfecting of this system is nevertheless currently an important task. The general goal of this work can be defined in Lenin's words: "...To achieve the greatest and most solid results in the least expenditure of forces" (Poln. Sobr. Soch." vol 9, p 208).

The multitude of the levels of control, necessitated by the complexity and diversity of the state administration and social organizations, does not exclude, but presupposes a search for ways and possibilities for a more efficient organization of control tasks. A tendency has begun to show and is now gathering strength to improve the coordination of activities of all links of socialist control, that is, primarily the organs of the party, people's, and departmental control and to increase their role in strengthening discipline, legality and legal order.

"The effectiveness of people's control," Comrade K. U. Chernenko stressed in his address to people's controllers, "will undoubtedly increase noticeably if

it closely cooperates with the organs of party control, the commissions of the soviets of people's deputies, and the activists of social control."

To unite the efforts of control organs and improve the effectiveness of their work, Moscow, Tselinograd and some other cities have formed coordination councils that include representatives of the basic organizations that perform control functions. The coordination councils promote improvements in the practice of planning control work and provide assistance in the arrangement of forces and in the selection of the most efficient means and methods of studying the major issues of economic and social importance. It is with the assistance of these councils that certain work is carried out to bring order into and improve the effectiveness of verifications and inquiries, to unite the efforts of controlling organizations and to prevent parallel actions and eliminate duplication.

The experience of those gorkoms and raykoms that are making complex plans for carrying out verifications, inquiries and inspections for a longer period at the level of their cities or rayons is also worthy of attention. This eliminates the worthless practice under which some enterprises and institutions have been subjected to numerous and, at times, constant verifications and inspections, something that understandably cannot result in anything but offense.

Of course, party commissions of raykoms, gorkoms, okrug party committees, obkoms, kraykom and central committees of communist parties of the union republics must also further perfect their activities. The plan principles must be intensified in their work. They must more extensively and more objectively concern themselves with controlling and verifying the fulfillment of the directives of higher party organs, particularly as regards increasing the intensification and improving the effectiveness of social production, accelerating the scientific-technical progress, improving the quality of products, economizing in the use of resources of all types and strengthening discipline and order. The party commissions are called upon ever more consistently and in a more principled manner to wage the struggle for the purity and staunchness of party ranks and for the elimination of shortcomings in various spheres of social life.

The party attaches special importance to raising the level of control and verification of fulfillment in the primary party organizations. This is natural. The primary party organizations must play a leading role in fulfilling the tasks of socialist and communist construction. The CPSU Central Committee stresses that it is precisely the lower party cells, which lead the labor collectives, that it is important to establish an atmosphere of high exactingness and efficiency, criticism and self-criticism and intolerance toward shortcomings.

Making use of their constitutional rights, the communists regularly hear at party meetings and sessions of party committees and party bureaus the reports and information submitted by their comrades on the work in the fulfillment of adopted resolutions, and actively support their initiatives and creative undertakings and their practical proposals and remarks. Topical organizational and ideological as well as educational activities of primary

organizations have a positive effect on the growth of production, fulfillment of plans and improvement of the moral-psychological atmosphere in labor collectives. Wherever the level of exactingness is high, the responsibility of each individual is clearly determined and the control activities are properly arranged, while digressions from the party and state discipline norms and from the rules of the socialist communal life--even if they do occur--are resolutely rebuffed.

It is appropriate in this connection to note that the control over the communists' fulfillment of the CPSU Statute is now and then understood in a simplified manner. Some party organizations apply this control only to the fulfillment of assignments issued to party members and candidate members, the attendance at meetings and lectures within the political education system, and so forth. However, it is imperative to concentrate attention on verifying the fulfillment of all statutory provisions that make it incumbent upon every individual party member to provide an example of a communist attitude toward work, take care of and multiply the public socialist property, firmly and steadfastly implement the party's decisions and its policy in selecting cadres by their political and work qualities, be just and honest before the party and the people, boldly uncover shortcomings and strive for their elimination, struggle against all sham appearances and complacency and adhere to party and state discipline.

The obligations of communists as defined by the CPSU Statute open up a wide field of control activities before the primary party organization. The organization must consider the responsibility of each of its members from the viewpoint of requirements of the CPSU program and Statute and educate them as active and selfless fighters for the cause of the party and for the fulfillment of its ideals.

As is known, a communist must act against all actions that cause harm to the party and state and report them to the party organs right up to the CPSU Central Committee. This is a statutory norm, and it is therefore important for every party organization to create a favorable atmosphere enabling the communists to fulfill this requirement, act against shortcomings and report any failures to take the necessary measures to higher organs. An essential condition for developing genuine criticism and self-criticism is to resolutely cut off any attempts to suppress it and to timely support the individuals who correctly raise acute questions.

The party organs have to scrutinize the letters from communists and nonparty people reporting shortcomings and violations of discipline and of norms of party life, including such violations by leading workers. The substantiated presentation of such questions is given due response and support. If there are still occurrences of an incorrect attitude toward authors of such letters, including occurrences of their victimization, they are an exception to the rule. And when one hears "try to criticize and you will catch it," it is more like an expression of cowardice that is uncharacteristic of a true communist. Party justice will invariably triumph in any matter of principle, and the mistakes or prejudice at one level will be rectified at another higher level and those responsible will be properly punished.

Some authors of reports occasionally resort to the form of anonymity. Let us leave aside the question of anonymous slander. This is a shameful action. It should have no place in our life. But is it possible to justify the action of someone who fails to put his name to a letter containing correct information? This is not only unworthy of a communist, but also of any citizen.

Why should a person hide his name? If he is right and honestly presents a question, he will always find support. Without building any illusions and without dramatizing the situation, we state with all responsibility that the possibilities of suppressors of criticism are negligibly small in the face of the party and civic consciousness. And the more boldly these forces act, the sooner the counteractions of the enemies of criticism will be reduced to naught.

In our social life, we have developed a good practice of harmonious work of the leading teams with the primary party organizations and their secretaries. They are engaged in a common cause although, naturally, the forms and methods of their activity are not the same even as they share common goals and tasks. While supporting a leading person and defending his authority, the primary party organization cannot choose the path of agreeability and fail to notice any shortcomings in his actions and attitudes when any such shortcomings become apparent. It is its duty, based on the right of control over the activities of administration, to call attention to any such shortcomings in a principled and party-like manner and demand their elimination. If the good word fails, it is necessary to use the force of influence and party authority. And whenever a shortcoming turns out to be a matter of deliberate violation of party and state discipline, there can be no room for even the slightest oversight.

Whenever the Party Control Committee or party commissions review the results of one or another inspection that has uncovered serious shortcomings and omissions and, at times, even abuses by the individual official persons, the question is automatically asked: How could it happen that all this had failed to come to the notice of the primary party organization concerned at an earlier stage? For, after all, all this is visible to the primary party organization, as we say, at close proximity.

The party statute and the decisions of the party congresses and the CPSU Central Committee plenums give it the necessary authority and make it incumbent upon it to exercise most active influence on the fulfillment of economic and political tasks, eliminate shortcomings and more fully employ its right of criticism and control.

The pertinent explanations by party bureaus and committees in such cases are frequently not very convincing: We overlooked it, did not have the facts at our disposal, counted on the effect of warnings made face to face. And if we speak directly and clearly as should be done in analyzing the mistakes that have been allowed to happen? They acted in an unprincipled manner, failed to stand up for the honor of their organization, followed the lead of a negligent and irresponsible worker, and, as the secretary of the party bureau of one of the institutes admitted, demonstrated "timidity and diffidence." Society pays a heavy material and spiritual price for this kind of "timidity," especially

whenever some official persons use their official positions for mercenary purposes, for favoritism and for other improper goals.

Of course, the more the leading party committees concern themselves with the militancy of the primary party organizations in the performance of their control functions, the greater this militancy will be. The principled position of the primary party organization and its secretary must always find support in the raykom, gorkom and party commission.

The primary party organizations, party committees and their commissions are called upon to review the personal affairs of communists and the appeals concerning these affairs. Is it really necessary to prove how important it is to be guided in all cases without exemption by the provisions of the CPSU Statute? What is involved in this connection are decisions determining the fate of a person and therefore special thoroughness is required in the investigation of facts, the causes of the matter involved, the motives for the misdemeanor concerned and the extent of personal responsibility of the communist involved.

In recent years, the primary party organizations and the party commissions of local party committees have noticeably improved the practice of examining personal affairs. Nevertheless, the analysis of the individual appeals received by the Party Control Committee allows us to conclude that the methods of full and objective party inquiry, attentiveness and thoughtfulness toward the individual and sufficient substantiation of adopted decisions have not been ensured always and everywhere. One-sided verifications, prejudiced attitudes toward the individual and disregard for his arguments, these are the most characteristic mistakes that have been allowed to occur at times in the processes of disciplinary practice. The elimination of these mistakes is the duty of workers of party commissions. But there are also the facts of another kind when some grave delinquent acts of party members, including even the acts that are punishable under law, have not been examined at the party level. Regrettably, it still happens that some individuals who have been sentenced by the organs of justice continue to be retained as party members. This is a direct and intolerable violation of the CPSU Statute.

The actions of some individual party committees that unnecessarily directly discuss the questions of responsibility of leading communists themselves, bypassing the primary party organizations concerned, cannot be considered legitimate. In this connection, they often do not even consider it necessary to inform the communists, explain to them the motives for transferring the examination of the matter directly to the party committee and elucidate for them the adopted decision in plain words. The CPSU Central Committee condemns this approach because it does not promote the strengthening of discipline and the correct education of people.

United by the unity of their goals and actions, the communists form their attitudes on the basis of complete and exacting trust, honesty, frankness and a principled approach. Occurrences of unjustified indulgence and liberalism weaken the party comradeship and hinder the organization of collective, creative and fruitful work.

A further perfecting of the control and verification of fulfillment is objectively necessitated by the growth of CPSU the leading role, the increased scope of the economic and social tasks that are being solved today, the increased range of constructive creativity of the working masses and the development and deepening of socialist democracy. To raise control to even higher standards and intensify its effect on the economic and social policy and the cadre and ideological-educational work, it is necessary to ensure a strict and steadfast adherence to the Leninist principles. It is necessary to ensure the implementation of the instructions of the party and its Central Committee to set up, in all links of the organization and administration, a precise and scientifically substantiated control system, a systematic and purposeful verification of fulfillment.

It is also important to further perfect the style of control work and increase its prophylactic potential. And, as is known, the style depends on the individuals, on the communists. Fulfilling important party assignments and participating in the control and verification of fulfillments, they act as staunch fighters of the party, as individuals who are implacable toward shortcomings, and who are principled and exacting, attentive and just. The party controllers are those who, as Lenin put it, do not utter a single word against their conscience, are not afraid to admit any difficulty and are not afraid of any struggle to achieve the goals set.

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

CSO: 1802/3

TOWARD A PURELY SOCIAL MODE OF PRODUCTION: NATURE OF THE LEAP AND STAGES OF STABILIZATION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 84 (signed to press 15 Oct 84) pp 37-49

[Article by Dr of Economic Sciences V. Mazur; article published as a basis for discussion]

[Text] The problem of the future has become particularly relevant in the contemporary world. What kind of a future will it be, in the throes of a social and scientific and technical revolution, in the immediate, more distant and maximally foreseeable future? This is one of the crucial questions in the conflict of ideas. The collective thinking of the CPSU has enriched scientific communism with the concept of developed socialism as a historically lengthy stage, which has just begun, and has substantiated the task of developing a theory of the advancement of socialist society and the further progress toward communism. The April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum emphasized that, in V. I. Lenin's words, today we need twice as many "more general, broader or longer-reaching views" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 38, p 41). In our view, the Marxist-Leninist theory of direct social production as the basic scientific prediction of a communist future is of prime importance.

I

The socialist revolution marks the beginning of a quantitatively new round in the spiral development of social production. The historical process in the course of which barter is replaced by commodity output and the latter develops into its highest capitalist form--production based on exchange value and functions as such--becomes interrupted. In surmounting the limited nature of the commodity method and uncontrolled economic development, society enters an age of organization of direct social production, the highest form of which is communist production which implements the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

K. Marx wrote that "as long as manpower itself is not exchanged, the base of the production process will not be the exchange which will have no more than a small range, based on non-exchange, as takes place at all levels which precede bourgeois production," (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 46, part II, pp 181-182). We believe that the conversion of manpower into a commodity

and a commodity into manpower and, on a new basis, its conversion into a noncommodity are precisely the qualitative limits which separate public production based on exchange value from barter or semibarter and direct public production.

The division of the history of public production into barter, commodity and direct-public is coupled with other three-stage breakdowns of the historical process, structured on a different basis and elaborated by Marx. The first, which is based on ownership relations, is the primary system based on primitive-communal ownership; the secondary formation, which is based on private ownership (see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 19, p 419) (covering the periods of slavery, serfdom and capitalism, i.e., "pure private ownership" (ibid., vol 3, p 62), covers the socioeconomic systems within the antagonistic class society); finally, the tertiary formation is the communist one. Secondly, it is based on the nature of dependence among the members of society: individual dependence; object dependence; "free individuality based on the universal development of individuals and the conversion of their collective public productivity into public property" (ibid., vol 46, part I, p 101).

Each one of these divisions, as we may see, deals with substantial differences in production relations, for which reason it is of major importance in resolving certain crucial problems of scientific communism: first of all, in determining the scale and nature of the leap made by mankind in rejecting the system of private ownership, material and value relations; secondly, of the stages in the process of advancement toward a communist direct public production.

In our view, the division of the historical process based on formal economic relations among participants in the public production on all its levels is of particular importance in properly assessing the depth of changes leading to the higher phase of communism. First of all, this form is an extremely abstract characterization of public production as a specific system (barter, commodity, direct-public). It indicates the distinguishing feature of the method used in the exchange of matter, energy and information inherent in a specific economic system and a method for coordinating the reproduction processes (objects, people and relations) and the establishment of the ratios between labor and consumption and, consequently, the socially necessary labor outlays. The "exchange of activities and abilities" is the content of the form of economic relations (ibid., p 35) regardless of whether or not it is achieved through the exchange of products, i.e., through materialized labor. Secondly, the barter, value and direct-social forms of economic relations express socioeconomic properties reduceable in terms of each other or in terms of a third form. These forms operate only in different historically specific combinations.

Public production originates as exclusively material. Subsequently, the exchange of products develops among primitive communities. The first such exchanges were, in a certain sense, the offshoots of production based on exchange value. Before reaching the capitalist production method, however, they had to develop, to begin with, from a simple, isolated or accidental form of value into an expanded and universal one and, finally, into a monetary

form, the form of prices; secondly, having become a universal economic tie, the conversion of money into capital. This process of transition from the offshoots of the new to its total replacement of the old covered, therefore, the entire spiral of universal history--the lengthiest complex path of development of production forces and production relations, the breakdown of the primitive-communal system, the appearance, blossoming and doom of slavery and feudalism and the establishment of capitalism.

Commodity-monetary and market relations are a form of economic ties not of joint but of separate labor, not an intra but an intercooperation tie. Thanks to this, they not only restricted and broke down but also supplemented the natural ties which, to a greater or lesser extent remained within the precapitalist peasant community and the slave-owning or feudal estates.

Public production, based on exchange values, means that commodity producers acknowledge the authority either of rivalry or coercion "which are the result of the clash between their reciprocal interests" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, p 369). That is precisely why "no single bourgeois economic category, even the primary one such as, for example, the definition of value, can become real other than through free competition..." (ibid., vol 46, part II, p 155). Therefore, limiting free competition, the establishment of monopolies and the conversion to state control means the beginning of the end of the value, the object-related form of economic ties. Marx emphasized that all such changes "although they may appear as the completion of the domination of capitalism are also, as a result of restraining free competition, the harbingers of its breakdown and the breakdown of the production method based on it" (ibid.).

Large-scale machine output, particularly under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution, cannot function and develop normally if the only information circulating within it is that of value (price), obtained by producers and consumers on the market and distribution of resources exclusively through the competition-market method. Information on new needs and means of satisfying them is increasingly developed at the stage of scientific and technical research and development. Therefore, if they reach their consumer mainly through the market and the signals included in the prices, they inevitably fall behind, the more so since the variety of goods is now frequently updated faster than the ability of the market suitably to react to a new commodity.

Under these circumstances, trusts, concerns and other monopoly associations and the bourgeois state begin to study social requirements, at least through their manifestation in the structure and dynamics of solvent demand, to take them into consideration and to make corresponding changes in production and distribution. A mechanism of state-monopoly control develops. Henceforth, not only spontaneously through the market but also deliberately and purposefully, through the direct interference of the state in the reproduction process, ties are established among the individual economic sectors. The state develops its own accountability and control apparatus, gathers and processes extensive data on the course of public reproduction and uses it in forecasting and long-term programming and control.

Marx's conclusion that at a certain stage in the development of capitalism the need appears for a change in the method of economic relations was further substantiated in Lenin's theory of imperialism. Monopoly capitalism, Lenin wrote, "pushes, so to say, the capitalists, despite their wish and awareness, into some kind of new social order, which is a transition from total freedom of competition to total socialization" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works, vol 27, pp 320-321]). He emphasized that at that stage "although commodity output 'prevails' as before and is considered the foundation of the entire economy, in fact it has already been undermined...." (ibid., p 322).

Even a cursory familiarity with the initial manifestations of economic relations which, under the conditions of state-monopoly capitalism supplement the market-value ties, enables us to note some of their important features, which are established as a result of knowledge of economic reality and through conscious and purposeful activities rather than spontaneously, concealed from commodity producers. Such ties are manifested through the complication of the scientific and technical, economic and social information and management tasks rather than their simplification. Currently neither the mind of one individual nor spontaneous regulatory influences of all sellers and purchasers (through the market-competitive mechanism) can provide effective socioeconomic control. This requires the "collective mind" of society and the corresponding material and technical base, above all an essentially new man-machine technology for data gathering, storing and processing. Generally speaking, a conversion to direct public production is needed.

As it develops, the direct-public relation asserts itself specifically through its system of information inherent in the organizational structure of a production process which has reached a high level of socialization. This relation begins to dominate only when society, aware of its needs, drafts a unified national economy plan with specific assignments by sector and enterprise and allocates correspondingly production and manpower facilities instead of simply regulating the structure and the dynamics of prices and solvent demand.

The establishment of a new form of economic relations is not, therefore, equivalent to the elimination of the commodity-monetary or value forms or even less so the conversion of the national economy to physical barter. Commodity-monetary relations are not replaced but wither away as they lose their functions. Society does not go back to the premarket form of relations but converts to the post-marketing method. What takes place is not simply a negation but a negation of the negation. This occurs gradually rather than instantaneously. "In the same way," Marx wrote, "that the bourgeois economic system develops only step by step, so does its self-negation, which is its end result" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 46, part II, p 222).

The movement toward direct public production presumes radical changes in the nature or type of social development: spontaneous development yields to planned development and market control to conscious scientific management in such a way that not only material and spiritual goods but society itself becomes the product of conscious toil, subjective knowledge and self-reorganization. It is a question, Marx wrote, "of the great debate between

the blind rule of the law of supply and demand, of which bourgeois political economy consists, and public production controlled by social prediction, of which the political economy of the working class consists" (ibid., vol 16, p 9).

The various means of implementation of the law of unity and struggle of opposites and the development and resolution of social contradictions are consistent with the consecutive stages in the development of public production: primitive-communal (natural); private ownership, exploiting (semi-natural production with methods of slavery and serfdom used in appropriating the added product, based on individual dependence and noneconomic coercion and commodity-capitalist with the appropriation of added value); and direct-public. The spontaneous-nonantagonist form of the public production process converts into spontaneous-antagonistic and, the latter, into planned nonantagonistic. In this case, the changing of the basic degrees of public production, as is the case with its antagonistic forms during the second round of the historical process, takes place as a result of the class struggle and sociopolitical revolutions. The several millenia of class-antagonistic society are a relatively short period (compared to the thousands of years of the tribal system and millions of years of anthroposociogenesis). However, this period proved sufficient for social production to reach a level on which the existence of classes becomes a direct hindrance to its further development and leads to the appearance of a "society which reorganizes the production process on the basis of the free and equal association of producers" (ibid., vol 21, p 173).

In this light the program of the proletarian and communist movements is reduced, essentially, to two main requirements: first, the elimination of private ownership and the division of people into owners and nonowners, and the establishment of a uniform handling of productive capital and allocation of a share of the produced goods; second, the creation of public production, in which everyone works according to his capabilities and consumes in accordance with the work done for society and, in the future, according to his needs. Such demands are inseparable although by far not identical. The objectives they contain are as attractive and understandable as are difficult the means and labor-intensive the conditions for achieving them.

For if everyone works according to his capabilities, consequently the social division of labor is already subordinate to a structure of the overall abilities of people as creative individuals which, understandably, is quite different from a barter economy in which "individuals obey nature" or a commodity economy in which they "obey the labor product" (ibid., vol 3, p 65). However, in order to achieve a division of labor according to ability, the people must go beyond the range of strictly material production in which the division of labor is dictated by the nature of labor tools and technologies rather than human capabilities. All work must become universal, i.e., work in which man joins in a universal participation in creative transforming activities unrestricted by place or time. Such work by its very essence cannot be divided among people other than according to everyone's capabilities. Today scientific, artistic, technical, pedagogical, social, political and other similar types of creativity come the closest to this type of work. Under the conditions of universal labor by individuals, the

determination and development of their abilities become the alpha and omega of the public production process.

This is direct public production, for its immediate objective is the production of man in his public relationships. In the past, such human production was only an end, indirect and spontaneous result. The development of the toiling man as a dominant of historical development is replaced by the shaping of labor by man. Having surmounted technological and social limitations of the full satisfaction of the need of the individual for work according to his capabilities--the most important and labor-intensive prerequisite for the all-round development of the individual--public production cannot fail to satisfy the totality of needs of all members of society, for the distribution of labor according to the capabilities of individuals and the distribution of material and spiritual goods according to their needs are interdependent aspects of direct public production.

The combination of labor divided into society according to the abilities of its members can be achieved only through direct public relations. The point is that the commodity-value and market relation can resolve the contradiction between public and private and between abstract and concrete labor only more or less efficiently and thus to adapt the structure of labor to the structure of needs. However, it is unable to resolve essentially another contradiction of a qualitatively different labor--the contradiction between labor as a means of realizing individual capabilities and labor as a means of satisfying social needs. It is only a proportionality deliberately established and supported by society, above all between workers and jobs, simultaneously oriented toward the abilities of the working people and their needs, that could be the proper socioeconomic method for resolving this contradiction and, consequently, for coordinating the structure of labor with the structure of needs. Such proportionality presumes that economic relations in society develop not in the least thanks to the conscious activities of everyone, aimed at the systematic involvement of the labor of the individual who is realizing his personal capabilities in public production for the satisfaction of public needs. Therefore, the direct-public relation in its superior aspects no longer is imposed on the individual by the market element or any other force superior to it.

As we see, the type of economic relations is determined by the type of social division of labor, which is based on natural factors (sex and age characteristics and natural conditions) in a natural economy; a division of labor determined by a material and technical base of production and trade in a commodity economy; and a division of labor based on the social characteristics of man and the ability of the workers, in direct public production. The public division of labor and the form of economic relations in their unity represent the socioeconomic type of labor as, first of all, a direct-communal or communal-cooperated labor; secondly, as a socially divided, indirectly related through commodity exchanges, i.e., the indirect-social; third, the direct-public, the universal cooperated labor.

The socioeconomic type of labor, in turn, is inseparable from a certain level of development and nature of production forces.

Production forces consistent with the superior form of direct public production--communist production--presume not only the implementation of the scientific and technical revolution, the purpose of which is to eliminate the type of labor which does not ensure the development of the creative capabilities of its performers, but also the subsequent qualitatively higher reorganization of production forces, in the course of which "work dictated by need and external expediency comes to end" and "the development of human forces as a self-seeking purpose begins" (ibid., vol 25, part II, pp 386-387). Man's production and reproduction as a creative individual becomes the leading area of public reproduction. By this token, the sciences of society and man become a direct productive force. Man assumes control not only over the forces of nature or social relations but also over his own social potential and ability for creative work.

Therefore, the view of the transition to communism from a superior form of commodity to a superior form of direct-public production and, in this connection, from the viewpoint of replacing the secondary formation with a tertiary one and relations of material dependence with relations of equal mutual dependence among free individualities enables us to avoid any underestimating of the scale of the leap in the development of production forces and production relations and simplifications and impoverishments in characterizing the communist ideal as the end objective of the proletarian movement. It proves that the essence and nature of this leap are determined by the establishment of conditions under which everyone acquires the possibility of or tries to work according to his capabilities and, therefore, to obtain from society everything which is required for their realization and development. In the light of this approach the development and improvement of socialism inevitably includes its qualitative changes and is a lengthy historical process. Finally, it becomes obvious that the time breakdown in the development of public production within the framework of the first and second phases of communism has criteria different from the time breakdown within the boundaries of the primary and secondary formations.

II

From the viewpoint of the changed forms of economic relations, the development of socialism is presented as a consecutive and gradual organization of direct-public production, which covers a number of qualitatively defined levels of its socialist (communist) maturity. On the basis of what criteria are such levels established? To answer the question we must take above all into consideration that after the completion of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism the relations of ownership of productive capital, which served during the previous historical round, under the conditions of the secondary formation, as the main system-forming factor and, consequently, were based on the periodization of the historical process, yield this role to production relations of a different nature, although this hardly occurs immediately. Let us discuss this in greater detail.

People mandatorily establish certain relations in connection with the appropriation of objects for production and nonproduction consumption (ownership relations). Such relations may be relations of equality, at which point they are not a source of contradiction and, consequently, are an active

factor of socioeconomic development. Its quality, unless disturbed, is always equality and nothing else. Such relations may be relations of inequality, at which point they predetermine who is who (slave or slaveowner, landowner or serf, capitalist or proletarian, or petty commodity producer who goes bankrupt or becomes richer) and are a source of contradictions and a decisive change factor. It is self-evident, however, that as ownership relations turn into relations of equality socioeconomic development does not come to an end. All that takes place is a change in its motive forces.

As a philosopher would say, ownership is the base of the production relations system. Although remaining as its inviolable foundation, it loses its topical significance in determining the development of social forms. Other relations assume a dominant role, i.e., the role of actual determinants of socioeconomic development, relations of distribution of the overall labor among the members of society. In other words, as it eliminates inequality in the distribution of productive capital, means of earning income and class differentiation, socialism (communism) undertakes--the further along the more so--the solution of problems on a different, a more profound level: eliminating inequality in the distribution of the overall labor, heterogeneous from the viewpoint of influencing the abilities of the people, through its transformation into labor which could be distributed and is actually distributed according to individual capabilities. Generally speaking, at a certain stage in socialist development, in Marx's words, the definitive "victory of labor political economy over ownership political economy" takes place" (ibid., vol 16, p 9).

The replacement of the leading components in the production relations structure is the result of radical changes which take place in the interaction among the main processes characterizing public production, i.e., the production of means of subsistence, of the person himself and social relations. The production of means of subsistence is the fixed foundation but not the permanent dominant in human activities. In primitive times (when all the person did was to appropriate the fruits of nature by picking them and hunting, i.e., when he had not even reached the production process, and when he was barely able to maintain his precarious existence and, consequently, when there was not even a question of any kind of added product), everything was subordinated to ensuring the production of man as a living being and the determining form of production relations was blood relationship (the primitive human herd, kin, tribe, family). Subsequently, the situation changed radically. As a result of the neolithic (agricultural) and, subsequently, industrial revolutions in production forces, man entered the process of material production and, furthermore, became an appendix to the machine. The upsurge of his labor productivity enabled him to create an ever growing added product. Under those circumstances, the production of man as a living being and the preservation and increase of the population lost (as did blood relations) their former social relevance and became part of the foundations of the social production system. The production of means of subsistence became dominant and the struggle for the appropriation of productive capital and consumer goods, the added product above all, became the form of development. This determined what the person was--exploiter or exploited--and his way of life--whether carrying the burden of heavy physical labor, engaging in a more attractive type of work or simply idling. Finally, a new leap occurred. As a result of the scientific and technical revolution in production forces, man

established his supremacy over the machine and subsequently withdrew from the process of the production of means of subsistence (naturally, greatly changed), turning from its direct agent into a subject of creative activities.

Before continuing our study of the change of dominance in the structure of production relations at the stage of the organization of direct public production, we must emphasize that the conversion of the production of man as a living being and of its means of subsistence on which this was based does not mean in the least that such processes cannot, under certain conditions, metaphorically speaking, reappear and become dominant. Thus, ensuring the reproduction of man as a living being may once again assume a primary social relevance although on an essentially different basis, as a result of the aggravation of the ecological situation. Nor is it excluded that in the future, with the primacy of the process of the reproduction of man as a creative individual, the problem of the distribution of labor means according to ability may become the source of social contradictions (naturally, radically different from the contradictions inherent in the appropriation of material and spiritual goods within the framework of the secondary system).

As we know, the economic stages of a social system are distinguished by the historically given methods of combining the worker (the manpower) with productive capital. This method characterizes quite adequately not one but a combination of socioeconomic forms. It expresses, on the one hand, human interrelationships in connection with the appropriation of objects or materials needed to satisfy the need for means of subsistence; on the other, it expresses the interrelationship among people in connection with an appropriation of a special kind--the appropriation of a certain share of labor of an appropriate kind as a means of satisfying the higher human need, that of realizing and developing the abilities of the individual and his creative personality; finally, they express interrelationships among people in connection with the exchange of "types of labor involved in the production process" (ibid., vol 4, p 108) which ensure the necessary regulation of the entire production process. We can see here a definite chain of dependencies: the structure of needs reflecting the condition of production forces is consistent with the structure of activities meeting such needs, while the latter is consistent with the structure of relations regulating such activities. From this viewpoint, the replacement of one type of public production with another is also a change of dominance in the structure of production process and, consequently, in the structure of needs which create their change in the structure of activities (labor) and, therefore, in the structure of relations.

Whenever and to the extent to which the problem of satisfying vital needs, resolved through nonproduction consumption of labor products, becomes essentially resolved, activities aimed at meeting such requirements, although remaining basic (before developing his creative potential the person must eat, clothe himself, etc.), starting with a certain level reached by public production, becomes a self-evident matter. At this point, priority is given to other unsatisfied needs. Therefore, the previously dominating relations and ties which ensured one type of appropriation of objects or another, also lose their relevance and become part of the foundation of the production relations system. As we pointed out, the problems of distribution of the

overall labor among individuals according to their capabilities and, correspondingly, the development of direct social relations and ties, which make their solution possible, become primary.

Actually, if the overwhelming percentage of human activities is dedicated to the production of objects and means of existence, material relations (ownership, value and their derivants), relations of material dependence, inevitably dominate. It is they who play a decisive role in shaping the labor structure. Matters change if the people leave direct production behind, if the production of objects and means of existence assume a lesser and increasingly smaller part of their activities, while most activities are directed toward the development and realization of abilities. In this case a direct exchange of activities based on the variety of human abilities and "collective needs, collective objectives" (ibid., vol 46, part I, p 115) develop in the process of common labor. If no such relations dominate, the comprehensive development of the abilities of the individual and their manifestation and realization of the sake of the common good remain limited. When from separate and indirect for public labor becomes a direct public function, the shaping of its structure is increasingly less affected by the influence of interests other than those of the free and comprehensive development of the individual.

In the course of the organization of communist production the direct-public and value forms of economic relations supplement each other in a certain way: to the extent to which the former does not as yet ensure a consistency between the structure of the overall social product and the structure of social needs, it is the latter which fills the gap. We cannot fail to note that throughout the secondary system (slavery, feudalism and, partially, capitalism) the commodity-monetary and natural forms of relations have also supplemented each other.

In this light, socialist (communist) social production undergoes, we believe, a series of qualitatively determined stages, levels or periods of establishment and development. This applies above all to the transitional period from capitalism, which has reached its monopoly stage, to socialism. Within the production relations system relations of private ownership of productive capital, which trigger the exploitation of man by man and the existence of exploiting classes and the regulation of public production essentially through the market, are surmounted.

Relations of public, of socialist ownership, which develop during the transitional period, become determining in subsequent socioeconomic development. They ensure the completion of the industrialization of the country within the shortest possible time. The material and technical base which existed prior to the scientific and technical revolution and the primarily extensive factors of economic growth, which characterize this stage, are unable to ensure the full socialization of labor and its conversion into socialized production as the only source of income of one and all, i.e., ensuring the definitive conversion to a classless socialist society. A significant percentage of the overall labor of the members of society (up to one-half) used directly for the reproduction of life will remain as nonsocialized labor (private farms, household, folk crafts, individual housing

construction, gardening, truck gardening, etc.). Therefore, one way or another, production and consumption based on individual trade will remain and will be impossible to eliminate.

The prime concern of a socialist society in which vestiges of inequality in ownership relations remain (differences in the level of socialization of state and kolkhoz-cooperative production, the existence of nonsocialized individual production and a corresponding market, etc.), is the strengthening, preservation, rapprochement and merger between state and kolkhoz-cooperative forms of public ownership of productive capital, the improvement of cost-accounting and plan-commodity-monetary relations, strictest possible control over the measures of labor and consumption and blocking all sources of unearned income, including any attempts at using one's official position or public property for purposes of personal enrichment.

Let us point out that from the viewpoint of changes in production forces, developed socialism covers an entire age of scientific and technical revolutions. A transition to a primarily intensive economic growth takes place at its initial stage. Step by step, nonsocialized production and labor lose their socioeconomic effectiveness and are reduced to naught. The acceleration of this process through administrative-legal coercive methods is excluded. With the elimination of exploiting classes and the cooperativization of peasants and artisans, such methods for reorganizing nonsocialized labor merely undermine real socialist socialization. They break down rather than strengthen socialist production relations and discredit the general line of assertion of direct-public production. The methods used in perfecting socialism cannot be identical to those used in its construction.

Initially, under the conditions of developed socialism as well, ownership relations remain leading and, consequently, the relevance of socioeconomic problems, vitally important in the preceding stage, remains the same, particularly if by virtue of one reason or another the level of satisfaction of needs for some means of subsistence (despite an overall increase in well-being) is reduced for a while. However, gradually, with further socialization and increased output, relations of labor distribution based on the abilities of the members of society begin to play an increasing role. This is the result of two types of circumstances. First, the fact that the appropriation of means of subsistence is determined to an increasing extent, if not exclusively, by the quantity and quality of labor in socialized production, i.e., in the final account, by the level of development and realization of the worker's capabilities. Secondly, by the fact that as the content of the labor dominant in society is enriched, priority in the hierarchy of needs is given to that of labor according to ability. This increases the relevance of the correlation between labor and ability. The solution of this problem depends on the extent to which the labor needed by society may be and actually is assigned according to ability.

The increased importance of the assignment of labor according to the ability of the members of society (rather than by virtue of other socioeconomic and political factors) leads to the fact that concern for improving labor conditions, eliminating heavy, unskilled and underskilled labor, routine operations, ensuring a balance between the structure of jobs and the education

and skill structure of the workers, converting agricultural work into a variety of industrial labor, equalizing technological labor conditions in all sectors and areas of the national economy, the intellectualization of labor, and converting labor invested in the direct production process into a universal type labor becomes one of the primary socioeconomic concerns of society.

The conversion of a class-oriented socialist society into a classless society includes the shaping of a corresponding material and technical base, social labor structure, production relations, social structure, superstructure, economic mechanism, etc. Within this process a number of natural levels may be singled out as a basis for orientation and, naturally, quite schematically. At the time when prerequisites for a classless socialist society appear, the scientific and technical revolution which is taking its initial steps, reaches a point at which universal labor which is essentially informational (in the realm of scientific research and experimental design, technical and artistic creativity, etc.), by virtue of its increased productivity in agriculture, industry, construction, transportation, and so on, becomes as widespread in society as work for direct material production. The level reached at this stage of the real socialization of production, the technical facilities available to the information infrastructure and the application of flexible technologies step by step lower the significance of the market as a factor which influences the shaping of socially necessary labor outlays. At the same time, the socioeconomic heterogeneity of labor and the possibility of the appearance of disproportion in its distribution determine the need for the use of value methods.

On the level of the direct transition to classless socialism ensured by the development and comprehensive application of automation in equipment and technology, the further socialization of nonsocialized labor, as well as hard unskilled labor in socialized production are reduced to a minimum, insignificant from the point of view of political economy. Nationwide labor cooperation reaches a higher level of maturity. The organizationally and technologically restructured production infrastructure, unified transportation system, unified automated system of communications and a nationwide automated control system become its most important component.

As a result of all of these changes in the means of production and exchange, a unified form of socialist social ownership will be established, which will eliminate the last vestiges of the former differences based on the process of the appropriation by the members of society of productive capital and labor products (through state, kolkhoz-cooperative and individual production) and, correspondingly, vestiges of class differentiation. The productions of means of subsistence and labor, related to them, will become totally socialized; the single form of public ownership and the corresponding mechanism for its implementation will exclude the restoration of class differentiation; the social structure will be characterized above all by two basic components: people involved in the direct production process and people potentially involved in universal labor. This will lower the relevance of ownership relations as a source of contradictions and a motive force of development. They will become part of the foundations of the socioeconomic system. However, this process will be completed only with the transition to the second

phase of communism, when private property will no longer be a form of appropriation of vital benefits in proportion to the labor given to society. Until then, even total labor socialization will not eliminate a certain property inequality, disparities in the level of well-being of the working people and the influence of such circumstances on the development of human abilities and corresponding contradictions.

The socialization of labor achieved in a classless socialist social production leads to the maximal rapprochement between planned and socially necessary labor outlays, the restriction of cash circulation and the intensified socioeconomic control over the measures of labor and consumption at all stages of the reproduction process. Distribution relations in classless socialism ensure the total dependence of individual incomes on the quantity and quality of labor for society. The planned economic management system will have a corresponding incentive system. The value method for determining socially necessary labor outlays, distribution and exchange of goods will lose the final vestiges of its former grandeur and will wither away once and for all. All in all, the conversion of relations of ownership into relations of full equality leads to the vanishing of the type of economic relations created precisely by heterogeneity and differences in such relations.

In a classless socialist society the decisive motive force of socioeconomic progress will be relations of distribution of labor according to ability. The social status of a person, not only legally but actually will be determined by no other than labor relations. In other words, limitations for labor according to ability will be based only on the internal contradictions of the exceptionally dynamic system of relations: structure of individual abilities--structure of job--structure of social needs. However, the completion of this leap from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom is still a matter of the future. So far it is not the development and application of human abilities which determines the division of labor but material production needs and the logic of the further development of the scientific and technical revolution.

The next period, which will cover the final stage of the scientific and technical revolution and the development of classless socialism, will be characterized by the fact that all labor will have converted to universal labor. Initially, at that stage relations triggered by the need for the development of productive capital and technical and technological dependencies will continue to play a leading role; subsequently, however, this role will convert to relations based on the structure of the individual abilities of the members of society and the needs governing the development of man himself. Direct public production will reach its highest form of maturity, when all labor will become universal and when all of it will be divided and distributed according to individual capabilities. The free development of the individual will become a prerequisite for the free development of all.

Let us draw some conclusions. The historical scale of the leap accomplished by mankind in the conversion to communism will be presented in its entire greatness from the viewpoint of the development of social production from natural to commodity and from commodity to direct-public. The foundation or criterion of this division is the form of economic relations which expresses

the most fundamental features of public production--the socioeconomic type of distribution and, correspondingly, combination of labor. The development of socialism, therefore, is a progress from public production based on exchange value to direct-public production. It goes through a number of qualitative stages, periods or degrees, the replacement of which will mean a replacement of the dominant features of the production relations structure. The forms of the distribution of labor means and products as dominant will yield to forms of distribution of labor itself. Each stage in the period of socialist development creates problems the solution of which marks the transition to the next stage, for which reason it cannot be postponed for the future. The awareness of such problems enables us to formulate the next tasks which are entirely real for the current generations, as well as tasks the implementation of which will mark a qualitative shift in public production and a truly historical step on the way to communism. Finally, each stage in the development of socialist production brings up not only general communist or general socialist features but also substantial characteristics which, naturally, must be reflected in the system of political economic categories and laws which identify historically established production relations.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/3

INDICATORS OF SOCIALIST MANAGEMENT: AN ECONOMIST'S OUTLOOK

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 84 (signed to press 15 Oct 84) pp 50-61

[Article by Prof D. Valovoy, doctor of economic sciences; article published as a basis for discussion; words in all capitals are italicized in the original]

[Text] Thanks to the tremendous advantages of the socialist economic system, a powerful production potential was created in the USSR within a historically short time. Our country firmly established its leadership in the world in the production of most important commodities, such as petroleum, natural gas, coke, pig iron, steel, iron ore, chemical fertilizers, cement, woolen fabrics, leather shoes and a number of other items for industrial and personal consumption. "We can and are willing to advance faster," Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU general secretary, noted in his March 1984 speech to the voters. "We can and must be far more energetic in resolving the problems of intensive economic development. For it is only on this basis that the increasing satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of the people can be achieved." At the same time, Comrade K. U. Chernenko emphasized that "our progress is held back by defects in the economic mechanism...." The improvement of this mechanism presumes a creative search for means to radically improve the functional efficiency of the unified national economic complex with the lowest possible outlays.

The 'Priority' of Value

With the lowest possible outlays! This clear and meaningful formula raises the most important problem of present-day socialist economic management, which deserves the closest possible attention. The point is that the "outlay" method of assessing the work of production units remains widespread. Essentially, it means that the higher the material and labor outlays on the basis of which wholesale prices are set, the better the enterprise work indicators appear to be. O. Antonov, the noted aircraft designer, described this contradiction as follows: assessing the work of an enterprise on the basis of production costs and the amount of materials and rubles expended is particularly at variance with to the interests of public production. It is the equivalent of assessing the work of a thermoelectric power plant not according to its production of electric power and heat, but the amount of coal burned: the more it burns, the better it works.

As we know, a commodity has two features: consumer value and cost. "The usefulness of an object," K. Marx pointed out, "determines its consumer value" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 23, p 44). The cost of a given consumer value, according to Marx, is determined only by the amount of labor or working time socially necessary for its manufacturing" (ibid., p 48). Naturally, a reduction of past (embodied in the means of production) and live (newly expended) labor per unit of output allows society to increase the production of consumer values. It is no accident that Marx described time saving as "the first economic law based on collective production" (ibid., vol 46, part I, p 117). The less time spent by society in the production of material goods which meet the personal needs of the working people, the more time is gained for other production, including spiritual. In other words, under socialism the nationwide production process is organized for the sake of consumer values, and cost is only a means of achieving this objective.

Under capitalism profit is the objective of economic management. That is why the owner of the means of production is interested not in specific consumer values, but in the cost which includes the added value. Under the conditions of the domination of public ownership of the means of production all levels and units in the national economic entity must be concerned above all with increasing the production of a variety of consumer values at the lowest possible cost.

However, the "priority" of cost over consumer value, related to the "outlay" method of assessing the work of economic units occasionally limits the possibility of upgrading the efficiency of the functioning of the entire socioeconomic organism and hinders the full implementation of the highest objective of our production process. A contradiction develops between cost and consumer value: enterprises and sectors frequently increase the cost volume without a corresponding increase in the production of consumer values (i.e., output in physical terms) and enhancement of quality, which causes substantial loss to society.

Let us cite the following quite typical example: a centrifugal multiple rotary machine produces 45 units of cast iron pipes per hour. They could be 50 or 100 millimeters in diameter. The former weigh 500 and the latter 1,130 kilograms. The amount of gross output is worth 70 rubles in the first case and 132 in the second. It turns out that labor productivity, output-capital ratio and wages in the production of 100 millimeter-diameter pipes...are twice as high! The production of wire of different sizes, of sheet iron of different thickness, and many other types of similar items produced with the same type of equipment makes it possible to increase the cost by a factor of 3-5 without increasing the output in physical terms or improving its usefulness. All it takes is to twist a little screw and all of a sudden labor productivity and the volume of output "increase" by several hundred percent. Therefore, the moment a problem develops with the plan or the wage fund (which occurs quite frequently in practice), hands instinctively reach for levers to control production parameters. The consequences of such "controls" are described in a letter to PRAVDA by construction worker N. Fyunov. He reports, in particular, that "in Leningrad 50mm cast iron pipes are totally unavailable, whereas virtually all construction organizations have a surplus of 100mm pipes. The use of the latter instead of the 50mm pipes is a gross

violation of the specifications and is not possible in all cases. Furthermore, there is a 7.35 kilogram overexpenditure in cast iron per meter. Bearing in mind the scale of our construction, the great loss to society is obvious."

In analyzing the process of transferring the cost of the means of production to the finished product, Marx wrote that "there should be no inexpedient consumption of raw materials and means of labor, for the unwise use of materials and means of labor tools means waste of embodied labor and, consequently, is neither considered nor involved in establishing the value of the product" (ibid., vol 23, pp 207-208). If we bear in mind that "consumer value is achieved only in the course of use or consumption" (ibid., p 44), it becomes entirely clear that labor spent on items which remain unused as above-norm stockpiles in warehouses of enterprises and trade organizations or as unfinished products, although creating the appearance of improved economic indicators of the work of production collectives and increasing earnings, is not in the least a factor in the actual improvement in public production efficiency and the increased well-being of the people.

The adverse effect of the "priority" of cost over consumer value in combining individual and collective interests with those of society, drastically increases under the conditions of economic intensification. The application of the achievements of scientific and technical progress enables us to lower the socially necessary outlays and, consequently, prices, which is of interest to society as a whole and to its individual members. At the same time, the economic units--from enterprises to ministries--find this occasionally unprofitable, for it entails a lowering of cost and "reduction" of the rates of production development and a rise in labour productivity based on it even if output in physical terms is increased. This negative feature of the current economic mechanism became particularly noticeable in the 10th and the current five-year plans in connection with the accelerated conversion to intensification.

In the period of economic development primarily based on extensive factors, i.e., on the building of new enterprises and increasing the number of the industrial production personnel, increased outlays were largely consistent with the increased volume of output. It was justifiable to say at that time that no major results can be obtained with low outlays. Under contemporary conditions, when 85 to 95 (and sometimes even 100) percent of the increased output is the result of higher labor productivity, the situation has changed radically. It is not only possible but absolutely necessary to obtain relatively greater results with relatively lesser outlays. However, a number of artificial difficulties appear along this way. When and how did they appear? The answer to this question enables us to define the means of their elimination more substantively.

'Not To Confuse Matters...'

How is the volume of output measured (computed)? This is a natural question which appeared at the very beginning of the process of the development of the socialist economic management system and has still not been definitively resolved on an entirely scientific basis.

In the search for an indicator with which to determine the volume of output, energized by Lenin's requirement of organizing nationwide accountability and control, scientists and practical workers agreed on the fact that this indicator should be based on value. However, as we know, Marx distinguished between full value and newly created value. Which one of them should be taken into consideration in determining the volume of output of economic units and of the country as a whole? This question became a subject of lively debates in the 1920s. At that time many people assumed that the indicator of gross (commodity) output consistent with the "full value" was unsuitable for this purpose. The materials of the All-Russian Statistical Congress (November 1922) stipulate that "...actual industrial output, considered an item in the national economic balance, is net industrial output." The All-Russian Congress of Statisticians (1924) as well recommended that the value of output be computed on the basis of net output, subtracting from the gross output the cost of raw and other materials received from the outside. Similar conclusions and recommendations were found in the materials of statistical congresses and conferences which were being regularly held at that time.

In August 1924 F. E. Dzerzhinskiy, chairman of the USSR Higher Council of the National Economy, sharply criticized gross output at an RKP(b) Central Committee plenum. He said that when we estimate gross output "we totally ignore our uneconomical and frankly predatory use of raw materials, fuels and materials.... According to our estimates, it appears that the more we waste them, the greater our output becomes and the higher the productivity."

Volume 8 of the first BSE [Unabridged Soviet Encyclopedia] noted that in computing gross output "we separate ourselves from the actual cost of output precisely by exaggerating it." It also describes the foreign practice of using indicators similar to net and conventionally net output.

Nevertheless, it historically developed that it was precisely the gross output indicator that became the measuring "instrument" in planned economic management.

In characterizing the "gross" (abridged description of the gross output indicator) as, metaphorically speaking, an economic yardstick, we must point out first of all that this "yardstick" seems to be "made of rubber": the greater the share of past (embodied) labor in the output, the more it "stretches" and inflates the volume of actually incurred labor outlays and the more it distorts the actual correlation between the dynamics of cost and the natural-material form of the created social wealth.

The rapid development and intensification of the specialization and cooperation process--the most important trend in technical progress--objectively leads to the steady growth of the "repeated count" of materials and semifinished goods. Thus, along their technological path (from raw material to a finished and installed machine) many items frequently go through five or more enterprises. At each consecutive enterprise, on a cumulative basis (including processing and transportation expenditures) the full cost of such items is included in the volume of the gross (commodity) and marketed output. Thus does this situation not prevent us from knowing the actual increase of the cost of output?

The artificial inflation of the actual volume of output through a multiple "repeated" counting of material outlays is not consistent with the Marxist-Leninist theory of social reproduction. We know, for example, that Marx included among the initial abstractions in the elaboration of a system for the marketing of the overall social product a stipulation according to which the entire fixed capital is consumed in the course of a given year and its value is totally transferred to the created commodities (op. cit., vol 24, p 446). In developing the Marxist reproduction theory, in his work "On the Subject of the So-Called Market Problem," V. I. Lenin described systems for the marketing of the overall public product over a number of years under the conditions of scientific and technical progress and the increased organic development of capital. However, in these systems as well said abstraction is one of the initial methodological postulates.

The expansion of the repeat counting of the cost of materials and semifinished goods cannot increase the overall public product in its physical form. Such a repeat counting inherent in the "gross" only nominally increases the overall amount of the product, as a result of which each ruble of its cost accounts for a lesser volume of specific consumer values.

The contradiction we noted between consumer value and cost in the course of the development of our economic mechanism was also aggravated by the fact that the gross (commodity) output gradually became not only a yardstick for the volume of output, but its basic ASSESSMENT indicator as well. The dynamics of its volume determined not only the growth rates of output, but also the rates of increase in labor productivity, the size of the wage fund, and a number of other most important indicators and standards. This stimulated an increase in the volume increase in rubles without the necessary growth of output in physical terms and improved quality, which led to underestimating physical and labor indicators.

Following the 1965 economic reform, the volume of marketing became the basic assessment indicator, while gross (commodity) output became a computation indicator. However, this substitution did not change the essence of the matter for the following reason: to begin with, the volume of marketing is a variety of "full value." The marketed, gross and commodity volumes of output are like "triplets," for they include past (embodied in consumed means of production) and live (newly used in creating the product) labor. Secondly, since the volume of goods marketed is computed in current prices, while the determination of the dynamics of the results of economic development requires the use of fixed (comparable) prices, the growth rates of the volume of output and labor productivity and the wage fund must, as in the past, be based on the gross (commodity) output. The economic incentive funds which were set up at the enterprises in the course of the reform and were "tied" to the volume of marketing, intensifying the striving of economic managers to meet the plan in rubles, aggravated even further the contradiction between consumer value and cost.

Under these circumstances the higher the level of cost, the more difficult "progress" becomes without artificially raising this level.

In order to raise it, in addition to increasing the "repeat counting," active use was made of the method of "eliminating" inexpensive items and increasing the share of expensive ones. As a result, to this day frequently the cost of new equipment and machines rises much more rapidly than their capacity, productivity and other quality parameters which reflect their actual consumer properties. Here and there the splintering of production associations also takes place (setting up a number of their subunits as independent plants), as a result of which, without any increase in output in physical terms, the volume of marketing is inflated by tens of millions of rubles. Is it surprising that in fulfilling and overfulfilling plans for the volume of marketing enterprises, associations and ministries sometimes violate contractual obligations and assignments for the most important types of stipulated items?

Today scientists and economic managers acknowledge virtually unanimously the need to replace the gross output indicator, but are totally unable to agree on the replacement. A number of indicators have been mentioned at different times (profit has been promoted particularly energetically). So far, however, no efficient solution has been found. Why?

We believe, above all, like the search for the philosopher's stone in the Middle Ages, efforts are being made to invent some kind of nonexistent single and universal (alternative to the "gross") indicator, which would not only accurately determine the overall social product, but will also SIMULTANEOUSLY objectively assess the work of the individual units on all levels of the hierarchical socialist economic management system. This "consolidated" indicator would COMBINE measurement (accounting) with assessment functions. However, we believe it expedient precisely to SEPARATE the functions of measuring the volume of output and assessing the work of economic units, for they are in a state of objective contradiction.

One of the proofs of the theoretical and practical groundlessness of the idea of a universal indicator was the attempt to assign this role to standardized-net output [NChP]. Why did this fail? In our view, precisely because an effort was made to replace the cult of the "full cost" (gross) with the cult of the "newly created value." In the same way that the gross was applied, the NChP began to be used as the basis for determining the growth rates for the volume of output, the rise in labor productivity, and the amount of the wage funds and withholdings for economic incentive funds. Naturally, the following situation developed: the higher the NChP, the better! Meanwhile, as in the past, physical and labor indicators were ignored. The domination of cost over consumer value and the contradiction between them not only remained but in a number of cases even worsened. A contributing factor to this was the fact that the norm of net output included a differentiated level of profitability. The higher the profitability, the higher (all other conditions being equal) the NChP. As a result, an equal amount and quality of labor assumed different "standardizes-net" values. As in the past, the new indicator classified the output into "profitable" and "unprofitable."

This proves once again the need to demarcate between the functions of measuring the volume of output, on the one hand, and assessing the work of economic units, on the other. The efficiency of this demarcation, in our

view, should be checked by introducing the corresponding additions to the method applied in the large-scale economic experiment.

In accordance with Marxist-Leninist methodology, the DETERMINATION of the volume of output of the economic units should be based on NET OUTPUTt, which suitably reflects the amount of newly created values. The volume of net output, combined with amortizations and the cost of raw and other materials, created and put in circulation for the first time, most objectively characterizes the value of the end social product.

In this connection, it is exceptionally important to recall Marx's advice that "in order not to confuse matters by creating unnecessary difficulties, we must distinguish between gross earnings...and gross income..." (op. cit., vol 25, part II, p 409). Marx further describes the content of these concepts and explains why the distinction between them is mandatory. "Gross earnings or gross product represent the entire reproduced product" (ibid.). "Gross income," Marx goes on to say, "is that part of the value and its share of the gross product...which remains after subtracting the cost and the determined share of the entire product used to replace the permanent capital invested in production and consumption" (ibid.). Therefore, the concept of gross income in this excerpt from "Das Kapital" is entirely consistent with the contemporary concept of net output, for which reason the claims of individual economists according to whom it was "rejected" by Marx are inconsistent with reality.

Since net output is the outlay of live (necessary and added) labor, in order to eliminate the interest of enterprises and sectors in artificially inflating it, it would be expedient to use this value indicator for the volume of output as a base for computations.

As to the function of objective ASSESSMENT by society of the work of labor collectives in enterprises, associations and sectors, in our view we should use a DIFFERENTIATED SYSTEM OF INDICATORS AND NORMS which would ensure the scientific practical use in economic management of a system of objective economic laws regulating socialist production.

Indicators and Laws

If a person needs a resort pass or a health certificate, he goes to a doctor. His temperature may be normal and his pulse good. Before concluding that the person is "essentially healthy," the physician suggests a cardiogram, appropriate tests and visits to a surgeon, the neuropathologist and other specialists. The result frequently is that a person needs treatment, sometimes urgently, for many patients have a normal body temperature and regular pulsebeat.

Is the assessment of the comprehensive activities of production collectives simpler than determining the state of health of an individual? An entire system of indicators is needed to ensure the comprehensive assessment of the work of enterprises and associations. Metaphorically speaking, annual and sometimes extraordinary "hospitalization" of economic units is necessary. In

such cases the physical, labor and value indicators and norms must be efficiently coordinated.

If cost is given "priority," underestimating physical and labor indicators is inevitable. Yet the former express the dynamics of specific consumer values while the second are a base for the scientific determination of the socially necessary labor outlays. A somewhat paradoxical situation develops: in theory virtually all economists unanimously agree that in a socialist society commodity-monetary relations are limited and play a subordinate role; in practical terms, however, in assessing economic activities the final word is that of...cost. After the implementation of the plan in rubles the principle that "nobody judges the winners!" is frequently applied.

The supporters of preserving the "leadership" of cost indicators sharply contrast them with physical indicators. The source of such economic "love of the physical" (i.e., the concept of upgrading the role of physical indicators), they assume, lies in the "unwillingness to take into consideration the scale of the Soviet national economy." They refer to the existence of hundreds of thousands of economic units in the country, the production of millions of various items, and opponents report the use in our economy of a great number of various instruments, materials, etc. According to one of the critics of such "love of the physical," even considering the existence of modern computers, the balancing of the plan in physical terms would require...some 30,000 years. The conclusion is that physical indicators "cannot be used directly for the same reason that a street and house number cannot be identified on a globe."

But then is this the function of a globe? As we know, for orientational purposes it would be entirely adequate to pinpoint on a globe or the map of a country the large cities. It is equally well-known that regional maps indicate all towns and villages and only local large-scale maps indicate streets and house numbers.

This "geographic" analogy not only does not confirm but, conversely, refutes concepts of the basic impossibility of balancing the economy on the basis of physical indicators. It would suffice on a unionwide "globe" to plan and control the production of several hundred most important types of commodities needed for the proportional development of the entire national economy. There are thousands of varieties of metal and fabrics used in the production of tens and thousands of items ("streets" and "house numbers"). However, is it necessary to consider and plan the latter directly from a socioeconomic center? No, naturally. This is accomplished by a complex hierarchical pyramid of sectorial and territorial economic organs subordinate to the center.

The reason for the occasional disproportions which developed in our country is not the great variety of items, but the violation in the course of economic management of the law of planned and proportional development of the national economy. The observance of this law under socialism requires the formulation of material, labor and value balances which ensure the coordination among production, distribution and consumption. The material balance calls for the production of the most important types of output needed for balanced

development. Through ministries and departments the list of such items is issued to enterprises and associations as a mandatory variety. The full and timely implementation of such assignments is an ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY PREREQUISITE for the economic realization of nationwide ownership, which is the true objective of economic activities by our production units.

It is no secret that many enterprises are still violating the implementation of directive-based planned assignments for variety and assortment, which leads to violations in the national economic balance. In such situations the artificial expansion of a nomenclature controlled from above could hardly prevent disproportions. At best it could prevent disproportions in particularly important economic sectors.

The substantial enhancement of the role of economic contracts, which indicate not only the "street" but "house numbers" as well, is a powerful lever in improving the utilization of the law of planned development. The contracts precisely define in physical and value terms millions of specific consumer values needed by society at a given time. The implementation of contractual obligations on time and in terms of the stipulated variety is also a prerequisite for the successful observance of the basic economic law of socialism.

Subsequent to the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers 1979 decree on improving the economic mechanism, a new indicator was applied expressing the principle of primacy of consumer value in the socialist economy--volume of marketing consistent with the implementation of contractual obligations. Last year, the party and the government passed the decree "On Serious Shortcomings in Observing Contractual Obligations for Procurements of Goods and Upgrading the Responsibility of Ministries, Departments and Enterprises in This Matter." In the course of the implementation of this decree a noticeable change for the better took place. Nevertheless, procurement shortfalls are still assessed in the billions of rubles and apply above all to a number of items in mass demand, spare parts and other relatively inexpensive "petty objects." What is the reason for this?

The violation of assignments for the production of a stipulated variety of goods and the violation of contractual obligations is largely explained, in our view, first of all by underestimating the role of physical and labor indicators. In the pursuit of cost and the growth of the overall volume of marketing, enterprises frequently "get rid" of inexpensive yet labor-intensive consumer values, while at the same time expanding the production of expensive varieties. The volume of gross output increased in this matter is morally and materially rewarded at least as well as the increased production of real consumer values and the increased actual efficiency of the items. If an enterprise fulfills its contractual obligations in physical terms in full but underfulfills its value plan, it finds itself in a difficult economic situation. It is no accident that the increased output of a number of goods significantly outstrips in terms of value their increase in physical volumes. There are many commodities the volume of which increases in monetary terms but declines in physical terms. Under such circumstances, changing the structure of scarce consumer goods becomes entirely understandable. Whereas previously the "scarcity" applied to items the increased production of which was hindered

by the limited nature of the raw material, base, today this applies to primarily inexpensive yet quite labor-intensive items, including spare parts (particularly small parts for automobiles, household items, etc.), some food products (fruit candy, zephyr, crackers) and other "petty" items.

Secondly, on the macroeconomic level, it sometimes happens that in order officially to balance some types of output, sectors and enterprises are issued above-plan assignments without suitably guaranteed resources. Funds are also allocated for projects which, according to the plan, should have been completed but the actual completion of which is repeatedly postponed for the following year. This triggers a "chain reaction" of violations of contractual obligations.

Thirdly, one could hardly consider normal the fact that a number of economic sectors (including transport organizations) have virtually no responsibility for procurement breakdowns and nonperformance of services and, furthermore, do not have to pay corresponding fines.

The role of physical indicators in observing the law of planned and proportional development would be difficult to overestimate. The implementation of assignments for the most important types of commodities needed for balancing the national economy could be compared to body temperature, and the implementation of contractual obligations, to the pulsebeat. It is precisely on the basis of these two indicators that, in our view, it would be most expedient to base the DAY-TO-DAY assessment of the work of production collectives. Should an abnormal "temperature" or a violation of the "pulse beat" be noted in an economic unit, a "diagnosis" should be urgently made and suitable "treatment" applied.

On the other hand, if assignments on the most important types of output and contractual obligations are met promptly, does this automatically mean that the enterprise works well? Hardly! An exhaustive answer to this question may be provided only by an investigation in the course of which a number of additional questions must be answered, the following in particular: How is productive capital used? Is material-intensiveness reduced? Has labor-intensiveness increased? What is the dynamics of production costs? Are profitability, profits and capital returns increasing? It is virtually impossible to clarify all of this without drastically increasing the role of physical and labor indicators.

It has long been said that he who pays the piper names the tune. Since payments are based on costs it is precisely the latter which "name" the corresponding "tune." In order to achieve an ACTUAL increase in the value of natural indicators (officially, in the system of indicators they have always been given priority and their leading role has never been denied) it is necessary to take them into consideration, along with labor indicators, in determining the wage fund. It is in this direction, in our view, that the search for new methods for the utilization of the law of distribution according to labor must be sought. The gravest shortcoming of the existing practice in this respect, in our view, is the averaging of wages in sectors and enterprises and separating bonuses for labor contribution from the actual

assessment of the quantity and quality of the consumer values they have created.

Wages are the main lever in the application of the law of distribution according to labor. How is it presently connected with qualitative and quantitative parameters of produced items?

We consider such ties to be rather approximately and largely averaged and rounded up. Relevant method instructions point out that the planned wage fund "is determined by multiplying the number of workers by their average wage." It is important, in this connection, to point out that, on the one hand, the level of the "average wage" for each individual period and respective economic sector is a given value and it is actually independent of the results of enterprise work. On the other hand, the "estimated number of workers" is determined on the basis of the gross (commodity) output per worker in accordance with the planned growth of labor productivity and the volume of output in terms of value. Therefore, if the share of labor objects and semifinished goods obtained through cooperation is increased at the enterprise and if the production of expensive items is enlarged, labor outlays decline and the number of workers and the wage fund increase. A different situation develops in increasing the production of inexpensive commodities and reducing outside procurements: labor outlays increase and the number of workers and the wage fund decline. Consequently, the wage fund depends essentially on the value of the output, which is very insignificantly affected by the labor-intensiveness of the items produced.

The lack of a close connection between the size of the wage fund and the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of the consumer values produced (practical experience has confirmed that this shortcoming has remained even while establishing this fund on the basis of the NChP) is, we believe, one of the main reasons for classifying goods and services into "profitable" and "unprofitable." The breakdown of planned assignments by variety and reduced cost, by the growth of labor productivity and the value of marketing, and contractual underprocurements are frequently out of the hands of enterprise and association directors, yet economic managers have never been and are not now forgiven failure to ensure the wages of the collective. It is no accident that experienced economic managers occasionally approach quite cautiously the problem of undertaking the production of new and less expensive commodities.

At the present time the construction organizations find themselves in particularly difficult straits. In the past, in building new plants, factories and other industrial and consumer projects they were able to achieve high earnings. Under the conditions of the intensification of the national economy it was deemed expedient to limit new construction and to increase the volume of reconstruction. In the first case wage outlays accounted for 15-25 and, in the second, for 30-60 percent or more of the volume of work done. In order to economize (or, more accurately, to "economize at a loss") as a rule the wage fund continues to be based on the principle of the "level reached." As a result, in order to "feed themselves," the construction workers undertake various projects which are over their head, "carry out" the profitable operations and seek new projects, while the older ones remain unfinished for years. It is this "losing economy" that is considered the starting base the

following year. It is no accident that for the past several years the steps taken to reduce above-norm unfinished construction are not yielding the desired results.

The scientific application of the law of distribution according to the quality and quantity of labor presumes, in our view, that the planned wage fund be determined on the basis of labor-intensiveness norms (in terms of norm-hours) of produced consumer values and the quantity of the latter. The Marxist classics described accountability based on cost as a "circuitous" and "unreliable and inadequate" yardstick. They scientifically substantiated the basic possibility and necessity of replacing it in the future society by the direct computation of working time.

In our country some production units are already actually applying standardized-labor indicators. Such is the case of the "Andropov Motor-Building Production Association, whose experience is widely known. This association, in which the work of shops is assessed directly in terms of norm-hours, has achieved significant successes in lowering the labor-intensiveness of output and increasing labor productivity. However, unquestionably, the main work in spreading this experience lies ahead. Furthermore, some negative phenomena are found here as well. Thus, the December 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum noted that in recent years the movement for the fastest possible reaching of planned production labor-intensiveness has been virtually ignored.

However, upgrading the role of physical and labor indicators should not be considered as underestimating, not to mention ignoring, production cost indicators. The latter also play a very substantial role in the economic mechanism. The physical, labor and cost parameters of output have different purposes. While supplementing each other and developing into an optimal and harmonious combination, their purpose is to become "advisers" in the choice of variants for the solution of economic problems and for assessing the actual contribution of economic units in the implementation of the final objective of socialist production. Cost indicators, metaphorically speaking, must firmly stand "on the shoulders" of physical and labor indicators rather than "hover" in the "air" of the gross output. This way, like a compass, they would be able to indicate the shortest way to the target.

The mechanism of the utilization of the law of value must be improved further in order to ensure the more successful implementation of this function. The main lever in the observance of this law is price, which, according to Marx, "is nothing but the MONETARY EXPRESSION OF VALUE" (op. cit., vol 16, p 128). In criticizing P. Struve, who tried to present value as something independent of price, Lenin emphasized that "price is the manifestation of the law of value. The value is the law of price, i.e., the summed-up expression of the phenomenon of price" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 25, p 46).

We know that in price-setting practice for a long time the view of the Marxist-Leninist classics, according to which a new value is created exclusively through LIVE labor, was not taken properly into consideration. As a result, the norm of profitability was based on percentages of production costs and past labor, embodied in labor objects and means and frequently

"created" new value several times higher than that created by live labor. One of the inevitable negative consequences of this fact was the distortion of the objective ratios between the necessary and the added product. This shortcoming is eliminated with the new wholesale processes introduced in 1982. However, they reproduce another serious shortcoming which we already discussed--a differentiation between the levels of profitability, which seriously lowers the accuracy of the indicator of standardized-net output currently used in determining the growth of labor productivity and the size of the wage fund.

Let us give a simple arbitrary example. Two consumer values (A and B) require identical outlays (50 rubles' worth of materials and 25 rubles' worth of wages with supplements). If the profitability norm in the production of a consumer value is higher by a factor of 3, the prices will be as follows:

Price A = 50 + 25 + 25 (profit) = 100.

Price B = 50 + 25 + 75 (profit) = 150.

Whereas we metaphorically described gross output as an economic yardstick, the prices of individual consumer values would play the role of millimeter sections. What would be the real role of the meter if such calibrations are artificially increased? The different levels of profitability of the NChP indicator will be substantially distorted, for different volumes of newly created values will "equate" equal labor (in our example, the net production norm for item B will be double that of item A). Could such a norm objectively reflect the growth of productivity? Would it be legitimate to compute the wage fund on this basis?

The profit obtained by artificially raising the profitability norm increases the sum total of newly created values only nominally (in the same way that the "repeat count" of past labor increases the amount of the cost). Yet the quantity and quality of consumer values remain the same. What is the reason for increasing the level of profitability? Obviously, it is to increase interest in the production of one commodity or another. We believe, however, that it would be far more efficient to accomplish this by introducing price markups for quality, novelty, etc. Here is why:

To begin with, with a different level of profitability the objective ratios between the necessary and the added labor are violated (which leads to the artificial increase of the added product). The profit thus obtained is like paper money issued over and above the necessary amount, regardless of its actual backing with commodities. Secondly, according to the norms, only a certain percentage of the profit remains at the disposal of the enterprise. The other part, known as the free surplus, goes to the budget without fulfilling its stimulating role in the least. That is why we believe that it would be expedient to set up a UNIFORM level of profitability. This (along with excluding the "repeat count" of embodied labor) would be consistent with the previously discussed methods for marketing the overall product as developed by Marx and Lenin.

The application of the achievements of scientific and technical progress leads to a sharp increase in labor productivity, which allows us to lower the socially necessary outlays for the production of consumer values and is an objective foundation for lowering wholesale and retail prices. The latter triggers a drop in the volume of gross, marketed and net output while retaining (and sometimes even increasing) output in physical terms. Since the volume of costs reflects embodied and live labor costs, its planned decrease (volume) is a positive and legitimate trend under intensification conditions. At the same time, the "priority" of cost turns this trend around: the appearance of a stagnation or production decline in individual economic units and sectors appears.

That is precisely why the volume cost indicators should be used as a basis for computations. Thus, the gross (commodity) output is not only necessary but simply irreplaceable in the study of the dynamics of the production structure and the means of lowering material and capital-intensiveness of output. The actual contribution of enterprises and sectors to the creation of specific consumer values and the growth of labor productivity and other most important indicators and proportions cannot be determined without net output. In other words, cost indicators act as "consultants" on how to satisfy the specific requirements of society with the lowest possible material and labor resources. Such indicators can properly "suggest" the most efficient means of converting from the notorious "outlay" method in assessing the work of production units to the desired method of "results."

As we can see, a demarcation between measuring and assessing functions does not require radical reforms in planning and accounting. However, it creates the necessary prerequisites for the real enhancement of the role of natural and labor indicators and norms and transforming them (along with cost indicators) into organic elements of the subordinated system of planned management, which should be made fully consistent with the functioning of the system of economic laws operating at the initial stage of developed socialism.

Having pointed out our successes in economic construction, the 26th CPSU Congress also directed the activities of the party and the people toward surmounting the remaining major shortcomings and difficulties caused by a variety of reasons. "The main reason, however," the congress noted, "is that the power of inertia, tradition and habits, which developed at a time when priority was given less to the qualitative than the quantitative aspects of the matter has not been entirely eliminated." The elimination of this reason requires the type of restructuring of economic thinking mentioned by K. U. Chernenko at the anniversary plenum of the board of the USSR Writers Union.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/3

LAWS MUST BE FOLLOWED UNSWERVINGLY AND ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT UPDATED

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 84 (signed to press 15 Oct 84) pp 62-76

[Article by Le Duan, Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee general secretary; from a speech delivered in July 1984 at the 6th CPV Central Committee Plenum]

[Text] Our permanent and serious task is the steady improvement of economic management. This task is faced by not only our country, which is in the first stage of the transitional period, but all fraternal socialist countries as well.

Our party and state have dedicated tremendous efforts to radically change the bureaucratic structure of economic management, to accelerate the development of the new structure and thus to ensure the accurate implementation of the principles of economic management: establishing a single centralized management and increasing the autonomy and creativity of enterprises and local areas and all production and trade sectors; ensuring the collective leadership of the toiling masses and providing a powerful incentive for upgrading labor productivity and economic efficiency. Nevertheless, as before, a number of difficulties are experienced by our economy.

Under socialism, the process of economic management must be based on objective laws. Management practices and their widespread shortcomings confirm the urgency of the task of updating management. We must comprehensively review and study the entire process--from the economic structure and organization of the production process to planning, economic measures and management mechanisms--so that, on this basis, we may develop a corresponding management structure. This is a difficult problem which must be resolved. A favorable factor in our circumstances is the possibility of using the experience of the fraternal countries. We must study and make use of this experience creatively, without automatically duplicating it.

In order to create a proper management structure we must analyze our own experience as well. The process of development from petty to large-scale socialist production raises a number of theoretical and practical problems awaiting their resolution. We would be unable successfully to manage the economy without mastering the most effective theoretical weapon of our age--the method of dialectical and historical materialism. The party must equip

the party workers, the communists, with profound theoretical and practical knowledge. It must develop in the party workers an accurate economic way of thinking, i.e., a deep understanding and proper utilization of economic laws and the laws of the socialist revolution in our country.

The Working People as Collective Owners Are Simultaneously Making Three Revolutions

In accordance with the course of the socialist revolution formulated by our party as the collective owner of the country, the working people are the essence of the new system. The creation of a collective economic management system by the working people is the objective of the socialist revolution.

As the essence of the new system and the objective of the socialist revolution, collective economic management is the overall result of three revolutions.¹ The revolution in production relations lays the economic foundations for collective economic management by the working people. It makes the people masters of their work, productive capital, the production process and distribution. Underestimating the revolution in production relations in any of its units means weakening the economic positions of the collective management system.

The scientific and technical revolution lays the material and technical foundations for socialism. This revolution enables the working people to be the masters of nature and the steadily ascending society, to create the "material axes" of the new system, victoriously to implement the task of the socialist industrialization of the country and to ensure the full and definitive victory of the collective economic management system.

The revolution in ideology and culture educates the member of the new socialist system, the able, energetic and conscious collective owner.

The collective economic management system encompasses within itself political, economic, cultural and social relations. It must be developed comprehensively, through the simultaneous making of three revolutions.

The collective economic management system is not only the end objective of the socialist revolution but the purpose of daily revolutionary changes. The new socialist social relations are shaped and developed and mature with the progress of the socialist revolution.

To be the master means to be familiar with the laws and to act consistently. Having mastered the laws of social development and the development of nature and using these laws in molding and controlling society, the individual contributes to unparalleled historical progress.

The collective economic management system ensures the working people's management of the political, economic, cultural and social areas. Management in the political area contributes to the simultaneous development of three factors: party leadership, state management and the mass revolutionary movement of tens of millions of people. Management in the economic sphere ensures the consistency between production relations and the level of

development of production forces. Management in culture offers conditions for the development by the working people of splendid national traditions, the utilization of the high accomplishments of the human mind and their transformation into a material force.

The collective economic management system coordinates the efforts of the entire society with those of every individual. It contributes to the harmonious development of the individual, the family and society. It liberates society, thus liberating the individual. It contributes to the blossoming of society for the sake of the happiness of the individual family and the individual person. It involves the person in the social orbit with a view to ensuring the full freedom of the individual. It enables us to combine the right of the entire society to be the master with the same right enjoyed by every individual member of society. Economic management on the scale of the entire society contributes to the increased power of the entire country and of each area and collective. The efforts of the individual contribute to the growth of the physical, intellectual and professional potential of free people within the framework of and in accordance with the development of collective economic management on the scale of the entire society.

The pursuit of a proper policy in economic management on different levels is a source of strength for the collective economic management system. This policy is confirmed by the truth that the working people gain the right to collective economic management by setting themselves no objective other than their own interest. This truth was clearly expressed by Karl Marx: "'An idea' invariably shames itself the moment it is separated from 'interest'" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 2, p 89).

In the economic area, the system of collective economic management shapes an efficient structure of interests. This unity of interests of society, the collective and the individual working person, these socialized interests, are supreme and long-term; the interests of the collective play a very important role, whereas the individual interests of the working people are of an immediate nature.

The unity among these interests is achieved, in the final account, in the interests of the working people. The combination of such interests is the motive force governing the further advancement of the production activities of the working people.

The collective economic management system secures not only the interests of the working people but also the close combination of interests with rights, obligations and responsibilities. Wherever interest exists there should be rights in order to ensure the implementation of such interests. Wherever interests and rights exist, obligations and responsibilities should exist, the supreme manifestation of which are duty and responsibility in building and defending the socialist homeland.

Collective economic management must be reliably secured in the course of economic management. It is considered its most important principle, which guarantees the harmonious combination of interests. It is on this basis that we must ensure the development of the motive forces in the collective economic

management system, the intensification of the three revolutions and the powerful and stable development of the economy.

Creation of an Industrial-Agrarian Economic Structure

With an industrial-agrarian economic structure, which acts as a material base, the collective economic management system expresses and ensures on the economic level its essence, objectives and motive forces.

In the course of the transition from petty to large-scale socialist production, a unified structure is created in industry and agriculture from the very beginning: economic subunits under central and local administration jointly engage in specialization, cooperation and production combination; production forces and production relations become interrelated within a single complex; economic requirements are combined with defense needs; the division of labor within the country becomes interrelated with the expansion of international cooperation.

In the conversion from petty to large-scale socialist production, we try, from the very beginning, structurally to link industry with agriculture and to follow the law of development which has been manifested in the party's course of ensuring the priority rational development of heavy industry on the basis of the development of agriculture and light industry.

Priority in the development of heavy industry must be mandatory. It is only thus that we can implement the main task of the transitional period, which consists of achieving socialist industrialization and creating that which we are particularly short of and particularly need for the successful building of socialism and for the reliable protection of the homeland--a machine-building industry.

However, the priority development of heavy industry must take place on a rational basis. At each individual stage we must concentrate our efforts on specific heavy industry sectors and correlate its development scale and level. In this area we must rely on the development of agriculture and light industry. At the initial stage, we must above all assist the accelerated development of agriculture and light industry which, in turn, will provide heavy industry with sources for accumulations, labor resources, food supplies for the workers and a market for their output.

At the current initial stage agriculture and light industry have the greatest possible opportunity for making full use of the labor resources of society and the land, alongside the tremendous resources of the country, in producing commodities which will directly satisfy the population's material and cultural needs. Furthermore, each step forward taken in the development of agricultural and light industry is under the influence of heavy industry.

The actual results achieved in recent years indicate the possibilities of agriculture. Such progress made by agriculture toward large-scale socialist farming cannot be entirely isolated and affect only the peasantry and agriculture; it must be fully the product of the activities of workers and

peasants, of industry and agriculture, interrelated within a single efficient structure.

The development of agriculture must be closely combined with the development of industry in producing consumer goods, including the food industry and the various light industry sectors. We have adequate possibilities so that we must rapidly ensure the availability of energy and raw materials, reorganize the production process and update the management structure with a view to developing the consumer goods industry in depth and in width.

At the initial stage in the building of socialism, concentrating efforts on increasing agricultural output and actively developing the consumer goods industry means strengthening the foundations for the creation of a heavy industry. On the other hand, in order to advance agriculture to large-scale socialist production and to ensure the fast growth of the consumer goods industry, we must ensure the primary and efficient development of heavy industry and make proper use of already created sectorial capacities. We must additionally create the necessary enterprises for such industry, which will supply the country with electric power, coal, petroleum products, fertilizers, insecticides, basic chemicals and various types of equipment, mechanisms, instruments, spare parts, construction materials, etc. By suitably expanding variety, we must upgrade the quality of heavy industry output for export, with a view to earning additional foreign currency.

In the years to come particular attention must be paid to the development of the power industry and transportation, which are the main part of the infrastructure, which make possible all production and economic activities and are also key links in the economy.

In directing heavy industry above all toward stimulating agriculture and the consumer goods industry, we must accelerate the preparatory work which offers new prospects for this sector. To this effect we must formulate the technical and economic substantiations and use the cooperation and aid of the fraternal and other countries in developing a heavy industry, designing enterprises and training workers and specialists. There can be neither heavy industry nor socialism without steel and machine building. We must comprehensively struggle for the development of large-scale heavy machine building and the accelerated development of petroleum and natural gas. We must see to it that within a short time petroleum and natural gas assume a leading position in the economy. We must build several additional thermal and hydroelectric power plants. We must create metallurgical enterprises with a capacity of 0.5 million tons and for several million tons of steel annually, as well as enterprises with a capacity for up to 100,000 tons of steel. We must develop nonferrous metallurgy, the chemical industry and the production of construction materials.

Equipping and strengthening the existing 400 large industrial enterprises and production associations and some 400 districts which have an agroindustrial economy is an important task in economic management. We must expand the right of enterprises and ensure the greater flexibility and mobility of their work.

The use of a collective economic management system on the three basic levels will unquestionably lead to the creation of an economic structure in which enterprises under central and local administration will be efficiently interlinked.

The economy under central administration includes the most important enterprises in heavy industry, consumer goods and agriculture. We must energize the efforts to strengthen existing enterprises under central administration and direct our efforts toward the creation of new sectors of key significance. Particular attention should be paid to interconnecting and reciprocally complementing such sectors.

The economy under local administration includes medium-sized and small enterprises. It must make full use of local resources and capacities and achieve the highest possible regional efficiency. It must produce a broad variety of goods and assume responsibility for the allocation of commodities and for meeting the vital needs of the population of the specific area. It must offer extensive opportunities for economic and defense development and make an increasing contribution to the country's industrialization.

We shall be able to combine all three stages in economic development--simple cooperation, manufacturing and large-scale machine industry--through the creation of an efficient structure and by simultaneously developing the central and local economies. Energetic steps must be taken to streamline the reorganization of public production and, starting on the enterprise level, to create an efficient industrial-agrarian structure which may be used as a base for the reorganization of the management structure. On the other hand, we must energize the creation of a respective management structure and make full use of it for the creation of a new economic structure strictly consistent with the party's course. The reorganization of the current economic structure must be aimed toward granting the enterprises production rights and economic initiative and the districts full management rights, so that they may successfully complete the creation of agroindustrial districts and develop at a powerful rate simultaneously the local economy with leading sectors such as machine building, the power industry, transportation, metallurgy and chemistry.

Connection Between the Plan and Cost Accounting and Socialist Economic Management Based on the Plan

A special feature and absolute advantage of socialism, unavailable under capitalism, is the planned development of each economic subdivision, area and sector and the entire national economy.

In our country, which is at the initial stage of the transitional period, although petty production essentially prevails in the country's economy and socialist production relations have not as yet spread throughout the entire country, nevertheless, based on the right to collective economic management established by the working people, we are developing the role of the socialist state, steadily relying on the plan which we consider the central link in the economic management system. We use the plan to encourage the development of

output, to satisfy social requirements and to ensure our defense capability and security and the country's industrialization.

The plan is the party's socioeconomic program. It must become the most powerful factor in the system of economic levers. It must include a set of carefully selected economic and scientific and technical projects. It must ensure therapid application in the national economy of the achievements of scientific and technical progress and create conditions for and make it incumbent upon all enterprises and individual working people to act in accordance with progressive economic and scientific and technical indicators and norms. The plan must reflect the content of the three revolutions. In the economic area it must combine all links in the public reproduction process. It must connect production with distribution, circulation and consumption and the domestic with the world market.

The plan must be formulated on three basic levels: the country at large (encompassing all of its sectors), the individual areas and the enterprises. All three levels must participate in the formulation of each separate plan.

Planning on a national scale has priority and is of decisive importance in three-step planning. The nationwide plan, which is formulated starting at the enterprise level but is not merely the mathematical summation of enterprise plans, must define the overall trends, objectives and tasks of the entire economy and society.

As in the past, the annual and quarterly plans on all levels (enterprise and additionally monthly and weekly plans) must play the main role in the system of short, medium- and long-term planning. By becoming management levers, such plans must also react to all changes in the socioeconomic situation. Furthermore, the five-year plan with its annual breakdown must play an increasingly important and effective role as we advance, and become the main planning method.

In the very immediate future we must undertake intensively the formulation of the 1986-1990 plan. The main planning units must include a specific socioeconomic strategy for the transitional period and its initial stage, the creation of systems for the development and deployment of production forces and the formulation of a long-term plan. This work must be radically accelerated in order to concretize the party's course, apply the laws governing the building of socialism and earmark prospects and trends in the entire process of socioeconomic development for a relatively lengthy period of time.

Cost-accounting is a method for socialist economic management used at enterprises and production and economic organizations. While firmly observing the plan--the main prerequisite--each production unit must manage autonomously. It must take into consideration economic results and mobilize all of its forces and utilize all growth factors and determine all possibilities of increasing output. Cost-accounting requires norms and clear criteria, statistics and a scrupulous assessment of efficiency. Cost-accounting must not be confused with a balance sheet.

Socialist economic management also includes a new method of thinking, a new approach to the work by the person who has become the collective owner, whose distinguishing feature is a constant awareness of the problems of economic efficiency. Every manager must become profoundly imbued with the ideas of socialist economic management and be able to manage in a socialist manner. The state plan is the headquarters of socialist economic management on a national scale.

Our country's management and planning system must be updated through the utilization of the specific ways and means of planning, the definition of corresponding economic levers, the elimination of bureaucracy and multiple-step management systems, block an orientation toward a free market and struggle against parochialism and narrow-minded departmentalism. Such renovation must follow the trend of expanding the rights and increasing the responsibilities and interest of lower units with a view to creating an efficient foundation for their economic autonomy. This also involves encouraging the material incentive of the working people and stimulating individual initiative, which must be closely interrelated with the development of the forces of the entire collective.

Scientific and Technical Revolution and Socialist Industrialization

We look upon the scientific and technical revolution as a key component of the socialist revolution and are creating comprehensive conditions for its active development. Our course is to master as soon as possible the necessary areas of science and technology for which we have real possibilities. We must act in the following spirit: areas of science and technology needed by the country must be developed at all cost. We must develop the great creative possibilities of scientific and technical cadres, encourage innovations and inventions, adopt progressive developments and immediately reach a contemporary technical standard or a standard closer to the latest accomplishments. At the same time, the achievements of the "middle level" and the necessary manual tools must be utilized.

Clearly, the scientific and technical revolution cannot be exclusively the concern of intellectual workers and scientific research institutions. Essentially, it must be the project of the broad popular masses. It must be the constant motion and work habits of tens of millions of working people.

Socialist industrialization plays a key role in the scientific and technical revolution, related to the implementation of the main task of the transitional period. For this reason, advancement toward and means of implementing socialist industrialization represent an advancement and means of implementing the scientific and technical revolution. In the immediate future, along with concentrating our efforts on the upsurge of agricultural production, we must prepare conditions for the next stage of industrialization.

We must define the main trends and select the necessary scientific and technical accomplishments for each individual sector. This selection must be based on an accurate assessment of the potential of the different sectors in the country. As to sectors of key significance, such as machine building, we must remember that any lagging here triggers technical backwardness in all

other sectors. Therefore, the leading sectors must be supplied with modern equipment as soon as possible.

The choice of directions in the development of science and technology must be combined with the choice of trends of socioeconomic development. Science and technology must maximally contribute to upgrading economic efficiency; the economy must be progressive in terms of the level of scientific and technical development. Economic management must mean including advanced scientific and technical achievements in the content and method of planning, economic incentive and organizational means and methods.

We have favorable opportunities for the more energetic application of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution.

Nevertheless, the scientific and technical potential has not as yet been properly appreciated or utilized. The main trends in updating the economic management mechanism and the management of science and technology must be one of surmounting shortcomings, so that the new mechanism can actually contribute to the transformation of science and technology into the flesh and blood of economic decisions, into a factor of economic growth.

Mastering Commodity-Monetary Circulation

Production, distribution, turnover and consumption are the basic links in the social reproduction process. These links are dialectically interrelated. Production remains the base. It determines distribution, turnover and consumption. At the same time, distribution and turnover have a powerful influence on production and life.

Finance, money, trade, prices and wages are all categories which obey the general laws of socialist commodity-monetary circulation. Furthermore, each category has its own laws which we must identify and use accurately. At the same time, even at the current primary stage the laws of distribution and turnover must obey the basic economic law of socialism and the law of planned and proportional development. Under circumstances in which a variety of systems remain within the economy and the struggle between socialist and capitalist ways of development is continuing, the area of commodity-monetary circulation is also influenced by the economic laws of petty commodity production and capitalism. We must apply the tools of distribution and turnover in ensuring the full victory of socialism.

The conversion from petty production to socialism requires initial accumulations. This is a matter of strategic importance. Such sources of accumulation are found in the mastery and efficient utilization of the rich opportunities of the country in the areas of manpower, land and natural resources and its material and technical foundation. Along with increasing output in the country, we must develop foreign economic relations and increase exports.

Output must be inseparably related to thrift in production and consumption. We must set levels of consumption which would allow the production process to

abandon customary consumption inconsistent with the level of economic development and the traditional thrift of the population.

The socialist state must strictly control monetary circulation. It must stabilize and upgrade the purchasing power of the dong.² We must reduce the surplus cash in circulation. This applies above all to the accumulation of large amounts of money in the hands of merchants, black marketeers and smugglers. On the other hand, the state should put money in circulation only in accordance with a plan, in order to stimulate production and redistribute financial resources to the benefit of the socialist forces and ensure the efficient utilization of the cash flow.

Material and commodity circulation (trade) is an exceptionally important area of socioeconomic activity. In V. I. Lenin's words, the communist "must learn how to trade," in order to be able to trade in a cultured socialist manner.

Establishing control over the market is the most urgent problem of today. By signing contracts with producers, the supply and procurement organizations of the state must organize supplies of material and consumer goods in order promptly to meet the needs of industry and the population. Competition in purchasing and sales on the market must not be allowed. Socialist trade must develop a retail trade network. It must organize the proper distribution of commodities. Allowing such distribution to be made by speculating merchants is totally inadmissible.

The market is an arena in which the struggle between socialist and capitalist ways of development is taking place. We proceed from the fact that five economic systems may still remain for a number of years during the initial stage of the transitional period in the southern part of the country. Already now, however, the socialist state must rapidly organize a unified management. It must establish economic monopoly of commodities of major importance to the state and the people.

The comprehensive development of socialist trade and the broadening of the area and upgrading the quality of state trade are of decisive significance in establishing control over the market. Most serious attention must be paid to organizing and upgrading the role of procurement and marketing cooperatives.

Taking into consideration the present economic conditions, the "free" market should exist within a specific framework in town and country, as a place of exchange and direct trade of secondary output, between producers and consumers, without speculators and middlemen. The activities of petty merchants must be organized and strictly controlled and gradually replaced with socialist trade.

As long as private economic systems remain, state prices must contribute to narrowing the area of the "free market." We must simultaneously struggle against two erroneous trends: first, against the orientation toward a market mechanism; second, against ignoring the objective requirements of changed economic and social relations. Most prices must be planned and based on production rather than market relations. The state establishes "framework prices" for some commodities and allows local authorities to change prices

within their limit. In control of the overwhelming share of the output of the national economy, for which reason it fully can and must establish control over the prices of essential commodities. On the other hand, by virtue of the remaining imbalance between supply and demand, for a while the state may pursue a policy of maintaining two sets of prices. Along with basically stable prices for essential commodities, some prices must be subject to flexible changes with a view to broadening the commercial activities of socialist trade and struggle against the "free" market.

Under present-day circumstances, the solution of the problem of wages should not be linked merely to a simple increase in wages as such, based on changes in prices on the "free" market but, mainly and above all should be such as to ensure for the working people a rational amount of necessary consumer goods. Therefore, we must apply a procurement system based on fixed prices for essential commodities, so that the bulk of the real wages become independent of steadily changing market prices. At the same time, we must regularly revise that part of the salaries which are subject to the influence of price fluctuations, in order to secure the real income of workers, employees and military personnel.

Expanding Foreign Economic Relations and Stimulating the Growth of Foreign Trade

In setting the task of industrialization, we must strengthen our foreign economic relations in order to make efficient use of the achievements of science and technology and modern worldwide industry.

As a member of the world socialist community, we give priority to relations of cooperation with CEMA members, the USSR above all. This cooperation is based on equality, mutual aid and mutual benefit. It means the integration among socialist economies, the purpose of which is to equalize the levels of economic development among all the members of the socialist community. Discussing the role of foreign economic relations in the country's industrialization, we must have in mind above all the division of labor and cooperation with the fraternal countries. A deviation from this way means failure to utilize the tremendous power of the world socialist economy.

At their summit conference the CEMA member countries defined the basic trends and indicated the various forms of economic and scientific and technical interaction and called for raising cooperation among them to a new level. The decision was made to increase the aid which the USSR and the European socialist countries give to us, Mongolia and Cuba. This creates favorable conditions for broadening cooperation with the fraternal countries.

Laos and Kampuchea are our two socialist neighbors. We maintain special, most close relations with them. Together with our country, they form a separate economic area in the Indo-Chinese peninsula. The interests of each one of our countries and the entire area demand special integration. Our country must play a key role in expanding cooperation and mutual aid with Laos and Kampuchea in all areas.

Our country pays great attention to expanding relations with independent national and nonaligned countries. It also uses relations with capitalist countries for breaching the blockade laid by imperialists and expansionists.

Our foreign economic strategy must be active and initiative-minded. We must study the world market and find proper ways and means for organizing cooperation. Foreign trade, joint enterprises, economic and scientific and technical cooperation, loans, and others are all widespread forms of expanding foreign economic cooperation.

Exports and imports must be considered a most important part of the country's economy. In order to industrialize we must boldly purchase everything we need. In order to import, however, we must also export. Naturally, loans are necessary but such loans must be repaid. Exports, therefore, must be increased.

We can increase production for export, using both internal reserves as well as specific methods of foreign economic relations, above all with the socialist countries, from cooperation in production on the basis of supplied raw materials and receiving loans on a compensation basis to the organization of joint enterprises. Exports must become a nationwide task.

The foreign trade management and control system must be flexible. Its purpose is to ensure state currency and foreign trade monopoly and to create conditions for large enterprises, areas and sectors to offer their goods directly on foreign markets. This would stimulate exports. Planning and management of foreign trade must be such as to guide its development, encourage output, contribute to the application of modern equipment and new management methods and upgrade national economic efficiency.

Creation of a New Culture and Education of the New Man

The purpose of the revolutionary cause of our party and people is man's happiness. Our slogan is "Everything for Man and Everything Is Created for Man." In speaking of building socialism and managing and controlling the national economy, we must speak of man as the subject and object of economic management.

The main task of the revolution in ideology and culture is the creation of a new culture, the education of the new person. Man is the basic production force. His abilities are a major influence on production and economic management.

The new social system and the new economy require the shaping of a new culture. As the product of the economy, culture stimulates its development. Under certain conditions, the development of culture may outstrip and influence the process of economic development. When we speak of culture we speak above all of people. People are the product created by social progress. At the same time, they direct this development. Economic power is inseparable from cultural power. Man's cultural power is manifested in the extent of economic power. Labor is the very essence of culture. The highest level of cultural development is the one which raises the person to the level of

collective master of society, nature and himself, implementing the principle of "one for all and all for one." This is the purpose of the creation of the new culture. Culture, socialist in content and national in nature, must express the idea of collective economic management. The abilities of our people must be brought to light in a socialist society and enrich it. Socialism raises the national features to a higher level. The new culture deepens patriotism, combining it with proletarian internationalism. It links the fate of the individual nation with that of all nations on earth in the struggle for peace, national independence and social progress.

The culture of collective economic management raises to a new height the feelings of comity inherent in our national traditions. At the same time, it creates conditions in which every individual fully develops his capabilities and intellect. The objective of the new culture is the creation of the new person, the working person--collective owner, good, decent and industrious.

Labor, conscientious, constructive and responsible is the main feature of the collective owner. Socialism restores to every person his human value. A concentrated manifestation of this fact is the leading role which labor plays in building the new life. To work according to one's ability and receive according to one's labor is the main moral principle of the socialist society.

Excellent relations among people will be established and the best qualities inherent in every Vietnamese--love for homeland and home, for others and for himself--will blossom gradually only through labor in the course of building socialism. Such great feelings must be developed and enhanced within the overall system of relations inherent in a collective management society.

With a view to accelerating the process of socioeconomic development we must mobilize the forces inherent in the collectives and in every individual. This precisely will ensure the gradual implementation of Marx's idea to the effect that "the free development of one is a prerequisite for the free development of all" (op. cit., vol 4, p 447). Defining the position of the individual within the collective economic management system and developing the abilities and qualities of the individual with a view to the proper exercise of the right of every working person to be the master from the viewpoint of his obligations and interests is a reliable guarantee of the power of the collective economic management system.

Ensuring Vital Needs, Creating Accumulations for Industrialization and Ensuring Defense and Security

The socialist collective economic management system and public production are based on the public ownership of productive capital. This objectively defines the main and permanent objective of the production process: the increasing satisfaction of the needs of the people. In order to achieve this, the production process must steadily develop on the basis of increasing modern technology. On the other hand, we must realize that we are building socialism under conditions in which external enemies have still not abandoned their aggressive plans. This situation makes urgent the task of steadily meeting defense and security requirements.

The stability of a country is manifested above all in the prosperous and healthy life of the people. However, if we were to consume everything we produce without creating accumulations or without industrialization, we would be unable to create socialism and, in the final account, to upgrade the living standard. Nor could there be any socialism without safeguarding the national independence.

The pace of economic development attained in recent years indicates that we have the possibility of meeting our needs and undertaking the creation of accumulations. Although the per capita national income remains low, properly managed and distributed and rationally and economically utilized, it could meet the minimal requirements of the population and the country. We must observe and properly implement distribution according to labor. Equalization in distribution is an erroneous trend unrelated to Marxism-Leninism; we must acknowledge the variety of life. At the same time, we must pay serious attention to the steady increase of public and collective funds which must be used by all working people and their children on an equal basis.

Upgrading the living standards of the people is a key problem of the basic economic law of socialism. Ensuring the country's defense and security are also laws of the revolutionary struggle under the contemporary international situation. From the viewpoint of their objectives, these laws not only do not clash but, properly used, beneficially interact and reciprocally supplement each other. Defense power is the combined power of the economy, politics, and military affairs. The combination of economics with defense and vice versa means building the economy and defense within the framework of an efficient structure, so that the economy may ensure a strong defense and a strong defense protect the economy and provide conditions for its safe development.

The Party Manages, the People Are the Owners and the State Administers

The party manages, the people are the owners and the state administers. Such are the three interrelated links of an entity. Each link has its place and functions which cannot be mixed with others. Party management means that the party must properly define the course and policy and involve the people in revolutionary activities. The people are the owners. This means that they themselves build and control their life. The state administers. This means that it must concretize the course and policies of the party in state laws with a view to organizing the revolutionary activities of the masses. The creation of a proper structure in which the party manages, the people are the masters and the state administers, will ensure the overall power of the dictatorship of the proletariat and bring about the active participation of the masses in successfully building socialism and defending the homeland.

The state plays a particularly important role in this system. Our state has two interrelated functions: protective and constructive. In the face of the intentions of the Chinese expansionists and hegemonists, who, allied with the U.S. imperialists, are engaged in a multiple-level subversive war, in an effort to violate our national independence and wreck the building of socialism, our state must show constant concern for defense and security and strengthen defense bodies such as the armed forces, the militia, the courts, etc. However, the main function of our state is the organization of the

economy and culture and the building of socialism. State building should be a topic of particular attention in the course of developing a collective economic management system.

Managing an economy in the process of organization demands of the state the ability simultaneously and accurately to resolve two problems: to create management projects and to control the gradually completed projects. The state must be the master of productive capital, manpower, the public production and reproduction process and the rational distribution and utilization of the manpower and the entire output created by the national economy.

The state must control economic activities on the basis of a single plan and law. It must develop the corresponding organizational structure which would enable it to be an apparatus of administrative and economic management and control of production and economic activity. The state apparatus must be organized in accordance with the requirements of the economic structure and the laws formulated by this structure. The laws of the organization and activities of the state apparatus must reflect those of the organization and activities of the economic structure.

The state apparatus must combine territorial with sectorial management and comprehensive with sectorial administration. The functional and sectorial ministries, the central ministries and the local people's committees must closely cooperate with each other and supplement each other in the course of the performance of their functions.

State management is based on laws. On the one hand, we must struggle against bureaucratic centralism and, on the other, strictly observe the laws and upgrade the discipline. We must particularly strictly observe and see to the observance of state laws by state organs and officials. The state apparatus must be brought closer to practical activities and life. It must flexibly be alert to new developments and correct errors promptly.

A collective economic management system alone, although a good one, is insufficient. We need a detachment of good cadres for the system to operate properly. Our party has a detachment of trained cadres. As a whole, however, they lack knowledge and skills in managing the economy and society.

The quality of cadres is a major problem. The overwhelming majority of cadres have splendid revolutionary qualities. However, faced with the various trials, a number of cadres proved to be short of tempering. They allowed actions such as corruption and aspiration toward personal advantages and egotism. Such phenomena became a major obstacle on the path to the implementation of the party's course and in the observance of the laws of the state and the collective economic management system by the working people. Therefore, along with the bold promotion of able and tested cadres, we must get rid of personnel who have become corrupt and have degenerated and have lost the confidence of the masses. The party's cadre work must be conducted on a planned basis in order to train a detachment of cadres truly consistent with the tasks of the revolution and the building of a socialist economy and culture.

Utilizing the Overall Power of the Revolution

In building socialism under conditions governed essentially by petty production, our party must, from the very beginning, make use of the overall power of the country and the economy. The party's revolutionary course reflects the law of comprehensive utilization of all the laws governing the economy, society and science, which define the process of our revolution. Strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat, developing the right of the working people to be the collective owner, the parallel development of the three revolutions, building the new system, the new economy and culture and educating the new member of the socialist society means the comprehensive utilization of the laws of ties between production forces and production relations, between the economic base and the superstructure, between politics, economics and culture, on the one hand, and society, on the other, and between national traditions and the quintessential nature of the age.

The creation of an efficient economic structure at the initial stage of socialism is consistent with the interconnection and reciprocal combination of heavy and light industry and agriculture, among the economy under central and local control and production units, between the national and global economy and between the economy and defense. This results in the creation of a tremendous force. The creation of a collective economic management system means asserting the social system which harmoniously combines the connection between the right to be the master of society, nature and oneself, the right to be the master in politics and economics, culture and society, the right to be the master of the entire country and the individual areas and enterprises and relations between society and the individual.

An economy, particularly one which is in the course of transition from petty to large-scale socialist production, develops on the basis of complex laws. Without the mastery and utilization of such development laws we would necessarily experience contradictions and erect obstacles on the path of the development of the economy and the other areas of social life. For this reason each ministry, authority, area and enterprise, based on their real position, must follow a common economic course in comprehensively resolving economic and other problems, developing our overall power and actively and flexibly advancing our revolutionary cause.

FOOTNOTES

1. Revolution in production relations, the scientific and technical revolution and a revolution in ideology and culture--translator's note.
2. Dong--the monetary unit of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam--translator's note.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/3

RUSSIANS IN THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 84 (signed to press 15 Oct 84) pp 77-88

[Article by Dr of Historical Sciences R. Konyushaya]

[Text] The constituent assembly of the International Association of Workers, which entered history as the First International, took place 120 years ago, on 28 September 1864, in the small St. Martin's Hall, located in the central part of London.

K. Marx and F. Engels, the founders of scientific communism, were the creators and leaders of this organization. The famous Alliance of Communists, which operated during the 1848-1849 revolution under the banner of the "Communist Party Manifesto," the program drafted by Marx and Engels, was the immediate predecessor of the First International.

The alliance, which rallied in its ranks a small circle of progressive like-minded proletarians, became the embryo of the proletarian party. Only 12 years after it was disbanded (1852) the tempestuous development of production forces in Western Europe and the United States, paralleled by the growth of international contacts and contributing to the increased identification of the common nature of class interests shared by workers in all countries, created prerequisites for the appearance of another proletarian organization--the First International--under the conditions of an overall upsurge of the worker, democratic and national-liberation movements.

The activities of the First International (1864-1876), of the first mass international organization of the proletariat, were an important stage in the universal history of its class struggle. Rallying various trends within the labor movement in individual countries, it led them into a common channel. It was within the organizations of the International that the progressive representatives of the working class mastered the ideas of scientific communism, outlived utopian and petit bourgeois illusions and concepts, surmounted sectarianism, learned proletarian party-mindedness and attended the school of proletarian solidarity. All of this prepared favorable conditions for the creation of mass socialist worker parties in various countries. In V. I. Lenin's words, the First International "laid the foundations of an international foundation of workers to prepare the revolutionary pressure on capitalism." Its activities "rendered great service to the labor movement in

all countries..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works, vol 38, p 302; vol 16, p 79).

As a result of the revolutionary work done by the First International, a new international organization appeared in 1889, which rallied within its ranks for a quarter of a century the labor parties in many different countries--the Second International. Engels played an exceptional role in its organization on a Marxist ideological basis, with his uncompromising opposition to reformist and anarchic trends and by promoting at the first congresses of the Second International class-sustained resolutions. The entry of capitalism into its imperialist stage and the establishment of a stratum of labor aristocracy, which became a breeding ground for reformism and Engels' death contributed to the fact that, gradually, representatives of an opportunistic and revisionist trend gradually assumed the leadership of the Second International. They tried to conceal their rejection of Marxist revolutionary theory behind a variety of antiscientific "theories" and considerations of alleged changes in the very nature of capitalism and the possibility of its peaceful grafting within socialism. World War I exposed the full and shameless bankruptcy of opportunism and its "theories," and triggered the collapse of the Second International and the termination of its activities.

The Communist International, which was created under Lenin's leadership and which developed its activities after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, when the Soviet Union began to implement the great ideas of scientific communism, was the heir and perpetuator of the great traditions of the First International, which had laid the ideological and organizational foundations of the struggle waged by the international proletariat for social liberation. The traditions of the First and Third Internationals, which invariably acted under the banner of the international solidarity of the working class in the struggle for common objectives, are alive and are strengthening and developing. The appeal launched by Marx and Engels to the world as early as 1848 "Workers of the World, Unite!" remains the great inspiring, mobilizing and rallying principle which reflects the decisive prerequisite for the further successful development of the global revolutionary process, the building of socialism and communism and the struggle against the threat of war and for the preservation and consolidation of peace.

At the very beginning of their sociopolitical activities, Marx and Engels formulated and substantiated the exceptional importance of the idea of combining the labor movement with socialism. In "the situation of the working class in England," Engels described the need to combine Chartism with socialism and called for "disseminating in proletarian ranks a clear understanding of the social problem..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 2, p 516). In his "On the Critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of Law. An Introduction," Marx formulated theses of the greatest possible revolutionary content: "Naturally, the weapon of criticism cannot replace the criticism of weapons. Material force must be removed with material force; however, theory itself becomes a material force the moment it conquers the masses" (op. cit., vol 1, p 422).

The party of the proletariat was called upon, as was scientifically substantiated by Marx and Engels and formulated as a practical objective on the very eve of the 1848 revolution, to combine socialist theory with the labor movement. The Alliance of Communists, the First International and the founding of socialist workers parties in a number of European and American countries were the basic stages in the growth of the class-revolutionary awareness, organization and international unity of the international proletariat. These were the results of the ideological and organizational works of Marx and Engels in guiding the labor movement, in the course of a continuing and intensive struggle against antiproletarian theories, trends and organizations. The lessons of this great work and struggle were learned by Lenin, who defended revolutionary Marxism from the revisions and debasement of the official leaders and ideologues of the Second International, which had sunk into opportunism and dogmatism. Lenin creatively developed all of its structural components in accordance with the conditions and requirements of the new age.

In our time the ideologues of the bourgeoisie, the social reformists and the revisionists are trying to substantiate the thesis that the organized leadership of the class struggle of the proletariat by its leading detachment is unnecessary. They try to promote liquidationist feelings in terms of communist and worker parties. They are distorting in all possible ways the Marxist theory of the proletarian party. They try to pit the views of Marx and Engels against Lenin's ideas and to misrepresent the true history and significance of the first labor organizations. They questioned the leading role and influence which Marx and Engels had in them. A sharp ideological struggle is developing on the subject of the legacy of the First International.

Historical facts irrefutably prove that Marx was the main character who stood at the cradle of the international association of workers. As Lenin said, he was the heart of this association. Guiding the work of the International crowned Marx's entire practical revolutionary-party activity. He was the author of the constituent manifesto and provisional bylaws of the International, which theoretically substantiated the political line and forms of its organization. It was precisely Marx who drafted its most important documents, helped to formulate the agenda of congresses and conferences and drafted reports and instructions. He wrote appeals and resolutions and gave advice and instructions on a great variety of problems related to the activities of the International and its numerous sections.

Marx's instructions and advice addressed to the leaders of the International were founded on his study of a huge amount of documents and works on the socioeconomic development of various countries and the situation of the working class, familiarity with the tremendous volume of materials contained in the labor press and correspondence he received and information which drew in the course of personal contacts with a broad range of revolutionary and sociopolitical personalities.

In elaborating the tactic of the struggle waged by the working class, Marx and Engels considered as a primary task the unification of the proletarian movement of different countries, including countries in which it was only

appearing. One such country was Russia, in which Marx was most greatly interested. Starting with the end of 1869, as confirmed by his wife and fellow worker, he independently undertook to master the Russian language "with enthusiasm and zeal," and, having mastered it, dedicated a great deal of time and effort to the very last days of life to the study of Russia. The result was worth his efforts, Marx believed, for in his view Russia was about to experience "the greatest possible social revolution," the consequences of which would inevitably be of tremendous international significance.

Marx's rough draft manuscripts about Russia¹ most clearly indicate the exceptional interest he showed in the situation of the popular masses of the largest country on the continent and the process of unparalleled expropriation of the peasantry within it, the faster development of capitalism, the mass spreading of information among the proletariat and the creation of prerequisites not only for a democratic but a socialist revolution or, in Marx's and Engels's expression, a "Russian Commune."

In addition to determining the revolutionary potential of a great and highly gifted people, undertaken by Marx during the existence of the First International, the purpose of the study of first-rate Russian sources was to complete--on the basis of Russian data--the unpublished volume of *Das Kapital*, particularly in terms of the theory of the agrarian-peasant problem. This was quite clearly stated by Engels in his prefaces to the second and third volumes of "*Das Kapital*."

Lenin's studies of the historical development of postreform Russia are the clearest possible confirmation of the continuity between Marx's studies and his own. The study of Marx's manuscripts offers a fruitful opportunity to study more closely his creative laboratory and to master the means and methods of dialectical-materialistic study of social phenomena.

New documents from Marx's legacy, which bring to light the source on which the views of the founders of scientific communism was based on the great revolutionary potential of the country which became the homeland of Leninism and of the October Revolution, also present us with one of the most effective tools to be used in the current ideological struggle. They disavow anticommunists and various types of falsifiers of history who spread fabrications to the effect that Marx and Engels saw only tsarism and reaction in Russian and failed to notice the existence of revolutionary forces.

As confirmed by the special scientific studies which Marx undertook at the time of the highest upsurge in the activities of the international, he had a clear concept of the importance of the major changes which were taking place in Russia after the abolishment of serfdom in economic relations and the social structure of the society. He brought to light the stages of the transition from the feudal-serfdom to the bourgeois-capitalist system. As a researcher he observed the class struggle which was in full swing and which brought about the appearance of a revolutionary situation in the country. The strong intellectual ferment, wealth of literary and philosophical-economic revolutionary-democratic thinking of the age of breakdown of serfdom and the revolutionary situation of the turn of the 1860s and subsequent years were recorded most vividly, clearly and specifically by Marx and Engels not only in

their manuscripts but in their public speeches and their extremely abundant correspondence on the subject of Russia.

An entire galaxy of Russian revolutionaries, scientists and fellow workers of N. G. Chernyshevskiy found themselves in foreign exile in Geneva, Paris and London as a result of the fierce tsarist repressions and showed a most lively interest in the international labor movement, particularly in the activities of the international and the revolutionary doctrine of its founders, Marx and Engels. They were enriched with the experience of this movement after studying the works of the founders of scientific socialism and mastered many of its ideas. In turn, gaining in these Russian emigres selfless fellow workers, Marx and Engels improved their ideas about Russia and its revolutionary potential. They were particularly enriched in this sense by their contacts with German Aleksandrovich Lopatin, Petr Lavrovich Lavrov and the members of the Russian section of the International.

The contemporaries of German Lopatin, a truly legendary figure of that period of glory, said about him that he was the "Il'ya Muromets of the Russian Revolution." Lopatin's brilliant mind was manifested while he was still in high school and his knowledge acquired at the university was crowned by a brilliantly defended dissertation in which he supported and developed materialistic views. His high intellect and splendid spiritual qualities attracted the attention of D. I. Mendeleev, the great Russian chemist, who offered him a scientific assistantship in his chair, perhaps seeing in him a possible heir. However, at age 22 Lopatin had already chosen his career and his fate--service to the cause of the revolutionary liberation of the people.

After a single initial talk Marx, as Lenin pointed out, "made a highly flattering reference to the young Russian socialist..." (op. cit., vol 25, p 300). Lopatin did not go empty-handed to see the leader of the International. While still in Russia he had studied Marx's works and decided to carry out a project of tremendous importance: to master the translation of "Das Kapital" in Russian. Escaping from his pursuers and finding himself in Paris, despite a difficult financial situation, he immediately undertook this project. Soon afterwards, realizing its exceptional difficulty and feeling extremely responsible for providing an accurate scientific translation of the original, Lopatin went to England to see the author and asked for his help. In itself, the initiative of the Russian revolutionary triggered a particular interest in Marx, whose greatest work had been by then persistently ignored for many years by the Western Europe bourgeois press. Marx's desire to "test" this daring person and to determine his overall spiritual possibilities, level of education and, naturally, political views, was understandable.

There are reasons to believe that Lopatin made his best impression on Marx by describing to him in detail the tragic fate of Chernyshevskiy, the great Russian revolutionary, his activities, scientific works and artistic creativity. With his talent and scientific turn of mind he was able not only to describe the main ideas of Chernyshevskiy's most important political and economic work but also to formulate its essence and scientific concept, which was of particular importance to Marx. It was precisely Lopatin who deserves credit for the fact that Chernyshevskiy increasingly became to Marx the embodiment of revolutionary Russia and its credo and banner.

Learning that Marx was particularly interested in Russian postreform reality, Lopatin undertook to supply him with the most valuable sources and publications. He gave to him Chernyshevskiy's works and rare statistical publications and involved in this project his close friend the economist N. F. Daniyel'son (who was to continue and complete the translation of "Das Kapital" initiated by Lopatin) and put at Marx's disposal his private library.

The report submitted by Lopatin, who regularly made daring clandestine trips from London and Paris to the homeland, were of great importance to the leader of the International. "Lopatin's stories on a variety of Russian matters," Engels emphasized, "are quite interesting and knowledge of them is particularly useful" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 32 p 434).

The Russian revolutionary Lopatin became Marx's friend from just about their first meeting. Having properly assessed his outstanding talent, warm support of the revolutionary-liberation struggle and high moral qualities, Marx unhesitatingly recommended that Lopatin be made member of the General Council and assigned him most important projects of the International. "Few are the people I love and respect as much as I do him," Marx wrote about Lopatin (op. cit., vol 33, p 403). In turn, this outstanding Russian revolutionary felt for Marx and Engels feelings of the most profound respect and warm attachment. Lopatin said that he loved Marx "as a friend, respected him as a teacher and revered him as a father."

Marx helped Lopatin in his theoretical development, personally supervising and advising him between July and November 1870 on his translation of "Das Kapital" to Russian. We know that it was precisely Lopatin who translated a large and most difficult part of the text and that under the guidance of the author himself, who had already mastered the Russian language, authentic terminology and a basic conceptual apparatus fully consistent with the original were formulated. This was of invaluable importance for the successful completion of the entire translation of Marx's great work.

The publication of the first volume of "Das Kapital" in Russia in 1872 was an outstanding event in the history of the Russian liberation movement and one of the most outstanding and significant manifestations of the great energy and dedicated search for a proper revolutionary theory by the best people of our country. Marx's words came true: "The first foreign nation to translate 'Das Kapital' turns out to be the Russian" (op. cit., vol 32, p 472).

Marx himself described the translation as "excellent" and "masterfully" done. Its high standard was due to Marx's help and the personal qualities of the main translator who had attended Chernyshevskiy's school: a materialistic and consistently revolutionary democratic way of thinking, a rich and powerful mind, an early development of independent scientific knowledge, and a literary talent which even Turgenev admired. And, naturally, the most serious feature--the passionate aspiration to master in the process of the study and the translation the logic of this great work in its entire most complex architectonics. According to P. Lafargue, Marx considered Lopatin one of the few people in his time who had understood "his theory all by himself..."

Another of Lopatin's merits was involving in the Western European labor movement and the activities of the International the great Prussian revolutionary Lavrov. In 1870 it was precisely Lopatin who organized Lavrov's escape from exile. In France, which soon afterwards declared war on Russia, Lavrov worked in a military hospital detachment of the Garde Nationale and immediately joined the active political struggle on the side of the Paris workers: he addressed meetings and assemblies, wrote about the 4 September revolution, which put an end to the Second Empire, and drafted a pamphlet-proclamation "To Work!" These and other activities of the Russian revolutionary clearly proved the influence on his political awareness of the revolutionary events which were developing and his adoption of the ideas contained in the appeals of the General Council of the International on the Franco-Prussian War, drafted by Marx. From the positions of the International Association of Workers, which was headed by Marx and Engels, he tried to contribute to the development of the political consciousness of the French people and to encourage their creative revolutionary energy. "The revolution," he pointed out, "is less risky than the apathetic acceptance of poverty which takes innumerable casualties...."

Lavrov was the first to assess the Paris Commune as a proletarian revolution in the European revolutionary press. He wrote that the popular government was headed not by a "rabble of bandits," as maliciously described by the bourgeois press, but by sincere and honest revolutionaries and members of the International. It was they who had brought together "in a single powerful entity" the Garde Nationale and established strict order in Paris. "All my wishes," the author emphasized, "...are for the victory of this republic which truly comes from the people, which was founded by workers who desire nothing but justice and fraternity...."

During the critical period of the Commune, Lavrov decided to organize help for it by workers in other countries. On its instructions, he traveled to Belgium where he reported to the local federal council of the International of the situation in Paris and called for help to the communards. He then went to London where he addressed the members of the General Council. It was here that Lavrov met Marx in person.

Lavrov returned to Paris toward the end of July 1871 to carry out Marx's and Engels' instructions, dedicating all his efforts to the fate of the communards, who were cruelly persecuted by the reaction. We learn from his letter to H. Young, a leading personality in the International, that the Russian revolutionary supplied them with passports for escape and that they came to him with recommendations Marx had issued in London. We also know that Lavrov gave the General Council a large sum of money which enabled it to help communards hiding abroad for a long period of time. In rescuing the communards from the malicious revenge of the bourgeoisie, Marx and Engels assigned to France especially trusted people who carried money and passports. Lavrov's premises in Paris were one of the safe houses for the persecuted revolutionaries.

As a direct participant in the first proletarian revolution, Lavrov also became one of its first historiographers. For many years he propagandized the universal historical cause of the Paris Commune. Lavrov's book on the commune

came out in Geneva in 1880. It clearly shows traces of a profoundly scientific and impassionate party analysis of events made by Marx in his "Civil War in France." Lavrov's work on the first attempt in world history to establish the power of the working class was included both in Lenin's personal library and his library in the Kremlin. According to V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich, Vladimir Il'ich considered this work on the commune "the best after Marx's 'Civil War in France'." Lavrov became personally close to Marx and Engels starting with 1871. This is explained not only by the situation of this emigre, who found himself in the center of the main events of the general proletarian struggle. Lavrov's desire to develop contacts with the creators of scientific socialism played a decisive role in this respect. He wrote in his autobiography that he considered "himself Marx's student ever since he became familiar with his theory," i.e., soon after the publication of the first volume of "Das Kapital" in 1867. Marx's interest in Lavrov as a direct and active participant in the Paris Commune was increased by his special interest in a country which at that time was the main target of his particular research.

Marx and Engels learned a great deal from Lopatin about his older and closest friend and about Lavrov's exceptional industriousness and selflessness in his scientific work, total devotion to the ideals of the social revolution and unusual modesty and simplicity in personal life. Lavrov soon became a very welcomed guest in Marx's home, where political exiles frequently gathered--Parisian communards, German revolutionaries and leaders of the International. Aware of the fact that "the good man" Lavrov "lives in devilishly poor circumstances," Marx, his wife and his daughter were invariably concerned and attentive toward this person who, stoically withstanding all difficulties, had abandoned a scientific and military career for the sake of the cause of the revolution. Marx and Engels invariably referred to Lavrov as a person who had selflessly dedicated his entire life to the Russian social revolutionary movement.

Lavrov was one of the spiritual spokesmen not only for the Russian revolutionary democratic movement. Through his revolutionary appeals and practical example he awakened in the best segments of the Russian youth interest in and sympathy for the liberation struggle of the Western European proletariat. In continuing in his publication of the journal and newspaper VPERED! the revolutionary tradition of Herten's KOLOKOL, Lavrov emphasized that although covering Russian problems he did not intend "to lessen his attention to the general problems of world socialism" and that the banner under which stood his journal was "the program of the International."

Although Lavrov's philosophical and political ideas were quite contradictory and frequently erroneous, they were distinguished by their dynamism, for as befits a scientist, Petr Lavrovich did not hold on to his previously developed concepts but was in a state of spiritual growth and development. This has been confirmed in recent years by a number of Soviet scientists who studied the development of Lavrov's topical, natural scientific, economic and sociological views and who were able to surmount a certain one-sidedness shown in assessing his ideological legacy and activities and find elements of scientific socialism in his views as a consequence of the influence of Western European socioeconomic conditions, active participation in the international

labor movement, the study of the works of Marx and Engels and personal contacts with them.

Lavrov spent the final 23 years of his life in Paris. His apartment at 328 Saint Jacques Street was a site of pilgrimage for many revolutionaries. The press described Lavrov's funeral on 7 February 1900 as a demonstration by "people of the future." The funeral procession, which was followed by 8,000 people, included representatives of workers and socialists from different countries. They marched to the sound of the Internationale, shouting "Long Live the International!" and "Long Live the Commune!"

Lavrov's life and activities are one of the vivid proofs of the exceptional wealth of international relations and traditions of revolutionary Russia which were described by Lenin with such warm conviction and profound respect, thus calling for the study of such traditions so that they may remain alive and be felt as a constant need and necessity by all subsequent generations of revolutionaries and communists.

In addition to the Russian revolutionaries, who worked in the International during different years as private individuals, in March 1870 a collective member of the Internationale was established as well: the Russian section, seated in Geneva. It rallied the most progressive and ideologically trained segment of the Russian emigres who belonged to the generation of the revolutionaries-raznochintsy, who expressed the expectations of the peasant democracy, the main inspirer of which was Chernyshevskiy.

A. A. Serno-Solov'yevich, a professional revolutionary and enthusiastic supporter of Chernyshevskiy, played a special role in the preparations for the establishment of the Russian section. He had become actively involved in the work of the International as early as 1867 and was in touch with its General Council and its sections; he headed the struggle of the Geneva proletariat and was deeply interested in Marx's theoretical and political activities with whom he corresponded. Marx and Engels were informed of Serno-Solov'yevich's activities. This great Russian revolutionary was among those who received as a gift from the author the first volume of "Das Kapital."

N. I. Utin became the leader of the circle of Russian revolutionaries rallied around the journal NARODNOYE DELO after the untimely death of Serno-Solov'yevich. As a student at Petersburg University, he had already become a supporter of Chernyshevskiy's ideas and soon afterwards became his very close fellow worker in the Land and Will secret organization, the aim of which was to prepare a nationwide uprising after the predatory 1861 reform. By decision of the organization's Central Committee, Utin left Russia where he had been sentenced to death in absentia. Abroad he studied socialist literature, the works of Marx and Engels in particular, and the experience of the Western European labor movement, which he joined as the International expanded its activities.

Also active in the organizational development of the Russian section were A. D. Trusov, who had headed a large rebel detachment in Belurussia during the 1863 uprising, and V. I. Bartenev, who was under Chernyshevskiy's ideological influence as well and had done clandestine work in Petersburg. The three of

them were the guiding committee of the Russian section. At their constituent assembly, the section members decided to submit the section's program and bylaws to the General Council. They turned to Marx, the head of the International, with a letter requesting him to represent the Russian section in the General Council of the International. In this exceptionally interesting and important document the section members declared that they considered it their main task, first of all, "to contribute comprehensively and energetically to the active dissemination of the principles of the International among the Russian workers"; secondly, "to rally them in the name of these principles." The authors of the letter thanked Marx for the invaluable assistance he had given to the Russian revolutionaries with his "theoretical and practical propaganda."

Marx personally supported in the General Council the request of the members of the Russian section for the approval of its program and bylaws and agreed to represent it in the leading body of the International. In his letter to the members of the Russian section committee he deemed it necessary especially to express his greatest respect for Chernyshevskiy, their teacher, whose works, as Marx wrote, "do true honor to Russia..." (op. cit., vol 16, p 428).

The practical activities of the Russian section included the preparation of materials for its printed organ and other publications, organizing and maintaining contacts with revolutionaries in Russia and other Slavic countries, comprehensive participation in the Swiss labor movement and waging a decisive struggle against the disorganizing activities of the anarchists headed by Bakunin. In the spring of 1871 the section members directly participated in the heroic struggle of the Paris Commune by working in its organizations and hospitals, fighting at the barricades and writing in the international press in defense of the great cause of the commune and its fighters.

Ye. L. Tomanovskaya, the 20-year-old fiery revolutionary and leader in the Russian section, entered the history of the commune along with the famous Louise Michel, under the name of Elisa Dmitriyeva, as one of the main leaders of the proletarian women in Paris. On the eve of her arrival in Paris she went to see Marx in London with a report on the work of the section. Her contacts with Marx armed her ideologically. She acquired a tremendous charge of class-oriented and truly party-minded energy. Tomanovskaya represented Marx and the general council in the commune, whom she informed of the developing situation and to whom, as member of the International, she reported all her activities which were not only filled with courageous resolve and heroism but were also illumined by a proper political understanding of the course of events and the greatness and weaknesses of the commune. On the subject of this activist in the Paris Commune and the International, Marx wrote that she had rendered "great services to the party..." (op. cit., vol 34, p 185).

Marx and Engels knew that the other members of the Russian section as well acted side by side with the Paris communards. Marx deeply respected A. V. Korvin-Krukovskaya, the wife of Ch. V. Jaquelard, a member of the National Guards Central Committee, who commanded one of its legions during the period of the commune. Korvin-Krukovskaya-Jaquelard was member of the Central

Committee of the Union of Women for the Defense of Paris and helped the wounded. She worked with dedication in a Paris hospital. She knew Marx and corresponded with him.

One of the great contributions of the members of the Russian section to the international labor movement was their conscious and systematic participation in the struggle which the International General Council, headed by Marx and Engels, waged against petit bourgeois ideology, Bakunin's adventurist tactics and anarchism. They knew that Marx had given his full trust to Bakunin when the latter had joined the International: the outstanding and active character and fighting temperament, outstanding publicistic and oratorical talent and hatred of tsarism were the features of this Russian revolutionary which drew Marx's attention as early as the 1840s. However, Bakunin did not justify this trust. Pursuing his anarchic beliefs, he undertook to create an actual counterbalance to the International headed by Marx and Engels: the so-called "Alliance for Socialist Democracy. He engaged in subversive work against the international proletarian organization which was following the revolutionary ideas of Marxism.

Particularly noteworthy are the activities of Utin, the head of the Russian section, aimed at strengthening the positions of the International after the fall of the Paris Commune and exposing the disorganizing actions of the Bakuninists. Let us note above all Utin's work as participant in the London conference of the International (1871), which played a particularly important role in its history. The documents of this conference revealed Utin as a person who had grown up ideologically and matured politically in less than 2 years' active work in the international organization of the proletariat.

At the international proletarian forum this Russian revolutionary described the revolutionary struggle in Russia and the activities of the liberation movement. He informed the participants in the conference of the trial in Russia involving Nechayev and his misuse of references to the International, and the intrigues of the anarchic secret Alliance Against the International Association. By request of Marx and Engels, Utin assumed the organization of the publication in Geneva of a closed circular of the General Council they had drafted, which exposed the anarchists' intrigues. The anarchists' hatred for Utin had reached its culminating point by that time. One night he was attacked on the street by eight people, who began to throw rocks at him. His life was saved only by students who had appeared on the scene unexpectedly. In the summer of 1872, despite his ill health and damaged eyesight Utin was able to do a tremendous amount of work by collecting and classifying factual data on Bakunin, Nechayev and the anarchist movement as a whole for the Hague Congress, which had to decide on whether to expel Bakunin and his supporters from the International.

Utin died in 1883, at the age of 42, as a result of a very poor state of health developed during his years of revolutionary activities. Marx was aware of the very severe heart disease contracted by Utin as a result of his term spent in the Petropavlovsk fortress and his life of great deprivation, spent in clandestinity and exile, and assisted in organizing medical help for Utin. Describing Utin as one of his best friends, he referred above all to the great activities, rare energy and great work stamina of the Russian revolutionary

fighter in defense of the ideological principles and organizations of the International during the period of the sharpest struggle against those who were disorganizing the great proletarian cause.

In his 14 June 1872 letter to I. F. Becker, Engels described the young Russian revolutionaries which he and Marx had come to know at the beginning of the 1870s. Some of them, he wrote, "are people who in terms of talent and character unquestionably are among the best people of our party; they are boys whose endurance, firmness of character and theoretical understanding are frankly striking" (op. cit., vol 33, p 411). He repeated this impression 2 years later, in one of his articles: "...Among the young Russian generation we know people with outstanding theoretical and practical talent and great energy..." (op. cit., vol 18, p 522).

According to prime sources, the members of the Russian section and the other Russian workers in the International were well aware of the need and importance of maintaining contacts between the Russian and the Western European revolutionary movements. They were aware of the growing role of the working class with the development of capitalism in Russia and welcomed the strikes as one of the initial forms of independent class struggle waged by the Russian proletariat.

The active party-political work of the members of the Russian section and their most sincere loyalty to the International and its leaders were based on their ideological convictions and recognition of the accuracy of the ideas formulated by Marx and Engels. Under the influence of these ideas and as a result of direct contacts with their authors and their practical participation in the international labor movement and in all projects of the International, the Russian fellow workers and friends of Marx and Engels experienced a development from revolutionary-democratic ideology and utopian socialism to adopting an increasing range of scientific socialist ideas.

Unquestionably, all of this singles out the Russian members of the International among the other Russian revolutionaries of the 1870s, proving the power which the views and activities of Marx and Engels had on their own. For a long time this fact was not properly interpreted in Soviet historiography. As a rule, historians of the social movement and social thinking concentrated exclusively on the revolutionary populists of the mid-1870s and beginning of 1880s.

Studies made by Soviet historians during the past 20 years convincingly refute the view that the Russian section in the International was not in touch with the revolutionary circles in its own country. The study of archive documents has confirmed that NARODNOYE DELO, the section's printed organ, and its other publications found their way to many parts of Russia. They were read and studied by the revolutionary circles in Petersburg, Moscow, Odessa, Orenburg, Perm, Yekaterinburg, the Nev'yanskaya fabricating and steel-smelting plant, in Nikolayev and the Nikolayev Shipyards, Kiev, Kharkov, Kazan, Saratov, Tver, Nizhnyy Novgorod and its industrial suburbs, Vatka, Vologda, Tula, Ivanovo-Voznesensk and Shuya. The establishment of this fact is quite important in assessing the activities of the Russian section, the history of the International, headed by Marx and Engels, and the history of the dissemination

of the ideas of proletarian internationalism and scientific socialism in Russia.

Ye. G. Barteneva was a very active member of the Russian section, participant in the Paris Commune and zealous propagandist of the ideas of the International. Following the defeat of the Paris Commune she returned to Petersburg, where she continued her revolutionary activities by spreading among working men and women the experience of the international workers movement and the ideas of Marx and Engels. She also became a member of one of the first social democratic groups organized in Russia (M. I. Brusnev's) and maintained friendly relations with the Ul'yanovs--Aleksandr, Vladimir and Ol'ga. It was thus that in the course of one lifetime a noteworthy contact was established between the activities of the Russian members of the International, headed by Marx and Engels, and the first Marxist groups in Russia.

A look at the history of the participation of the Russian revolutionaries in the First International proves that it was represented by outstanding purposeful personalities, truly the flower of the nation, a progressive combat detachment of the "thunderous" and "greatest" people's revolution which, as Marx said, was ripening in this great country. Marx and Engels were drawn to the Russian revolutionaries above all by their infinite loyalty to the people who were in the clutches of a horrifying oppression--economic, social, political and spiritual. They admired the fearlessness, courage, firmness and ability for self-sacrifice of these real friends of the people in the struggle against the tsarist regime.

The leaders of the International immediately noticed in its Russian members a particularly strong desire for theoretical knowledge and progressive social science, in order to find with its help the proper way for struggling for the liberation of the people. They were highly impressed by the combination in their Russian fellow workers of theoretical studies with revolutionary action, which they considered their moral duty and obligation.

In observing the actions of the Russian cohort of revolutionaries, Marx and Engels realized that they were dealing with people zealously dedicated to the liberation of their own and other oppressed nations, with fighters ready to give their selfless and active support to the liberation struggle wherever it may be taking place. These were patriots and internationalists in action.

The principles of proletarian and socialist internationalism--one of the great Marxist behests--are the focal point of the system of the powerful Leninist ideas of the liberation of the working people the world over. As in the past, today this principle is the guiding star, the very foundation of the international communist and workers movements and a law of development and strengthening of the members of the socialist commonwealth and all of their activities for the sake of peace and progress on earth.

FOOTNOTE

1. The special and unusually intensive study of Russia's socioeconomic development by Marx was reflected in the manuscripts he left, showing his

comprehensive study of our country. This priceless legacy is published by the CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism in the works "Marx and Engels Archive"; on the eve of the 165th anniversary of Marx's birth and the centennial of his death the fourth volume of his manuscripts on Russia came out ("Marx and Engels Archive," Vol XVI, Moscow, 1982).

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

5003

CSO: 1802/3

COMMUNISTS AND PROBLEMS OF THE CONTEMPORARY PERIOD

AU091145 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15 Oct 84 (signed to press 15 Oct 84)
pp 89-102

[Unattributed article]

[Text] From their very first steps, as imprinted on the "Manifesto of the Communist Party," the communists have considered it their moral and political duty to expound their views, goals and aspirations openly before the entire world and pit their principled and honest position against bourgeois mythmaking. The communists, K. Marx and F. Engels wrote, "are in practice the most resolute part of the workers parties of all countries, the part that always provides the incentive for forward momentum. Regarding theory, they have an advantage over the remaining mass of the proletariat because they understand the conditions, course and general results of the proletarian movement." In this connection the authors of the "Manifesto" especially emphasized that the theoretical position of communists "is only a general reflection of the relations in the class struggle that is in progress and a reflection of the historical progress that is taking place before our very eyes" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 4, p 438).

This indissoluble link between the views and actions of communists on the one hand and the requirements of the class struggle of the working people on the other, as well as their aspiration and ability to find answers to these requirements in the interest of solving the fundamental tasks of the proletariat and fulfilling its historical mission have always distinguished the communists. All this also fully applies to the contemporary international communist movement, the very rise of which was an expression of the requirements of the revolutionary workers movement at a certain stage, that is, precisely at the stage of the beginning of the contemporary era of world history. It is necessary to note this in order to perceive more clearly what characteristics and laws of our era engender the key problems faced by the communists today.

However multifaceted and complex the picture of the communist parties' struggle in all its specific forms may be, its basic features are clearly visible: the real course of development and historical fate of the two world social systems, the interaction between which determines the answer to the question of war and peace that is vitally important for the future of mankind.

At the beginning of the 20th century, the development of capitalism in its imperialist stage created great problems. The very foundations of world progress still depend on the solution of these problems. There is the problem of emerging from the impasse of imperialist contradictions fraught with world wars.

There is the problem of overthrowing capitalism, which had become an obstacle of the development of society and to the process of its transition to socialism. There is the problem of the elimination of the colonial system and the liberation of the oppressed peoples.

The Great October Socialist Revolution was the answer of the workers class and the working peasantry of Russia to these key problems of the century. And it is perfectly legitimate that it was precisely under the impact of the victory of the October Revolution that the contemporary communist movement came into being and was formed as an international force and as the most influential sociopolitical movement of the contemporary period.

Now, communist parties exist in 95 countries. The communists are in the front ranks in all areas of the struggle for peace and social progress. The voice of communists is heard and their role is fulfilled in practice wherever people act against militarism and reaction, for the freedom of peoples and social justice and for the interests of the working people.

This struggle is by no means easy or bloodless in the world of capital. The "crusade" against communism, which with its bitterness and scope once again testifies to the force and authority of the communist movement, is waged in various forms: These forms include open mass terror and brazen "psychological warfare," the undermining machinations of special services and blackmail and pressure of the imperialist reaction against those countries that are "threatened" by the entry of communists into their governments, and attempts to push the communist parties into capitulating compromises. There is no capitalist country in which the communists would not be subject to discrimination in one way or another, no matter whether this is the practice of "interdiction of professions," as in the FRG, or of some other "filters" barring communists from many spheres of life. Choosing the revolutionary road and firmly following it requires great personal courage, selflessness, high moral standards and readiness to forgo one's own welfare for the sake of the humane ideals of communism.

The great changes in the arrangement and correlation of forces on the world scene to the advantage of peace, the workers class and the working masses--to the advantage of socialism--represent the general result of the heroic efforts of several generations of communists.

Our party has made a great contribution to this result. Speaking at the session of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for Drafting the New Edition of the Party Program, Comrade K. U. Chernenko stressed that the CPSU is an inseparable part of the international communist movement. It is our Leninist tradition to measure our party's activity not just by the national but also by the international scale.

The CPSU proceeds from the fact that, as an international force, the communist movement is not simply the sum total of the parties that comprise it. It goes without saying that each of them works out its own program on the basis of theory and the united world outlook. The parties operate under different national and specific conditions and in specific historical situations. Hence the varied nature of their programs and plans for their own countries even when they have been worked out for relatively long periods, as well as the wide range of their solutions for some general tasks. However, this situation in no way changes the fact that the vital activity of each of the parties of the movement as a communist party is unthinkable outside the general laws and principles of the communist movement. This is because the communists of all countries share the common goal of fulfilling the worldwide historical mission of the workers class and their common opponent of the struggle for this goal is imperialism.

It is not only the social goals as such but also the very fate of human civilization that are the unifying factor of the communist movement. This factor assumes extraordinary importance in the nuclear era, which has made the task of safeguarding the first and foremost human right, the right to life, the fundamental task.

The progressive advance of the communist movement as a whole depends to a certain extent on the activities of each of its "component parts." Therefore, reviewing the movement, it is necessary to give due consideration to the general trends that are characteristic of it in a certain historical period as well as the specific tasks of each of their parties, the tasks emanating from the urgent requirements of social progress in the country where the party operates and, naturally, also the objective position of each of the parties within the framework of the entire movement. This applies also to the CPSU. While by no means having in mind any kind of privileges for the CPSU within the great alliance of like-minded communists, it is impossible to ignore certain specific characteristics of the CPSU that have been formed by the course of history itself.

These specific characteristics include in particular: The longest and the most varied experience in building and developing real socialism; the USSR's greatest economic and military power among all other socialist societies headed by communist parties; the widest range of international relations, including both direct interparty relations and relations along other lines; and following from this, the responsibility before other detachments of the worldwide brotherhood of communists.

Several principled features that distinguish it from all other political currents are characteristic of the communist movement as a result of its class nature and its ideological-political experience.

Its fundamental virtue is its revolutionary transforming nature. "Philosophers have only been explaining the world in different ways but the task is to change it" (Marx and Engels, "Soch." vol 42, p 263). This famous proposition of K. Marx has been enriched by communist practice itself. As socialism grows, the task of changing the world, including the elimination of

the obsolete social forms and systems, is increasingly determined by this constructive revolutionary nature of the parties of the workers class.

At the same time, as long as capitalism exists, the revolutionary nature of the communist parties operating in the capitalist countries primarily amounts to striving for the liquidation of exploitation of man by man and, consequently, also of the relations of private ownership on which that system is based. And in this connection the communists of each individual country formulate their immediate tasks by proceeding from an analysis of the actual situation and from sober evaluations of the level of maturity of the objective and subjective conditions that are characteristic of the society involved in a given historical period.

The uninspired, base pragmatism that is so typical of the bourgeois and reformist parties, and the passion for "revolutionary phraseology" equally are alien to communists as revolutionaries. The founders of Marxism-Leninism cautioned the communists many times both against forgetting or underrating their vanguard role ("tailing events") ["khvostizm"] and against sectarian "revolutionarism" leading to a separation from the masses.

History bitterly avenges the opportunist inclination to adaptability and dispels both the illusions of conciliation and the "revolutionarist" illusions. It goes even further by constantly changing the conditions under which the struggle for the liberation of labor is developing. Hence, it is necessary to master all of the forms of this struggle, constantly change its methods in conformity with the changing circumstances and perfect the strategy and tactics of revolutionary actions.

The following immortal lines of the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" have an everlasting significance for communists:

"The communists distinguish themselves from other proletarian parties only by the fact that in the struggle of proletarians of different nations they distinguish and defend the common interests of the entire proletariat regardless of nationality on the one hand and that, on the other hand, at different stages of development of the proletariat's struggle against the bourgeoisie they always act as representatives of the interests of the movement as whole" (ibid, vol 4, p 437).

Internationalism, including an internationalist view of the world, is an inseparable characteristic of the communist movement. Only the class approach, an understanding of which class occupies the central position in an era, makes it possible to work out an effective national strategy of the workers class and to find the ways of correctly solving both the domestic and foreign political tasks. Internationalism and only internationalism, being the basis of the ideology and practice of the international workers and, primarily, communist movement, correctly reflects the dialectic of the contemporary world development in the sphere of national relations and the growth of mankind. It is in this capacity that internationalism plays an irreplaceable role as a counterweight to bourgeois ideology, whether this takes the form of chauvinism, racism and national narrow-mindedness, or as cosmopolitanism and national nihilism.

Preserving its fundamental class foundation, internationalism of the workers class is never reduced merely to mutual relations between the proletarians of various countries. Constantly enriching itself in the course of its long history, it has absorbed new content. This content is the socialist internationalism that embodies the principles of mutual relations between the socialist states and their peoples. It is the attitude of the countries of socialism and the international workers class as a whole toward the peoples who have only recently embarked on the road of independent existence as states and are struggling for social progress under contemporary conditions. Internationalism also determines the attitude of communists toward various types of sociopolitical forces struggling for peace and for the prevention of a thermonuclear war. It is from the position of internationalism that the communists strive for a thorough reorganization of the entire system of interstate relations on a peaceful and democratic basis; for, it is precisely wars that have been used throughout the centuries as a means of solving international conflicts and, therefore, their elimination would bring a new quality to the very nature of relations between countries.

The communist movement further distinguishes itself from all other political currents by the fact that it has its scientific theory, a deeply revolutionary and truly international Marxist-Leninist teaching that reveals to the workers class the meaning of its struggle and the conditions for victory. At the same time, the theory of scientific communism has one principle characteristic: By studying the surrounding world and real society in all of its diverse forms and, at the same time, also its own promoter, that is, the communist movement itself, this theory serves the movement as an irreplaceable instrument of self-recognition. It is now impossible to recognize the objective laws of the development of society and the new phenomena in its development without taking the influential and purposeful activities of communist parties into consideration. On the other hand, the processes taking place in the communist movement can be recognized only by taking into account new phenomena in social life that have an essential impact on the forms and nature of the ways in which the communists fulfill their international mission. The practical tasks of the communist movement can only be formulated on this basis.

The theory of scientific communism makes it possible to see the general revolutionary perspective behind the momentary and especially practical tasks, the general line and laws of historical development behind the current changes of situation and the class proletarian position behind the particular interests of individual categories of the working people. Marxist-Leninist theory instills an international view, makes it possible to correctly determine the place of every event or problem on the broad international panorama and reveals the possibilities for fully utilizing the mighty motivating forces of social progress. The understandable general preoccupation with everyday practical concerns, accompanied by a weak ideological "grounding" and a lack of taste for theoretical studies and work, can become a source of neglect of theory and a particular kind of political utilitarianism. Of course, hollow doctrinairism that shuns practice is no better. The active and creative development of the Marxist-Leninist theory is the main antidote to the spread of revisionist diseases. This is true because any attempts to distort revolutionary theory and practice--whether from the

right or "from the left"--always cover themselves by false claims of innovations and try to fill the real and existing "blank spots" in the theory and political strategy of the communist parties.

The communist movement operates in the area of transition from capitalism to socialism on a worldwide scale. The socialism that actually exists embodies the prevailing trend of the era and represents the pivotal factor of world development. Precisely and comprehensively taking into account the objective place of real socialism in the world is of principled importance for the entire communist movement and for a correct approach to any major social issue. Proceeding from this, it is possible to single out several problems here that are interconnected and with which the contemporary communist thought is occupying itself.

At the center of its attention are the nature and laws of the development of socialism considered in connection with those specific historical internal and external conditions under which this development is taking place.

Facts speak more eloquently than any words about the role and place of real socialism in the contemporary world. It accounts for more than 40 percent of the world's gross production. It has created a powerful material guarantee for preserving peace in the nuclear age. It has achieved an unprecedented rate of social progress for hundreds of millions of people, including the peoples who are at a very backward stage of social development. It has fulfilled a number of such social, national, political and cultural tasks as capitalism is in principle incapable of fulfilling. All this has been achieved despite the fact that the historical competition with capitalism began under very unfavorable circumstances for the countries of socialism: A majority of them were at the medium or even low level of economic development, they suffered the greatest material and human losses as a result of the world war and so forth.

Socialism is also now confronted with considerable difficulties and problems as a result of both objective and subjective causes. The road of a trail blazer is always difficult. However, it is doubly difficult when the natural difficulties of the establishment and growth of the new society are further exacerbated by the hostile interference of external forces that try to shake, undermine and destroy the socialist system. It can be said that the development of real socialism--and not only in our country--is, literally and in an applied sense, taking place "under fire" from the class enemy.

At the same time, the communists are fully aware that the world system of socialism is a young and developing organism that has its own characteristic contradictions, which can, however, be resolved on the basis of the correct Marxist-Leninist policy.

Working out its policy on the scientific Marxist-Leninist basis, the CPSU attaches great importance to thinking out and understanding the specific characteristics of the contemporary stage of development of socialism in our country. The recent statements by Comrade K. U. Chernenko and the decisions of the recent Central Committee plenums provide, without a shade of utopia, a definition of the achieved level of the socioeconomic maturity of the new

society. The fundamentally important conclusion has been drawn that the Soviet society is at the beginning of a historically long period, the stage of developed socialism.

This conclusion makes it possible to see more clearly the picture of development of our society in all of its complexity, contradictory nature and diversity, to determine more realistically the current and future tasks, and to search for ways of solving the varied and difficult problems that are by their nature still connected with the first stage of communist formation. As Comrade K. U. Chernenko has put it, "On the road to the communist idea, we still have to more fully realize the socialist ideal in practice."

In this connection, there is also much that is interesting, specific and instructive in other countries of the socialist community. Some of them are at one or another stage of approaching the stage of developed socialism. Others are solving the tasks of the transitional period. Mutual cooperation and the exchange of experience make it possible for each of the countries to advance more quickly even as they retain their specific characteristics resulting from the different levels of their socioeconomic development and different national traditions.

It is understandable that the problems of real socialism are not just the problems of the ruling parties. The state of affairs in the socialist countries in many respects has an impact on the effectiveness of the work of communists in the entire nonsocialist part of the world. They show a lively interest in real socialism among other things because its experience provides enormous and completely irreplaceable materials for theoretically thinking out and planning the transition from capitalism to socialism.

And for their part, the ruling communist parties and the peoples of the socialist countries are interested in enjoying the support and solidarity of the international communist movement and of all revolutionary forces. The significance of this support is particularly obvious in the light of the "crusade" against socialism proclaimed by the U.S. administration. This "crusade," which has been joined by the entire world reaction, is not waged solely along its main direction, that is, against the socialist countries, but also against all progressive forces in the world. Imperialism primarily inflicts its blows on those parts of the revolutionary process and those of its forces which find themselves in the most difficult conditions. It is impossible to parry these blows by turning away from real socialism, by dissociating oneself from it. That would be an illusion. Trying to undermine the positions of the socialist community and to blacken it, reaction pursues the goal of turning people away from the socialist ideal and thereby applies the brake to the process of revolutionary renewal of the world.

Wrong steps, deviations from principles and various errors in the course of building the new society have been frequently used by the internal and external class opponents to create conflict situations in the individual socialist countries. There are also instances of incorrectly understanding or of refusing to understand the situation in a particular country or the policy of the ruling party in regard to one or another question. All this taken together has resulted in a certain sharpness of discussions within the

communist movement about the attitude toward real socialism and toward appraising its international role. Without entering into the course of these discussions, it is necessary to point out one perfectly obvious conclusion:

It is impossible in principle to agree with the attempts to underrate and, even less, with the attempts to belittle, the significance of the socialist societies and of their achievements and positions for the struggle for the cause of communism, for social progress in the world. This kind of attitude also harms those who show this inclination as well as the entire communist movement as an international force.

Spreading the truth about real socialism is of greatest importance under the contemporary international conditions. However, first and foremost this task presupposes a Marxist-Leninist attitude; this is, a scientific attitude toward its experience and toward the socialist reality. Adopting the correct approach to real socialism implies seeing first and foremost its enormous historical achievements and advantages of principles, and its enormous creative possibilities, and, in appraising these or those of its shortcomings, such an approach applies observing historicism and understanding the actual scope and nature of such shortcomings; it also implies respecting the sovereign right and ability of the ruling parties to solve the problems that have risen in the interest of their own peoples and in the interest of the further development of the new system.

The question of attitude toward real socialism is here and there polemically linked with the problem of the paths and forms of transition to socialism in other countries. Is it truly necessary to explain again and again that the study, cognition and understanding of the experience of the socialist countries do not imply its blind copying, particularly in view of the fact that the ruling Marxist-Leninist parties are not imposing any kind of patterns or schemes on anyone, any kind of "models" that disregard the specific characteristics of this or that country? The following dictum of V. I. Lenin is well-known: "All nations will arrive at socialism; this is inevitable; but all will not arrive in quite the same way" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 30, p 123). The CPSU strictly adheres to this principle.

The question of the ways of transition from capitalism to socialism undoubtedly not only may continue but, in the foreseeable period, also most likely will continue to be a subject of discussions within the communist movement. However, these discussions are fruitful only as long as they observe the necessary methodological principles and are conducted on the basis of a concrete analysis of the concrete reality. They are pointless and, at times, even cause political damage if they are conducted on the basis of abstract and speculative opposition of the "new" paths to the "old" ones.

Here it is appropriate to recall such Leninist dicta as: Marxism "does not link the movement with any kind of single definite form of struggle," and "recognizing the inevitability of the new forms of struggle resulting from changed current social situations and requirements, new forms that are unknown to the political workers of a given period, it most certainly does not limit itself to the forms of struggle that are possible and exist only at a given

time. If it is possible to put it this way, in this respect Marxism learns from the mass practice and is far from teaching the masses the forms of struggle that have been invented by 'systematists' in their offices" (ibid., vol 14, pp 1-2). Thus, there is the inevitability of the new forms of struggle... Therefore, fighting for the "new" and determining its interconnection with the "old" is a real, constructive task.

The task of establishing the new society in various countries had not progressed and is not progressing as quickly and in such similar forms as has now and then been expected. However, precisely the wealth, flexibility and diversity of the historical experience of real socialism again and again confirms: The establishment of development of the new society is based on a number of general laws which the communists cannot disregard without jeopardizing the cause of the struggle for socialism and the very future prospects of victory in the historical competition between socialism and capitalism.

What is even more, the need for protecting the positions of socialism, which is inseparable from the search for solutions for its problems on the basis of creative Marxism-Leninism, is dictated by the broadest interests of mankind as a whole. It is impossible to solve the global problems confronting mankind, and primarily, the problem of preventing nuclear war, without recognizing the necessity of protecting real socialism, without understanding its worldwide historical role and without practical actions in conformity with this understanding.

Many old problems of the world that are now appearing in new forms also demand a more thorough analysis by the international communist movement and its collective Marxist-Leninist reflection. The communist parties in capitalist countries come face to face with these problems.

The objective conditions of the existence of the workers class and of other sections of the working people are changing; profound changes are taking place in capitalism itself, in its production forces, its production relations, in the social and class structure, in the political superstructure, and in the strategy and tactics of the monopolist oligarchy. Each of these processes confronts the communists with new theoretical and practical problems. The success of the activities of communist parties depends to a considerable extent on the ways in which they react to these changes and on the extent to which they correctly evaluate the changing conditions and possibilities of the struggle for their ideals.

Let us consider, for instance, the trends that are characteristic of the countries of industrially developed capitalism. These countries are now passing through a transitional period of development that began in the 1970s.

The fraternal parties regard the deep changes taking place in the economy of capitalism from the viewpoint of the changing conditions of class struggle.

First, mass unemployment is becoming a permanent factor, something that makes the economic struggle of the working people more difficult.

Second, the number of people employed in the traditional industrial branches which until now represented the main basis of the workers and communist movement is declining both absolutely and relatively.

Third, the proportion of "white collar" workers (office and professional employees) in the composition of hired labor is growing more and more, whereas the proportion of "blue collar" (production) workers is declining. The relative proportion of those employed in material production is declining, whereas the proportion of those employed in the sphere of services is increasing.

The structural breakdown is also having an impact on the position of the middle classes and the petty bourgeoisie. Their proletarianization is intensifying and large numbers of small economic establishments and workshops are being ruined. At the same time, the technical miniaturization, including the miniaturization of electronics, is laying a new material basis for the establishment of new forms of small-scale production operations. The numbers of schoolchildren and students have considerably increased.

At the same time, a transformation of methods of the state-monopolistic regulating activity is now in progress because these methods have proved to be untenable in the face of uncontrolled crisis shocks. The influential circles of the monopolist bourgeoisie have advanced a program of reconstruction of the state intervention (manifested in Reaganomics, Thatcherism and so forth) which envisages a curtailment of the state social appropriations primarily at the expense of the least secure and poorest sector of the population; reducing the tax burden on monopolies and the most prosperous classes; intensifying arms expenditures; an offensive against the rights of the trade unions and the use of strict measures of pressure to split and weaken the workers class and to place one section of the working population in opposition to another; a deliberate reduction of employment to instill the fear of unemployment in the working people and so forth.

Briefly, at this stage, the most conservative and aggressive direction of the state-monopolistic capitalism, as distinguished from the bourgeois reformism and its tactics of social maneuvering, has now gained the upper hand. The reinforcement of the military-industrial complex has played a considerable role in this respect. The military establishment and the military-industrial monopoly have expanded and have become firmly established as a result of decades of a continuous arms race. Their political ties have expanded. A considerable part of the state apparatus has been drawn into the nets of the military-industrial complex. The military-industrial complex is not only one of the grounds for the growing foreign aggressiveness of imperialism in our period, but also the basis for an intensification of the internal reaction and one of the main sources of the fascist danger. The role of the military repressive and ideological propaganda apparatus is also increasing simultaneously with the growth of the military-industrial complex and this apparatus is becoming increasingly subordinated to the directions and demands of the most reactionary section of the ruling class.

An important new factor in the political life in the world of capitalism is a growing threat to national sovereignty, including the national sovereignty of

large countries, as a result of a qualitatively new level of internationalization of capital, that is, more specifically, as a result of the growing dominance of the transnational, that is, primarily American monopolist capital.

A correct answer to the problems arising before the communist movement in connection with all these changes can only be found on the positions of Marxist-Leninist theory. Not everything has been yet fully clarified in this connection. Different interpretations and different shades of opinion have been apparent among Marxists in many cases. This situation calls for an intensification of theoretical work, including joint theoretical work, and more frequent international discussions by communists of the currently most topical and important problems.

The masses are waiting for answers to the questions of where to go and what roads to follow and what slogans and program directions are the most suitable for contemporary conditions. There can be no set patterns in this connection and there are no and can be no ready-made prescriptions. However, there are several general elements from which the fraternal parties in the industrially developed capitalist countries proceed in their work.

The communists strive to reveal the class sub-basis [podosnova] and, at the same time, the economic ineffectiveness of the bourgeois modernization programs, which are usually presented under the screen of slogans of "national interests." They set against all this their alternative programs that fully take into account the necessity of scientific-technical progress but proceed in this respect from the interests of the working people. The communists demonstrate that a genuine economic modernization requires the elimination of obsolete social structures and a democratization of the state apparatus.

They are doing a great deal to give a broad political character to discussions on the prerequisites and essence of a genuine economic modernization and to draw into these discussions the working people and democratically-minded specialists and scientific and technical workers. This new sector of class antagonism and the political initiative of communists will become increasingly insignificant not only for the protection of the immediate interests of the working people, but also for the struggle for future socialist development.

Consistently working for the unity of all democratic forces and for the alliance of the left-wing political parties and mass organizations of the working people, the communist parties demonstrate their readiness to assume their share of responsibility for implementing the programs of democratic demands, including assuming government responsibility as well. It goes without saying that the communist parties determine the political expediency of their participation in a coalition government on the basis of specific analyses of concrete situations and by taking into account the realistic possibilities for influencing the government policy on the interests of the masses of the working people and promoting the rise of the workers and democratic movements and, naturally, in this connection, retaining their complete independence in the ideological issues and in pursuing their own political line.

The all-around deepening of the economic crisis of capitalism, the economic shocks and the deteriorated position of the working people do not automatically provoke a revolutionary frame of mind among the masses and do not even always result in shifting them to the left. This situation impels communists to even more actively defend the interests of the workers class and working people and even more closely link their struggle for a fundamental transformation of the bourgeois society with an effective solution of direct and immediate problems.

Within the framework of the world communist movement, the activities of the communist parties of Latin American and Caribbean countries are distinguished by certain specific characteristics. These countries are now at the medium level of capitalist development. Some of them have already assumed the characteristics of monopolist capitalism. At the same time the accelerating development of capitalism is being deformed everywhere by dependence on U.S. imperialism and is being slowed down by the inheritance of precapitalist forms. Therefore, the revolutionary process here, too, is characterized by an interweaving of anti-imperialist tasks with an orientation toward fundamental transformations aimed against capitalism as a system. The struggle against the terrorist and authoritarian dictatorships and against the fascist threat, which was intensified in the 1970s, has been organically incorporated into the programs of the Latin American communists. As the Declaration of the Conference of the Communist Parties of South American Countries, held in Buenos Aires in July 1984, points out, they are a "part of a mighty current that will change the course of history and build a new society in which there will be no exploiters and no exploited."

The communist parties of many Asian and African countries are in a special position. The process of national liberation that took place in those countries under the conditions of backward socioeconomic structures and in the absence of a compact industrial workers class brought the national democratic or revolutionary democratic parties to the foreground of political life.

In the countries that follow the capitalist road, the communists act as the initiators and champions of the formation of an antifeudal and anti-imperialist front that would unite the widest spectrum of forces, ranging from workers to elements of the national bourgeoisie. There are quite a few difficult and unsolved problems in this connection. They are connected first and foremost with the mass work among the ranks of a rapidly growing proletariat in the new industrial branches developed in both the state and the private monopolist sectors. The importance of this task increases sharply as a result of the establishment of industrial enterprises of multinational corporations in those countries. The future prospects of strengthening the positions of communist parties in the national development of their countries depend to a great extent on the fulfillment of this task.

In the states that follow a socialist orientation and where a revolutionary democracy is in power, a broad basis exists for cooperation between the communists and the revolutionary democracy.

However, at the same time, there are certain factors that make their relationship more difficult. But, there can be no doubt about the fact that,

in the face of continuous pressures from imperialism, the international solidarity of the communist movement is of special importance for the communists as well as for a number of the revolutionary democratic parties that have adopted scientific socialism as their own ideological basis.

Under the conditions of the threat of nuclear war hanging over the world, the communists, who have always been active fighters against oppression, have also been moved by life itself to the forward front of the struggle for the preservation of civilization and for the people's right to life. The system of exploitation and oppression of man by man is the source of the militarist and aggressive policy of the exploiting classes. For this reason, the struggle against this system has always been combined--though differently at different historical stages--with the antiwar and antimilitarist struggle.

The principled contribution of communists to the struggle for a stable and just peace at the contemporary stage is multifaceted:

It is scientifically working out the answer to the question of war and peace in conformity with the realities of the nuclear age;

It is the socialist community achieving and strengthening the new correlation of forces on the world scene and, in particular, liquidating the military-strategic supremacy of imperialism, which will ensure a material basis for preventing nuclear war;

It is the active internationalist and peace-loving foreign policy of the fraternal countries of socialism on all key and acute issues of international relations;

It is the resolute struggle against warmongers, revealing and mercilessly unmasking the true causes and real promoters of the war danger, unmasking the secret of preparations for nuclear war by the most aggressive circles of imperialism, as well as all types of falsifications and slanders designed to conceal this secret;

It is assisting the worldwide development and maximum effectiveness of the mass antiwar movement and a constant concern for mutual understanding and cooperation among all of its currents.

The revolution in military affairs caused by the appearance of nuclear weapons and of their delivery vehicles, against which there is virtually no defense, as well as the liquidation of the military-strategic supremacy of imperialism--these are the main prerequisites that have made demands on the communists to introduce new ideas of principle in the Marxist-Leninist concept of war and peace. The CPSU has made a significant contribution in this respect.

A fundamental conclusion on the absence of the fatal inevitability of a new world war and on the possibility of not allowing it to happen was formulated and substantiated in the second half of the 1950. Gaining the greatest political response as a part of the decisions of the 20th CPSU Congress, this conclusion has become the basis of international activities of the fraternal

parties of the socialist countries as well as of the entire antiwar activity of the communist movement.

For the first time, it was a question--and a question in a perfectly practical way--not simply of delaying a future war, of prolonging the "peaceful respite," and of possibilities for overcoming this or that international crisis that was fraught with the danger of war, but also of liquidating the military threat as such, of excluding wars from the life of society and of general and complete disarmament, including primarily nuclear disarmament.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the Leninist teaching on peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems was further developed and paths were blazed to international detente and to the struggle for its perservation and deepening. The Peace Program set forth by the 24th CPSU Congress and constantly enriched by subsequent congresses, the CPSU Central Committee plenums and statements by CPSU leaders, has been of enormous theoretical and practical importance both as a platform and as a factor of detente.

In the 1970s and at the beginning of the 1980s, a fundamental conclusion was substantiated: about the hoplessness of efforts to achieve military supremacy and about the impossibility of victory in a nuclear war because such a war would be equal to a worldwide catastrophe and, therefore, could not be used as a means to achieve political goals. This conclusion has been specifically politically embodied in the complex of initiatives of the fraternal countries of socialism for a return to detente and for effective measures that would help prevent nuclear war.

The communists have been at the origins of the contemporary antiwar movement and have invariably been and continue to be its active participants. It is indisputably to the credit of the fraternal parties that they consistently follow the policy of unifying all champions of peace irrespective of their world outlook and general political positions. The communists have actively contributed to the current spreading of the antiwar movement, which has assumed an all-people's character in many countries, primarily in Europe. It is precisely thanks to the communists that those artificial barriers with which the enemies of peace would like to divide the antiwar movement in capitalist countries from the antiwar activities of peoples of the socialist countries and their peace-loving foreign policy are being destroyed.

The communists see the solution to the problem of preventing a world war along the paths of consistently introducing the principles of peaceful coexistence into international life. The objectively inevitable antagonism between the two systems can and must be regulated and subjected to a definite, mutually acceptable "code" that would exclude military confrontation. The problem of the correlation of the struggle for peace and the struggle for social progress has now become all the more topical within the framework of the contemporary Marxist-Leninist concept of war and peace. Comrade K. U. Chernenko has pointed out that the "problems of war and peace, just as, after all, all global problems, do not exist on their own. They cannot be separated from the world social contradictions and from the development of the class struggle." A most important question in this connection is that of clearly understanding where the source of the military threat lies. The communists perceive the

principled class background and the deep aspects of the matter behind the elements of personalities (Reagan, Reaganism), and behind the "geopolitical" combinations invented by the bourgeois ideologues.

Today, the general calls for peace and for continuing political dialogue miss the target if they fail to point out those responsible for the exacerbation of tension and the breakdown of negotiations and if they fail to provide a clear answer to the question of conditions for the resumption of these negotiations. Slurring over or obscuring the principled differences between the two positions--the one of the United States and the other of the fraternal countries of socialism--and, even more, shifting to any extent the responsibility for the present tension from imperialism to socialism, is tantamount to directly harming the cause of peace.

The most aggressive militarist forces of imperialism are the worst enemies of social progress. The militarization of the capitalist society bordering on the usurpation of power by the military is undermining the bourgeois democratic institutions. The bugaboo of a "Soviet threat" is used in the latest turn of events to frighten the working people and force them to forgo their democratic rights.

The struggle for the defense of peace is indissolubly interwoven with the struggle for freedom, national independence, progressive social transformations and socialism. New, important experience has now been accumulated in the countries of capital in practically and concretely linking together the struggles along both of these directions. The current upsurge of the sociopolitical struggle of the workers class in Britain, France, Italy, the FRG, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg is most closely interwoven with the further growth of the antiwar and antimissile movement in Western Europe. "Peace and Work"--this is the slogan that more and more frequently appears not only on the banners of the workers movement, but on the banners of the broad mass struggle for peace as well.

The antiwar struggle is also organically linked to the prospects for solving all other global problems. Strictly speaking, the number there is purely conditional. All of them are multifaceted manifestations of the single most important issue of our time: How is mankind to survive and how can it avert mortal threats to itself? The danger of war is the most immediate, the most tangible and the most terrible of these threats. It very nearly also feeds all other threats. The arms race fanned by imperialism and unrestrained militarism is devouring enormous resources that are vitally needed to overcome the colonial inheritance and the continually increasing economic and scientific-technical lagging of developing countries and is intensifying mass poverty, hunger and disease in that part of the world. On the other hand, the tragic fact that hundreds and hundreds of millions of people live under inhuman conditions not only offends the conscience of all peoples, and not only adversely affects world economic relations, but is also fraught with unforeseeable consequences for international relations and international development as a whole.

The very fact of the rise of global threats to mankind shows what an impossible knot the national and international elements of the world

development have tied themselves in. As all these problems--including first and foremost the antiwar struggle and the counteractions against the strategy of global revanche developed by contemporary imperialism--are advanced to first place on the agenda of the communist movement, the international cooperation between the fraternal parties assumes vital importance.

The concept of internationalism is always concrete and always historically conditioned. The criteria of internationalism, its forms, and the norms of international communication are also historically conditioned. No one is prohibited from saying "new words" in this connection as long as this does not turn out to involve the inventions of various obstacles on the path of the international cooperation of communists and does not turn into a "substantiation" of the repudiation of collective discussions and initiatives and of joint actions of the fraternal parties.

In the last few decades, a mechanism of comradely and voluntary cooperation and solidarity of communist parties that corresponds to the contemporary conditions has been developed on the basis of the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin and on the basis of strictly maintaining the equality and independence of each of the parties in working out and determining its own policy, on noninterference in the internal affairs of each other and on the respect for freedom in choosing roads in the struggle for progressive social transformations and for socialism.

These are the bilateral and multilateral meetings of communist parties at various levels. These are the regional consultative conferences of communists.

These are the large international theoretical conferences similar to those that were held in connection with the K. Marx and G. Dimitrov jubilees. These are the periodic conferences of representatives of communist and workers parties that examine the work of the journal PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA as well as the entire activity of its editorial council in which 65 fraternal parties are represented. These are the meetings of the communist press representatives that have become a regular event. If we add here the cooperation of communists and representatives of the most widely varied progressive forces in the numerous forums convened by international social organizations, then we have every basis for claiming that the contacts between the communists of various countries have never before been as intensive as they are now and that the forms of their mutual communications have never before been as rich and multifaceted as they are now.

The political returns from this mechanism would be greater if it were not for the occurrences here and there of nonacceptance of joint actions. This tendency is all the more out of step with time because now literally all political currents, ranging from the social democratic to conservative parties, actively coordinate their actions on an international scale. The fraternal parties are simply bound to oppose the imperialist strategy of splitting the communist movement with the strategy of their cohesion. History would not forgive the communists taking any other position.

Deviations from the internationalist view of the world and from the internationalist forms of actions toward national narrowmindedness or national nihilism hinder not only the joint actions of the fraternal parties, but also the creative approach both to national tasks and to the problems of the contemporary period as a whole.

The CPSU, being an inseparable part of the international communist movement, strives to play an active role in this movement and to comprehensively promote its growth and successes. The volume and intensity of our relations with the fraternal parties are constantly growing. Our party invariably considers the strengthening of international solidarity of fraternal parties in the struggle for peace, in the support for the peoples fighting against imperialism and its hirelings and in defending the positions of real socialism as being of paramount importance.

The internationalism of the CPSU is also practically expressed at a purely human level. The Soviet people show enormous sympathy for the struggle of their class brothers in the countries of capital and hold close to their hearts those who suffer persecution and repression in their own homelands. The protest voice of the Soviet people in defense of the victims of police reprisals and arbitrary court rulings have helped to wrest many ardent fighters for communism from the hands of reaction. The socialist countries are extending their hospitality to communists from capitalist countries who need rest or medical treatment.

The communist thinking and the communist actions are international by nature. A practical implementation of this law represents a natural answer of communists to the problems of the contemporary period.

Only another 16 years or--using the measures customary for the Soviet people--a little more than three five-year plan periods are left until the beginning of the new, the 21st century. All currents of social thinking--even those that fear the future--are preparing for the approaching frontier of time. The communists, too, are already looking forward to this, and regard the future not as a blind, self-directing [nepodvlastnyy] human destiny, but as a result of the creativity of the popular masses and as the work of the mind and will of the revolutionary vanguard of the workers class and all working people.

Communists realize that most of the present difficult problems will not be left in the past together with the 20th century.

However, how mankind gets the better of them--this question is already being decided to a great extent even now and a great deal in this connection will depend on how the communists will answer it with their ideas and actions.

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

CSO: 1802/3

MAY FRENCH-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP BECOME STRONGER

AU141708 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Oct 84 (signed to press 15 Oct 84)
pp 103-107

[Article by Jacques Duclos]

[Text] On 28 October it will be 60 years since the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and France. In this connection, KOMMUNIST publishes the heretofore unpublished message from Jacques Duclos, prominent worker of the French Communist Party [PCF] and great friend of the Soviet people, to the Conference of the France-USSR Society that was held in Lyons in 1974 on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries. Illness prevented J. Duclos from attending the conference, but his message was made public. The document was placed at the disposal of the KOMMUNIST Editorial Office by V. N. Sedykh, who attended that forum as PRAVDA correspondent in France.

It is difficult to express in words how much I would like to observe the 50th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between France and the Soviet Union with you. To my great regret, circumstances have prevented our meeting, but I wholeheartedly greet the striving of the France-USSR Society to revive the memory of the event that marked a turn in France's position in relation to the world's first country of socialism where, in the opinion of many of us, the noble dream of the Paris communards has become a reality.

Being in a prisoner-of-war camp in Germany at that time and associating with Russian prisoners there, among whom were followers of V. I. Lenin, I in some way witnessed the profound shocks caused by the October Revolution and understood that revolution as a special kind of social continuation of the great French Revolution that took place toward the end of the 18th century.

In 1924, as a candidate of the Communist Party in the elections in Paris First District, I actively joined the campaign for the recognition of the USSR, which was also supported by candidates of the "Cartel des Gauches," the Radicals and Socialists. In this connection, I never forgot the hate-filled campaigns against the Soviet regime that were unleashed after the 1917 October Revolution.

I also did not forget the feeling that gripped me when, upon my return from the prisoner-of-war camp, I became aware of the entire depth of hatred which official France entertained toward the young Soviet regime and I automatically compared it with that wall of hatred with which feudal Prussia and Austria surrounded revolutionary France in 1792.

What was taking place in postwar France recalled to mind the insolent manifesto of the duke of Braunschweig in which he cursed France and stood up with might and main in defense of the monarchy. I then thought: if soldiers of the French Revolution forced the old Prussian army to retreat in the Battle of Valmy, then the Red soldiers will also know how to defend and protect their fatherland and the hopes connected with it.

I did not forget the shame which I felt for my country when France joined the campaign of vile slanders against Soviet Russia. An article from the newspaper TAN entitled "About Holding Negotiations With the Bolsheviki" has been preserved in my archives.

This is what the article said about relations with Soviet Russia:

"...The fundamental question of the day stands as follows: Should negotiations be held with the bolshevik dictatorship? There are some who are inclined to say 'Yes.' We most certainly do not aspire to make any indiscreet exposures here... but we have the right to point out where such a policy would lead. In Russia, it would have two kinds of result: temporary and longer-term. The temporary result would be that the bolshevik autocracy would win unlimited power... in the future, those Russians whom bolshevism will not be able to satisfy--and this dissatisfaction will soon become general--would turn toward Germany as their only hope... If we signed an agreement with Lenin, the prestige of bolshevism in central Europe would grow excessively. Soviet Hungary would be victorious... and finally, what would be the effect of the conclusion of an agreement with the bolshevik dictatorship on our allies? Would Lenin recognize the debts of the old system? What gross and deceptive bait... Therefore, we openly declare that we are in favor of a directly opposite policy..."

In the meantime, the Soviet Republic and Hungary appeared to have become a special kind of first extension of the October Revolution. In the opinion of many of us--which unfortunately did not materialize--the revolution should have spread to Germany toward the end of 1918, but the murder of Karl Kiebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg sounded the death knell of the German revolution.

During the 1924 election campaign, I often spoke about the French soldiers and seamen who saved the honor of France by refusing to fight against Soviet Russian in the Black Sea. Standing up against intervention in the Black Sea, which was aimed at suffocating the Russian revolution, the French sailors and soldiers virtually forced the French Government to recall its fleet, thereby rendering enormous service to Soviet Russia. They were subjected to brutal repressions because of their action, but their contribution to the great cause of liberation of the peoples rightfully deserved a high appraisal.

As an eyewitness, I cannot but recall with what enthusiasm and respect I told my voters (I note that women did not yet vote at that time) that famous authors, including Anatole France, Georges Duhamel, Henri Barbusse, Jules Romains and Jean-Richard Bloc, issued a statement condemning the intervention against Russia. Their statement said: "We refuse to be accomplices, even if only by our silence, of this crime. We protest with all the force of our hearts and minds against this act, which is unworthy of the human intellect in general and of the traditions of our people in particular."

All this took place in 1919. Toward the end of that year, I participated for the first time in the election campaign that, to our great disappointment, resulted in the election of a "gray-blue chamber."¹

Nevertheless, having ordered intervention against Soviet Russia, G. Clemenceau was defeated in the presidential elections, which represented the first victory of those who had adopted a sympathetic attitude toward the young Soviet Republic. I was one of those, and, during the extensive political discussions among the French Socialists in 1920, I, together with others, spoke in favor of joining the International formed by Lenin. In that extraordinarily stormy year, a wave of meetings, rallies and other manifestations of solidarity with Soviet Russia, which the French government continued to refuse to recognize, spread throughout France.

However, the government could no longer ignore French public opinion, and Georges Leygues, the government's premier at the time, was forced to make a statement to the foreign affairs commission of the Chamber of Deputies that was subsequently commented on by the newspaper LE MATIN in the following manner: "The government will continue the policy of its predecessors in its relations with the Soviets; it will not recognize the Soviets, but will allow private French persons to resume economic relations with the Russians... At the same time, the premier presented himself as an opponent of the blockade of Russia because he considered that measure to be dangerous and ineffective..."

In hallway conversations, it was pointed out with what haste the French evacuated by sea in 3 days 150,000 soldiers and refugees who had left the Crimea following the defeat of Wrangel. The blockade was formally lifted by the Entente Council in January 1920. The young Soviet regime consolidated itself in the entire territory of the country.

Speaking about the need to recognize the Soviet Union, I often alluded to the Paris Commune, for the suppression of which Bismarck and Thiers united. In those days, I did not yet know what Lenin had said in his talks with Jacques Sadoul, who left the Soviet Union for Germany in the fall of 1920. As you are leaving for the West, Lenin said, inform our friends more precisely. The situation in our country is difficult... Your glorious Paris Commune managed to govern a large city for 10 weeks, from 18 March to 28 May. If the worst should happen tomorrow, the socialist-bolsheviks have already managed to govern a large territory with 150 million people from November 1917 to the fall of 1920, that is, over a period of 3 years.

The communards showed the world the road to socialism. Following their example and avoiding their mistakes, we have embarked on this road and have

passed through decisive stages on it. Even if our advance should be interrupted, the colossal experience accumulated by us will make it possible for other peoples to complete what we have begun: to build the socialist system.

In a situation of incredible difficulties, Lenin demonstrated a striking faith in the future that was subsequently verified by life. Toward the end of 1921, a historian wrote at that time, the Soviet borders--if we discount certain details--were established--it can be said--both in Europe and in Asia. Nevertheless, the Soviet problem was not solved. None of the powers yet recognized the new government despite its efforts in this respect.²

Having lifted the blockade, the Entente states still refused to recognize de jure the Soviet government, although a certain shift in that direction had already begun to appear.

Thus, for instance, the Soviet Union was invited, together with Germany, to the Genoa conference on economic questions that was held from April to May in 1922. The purpose of the invitation was to include these two countries "in the concert of powers," but on the whole the conference failed, particularly because the United States refused to participate in it in order to avoid any negotiations with the Soviet representatives. The negotiations in Genoa ended in failure. The new conference that met in the Hague from 15 June to 10 July 1922 also was not crowned by success.

At that time, a split began to show in the ranks of the French bourgeoisie. Certain representatives of financial circles opposed the recognition of the USSR and raised the demand for repayment of tsarist debts as a preliminary condition, whereas the business world hurried to develop economic relations between the two countries.

On the eve of the 1924 parliamentary elections, the large French bourgeoisie was confronted with major difficulties in all spheres. An understanding of the need to change the policy was spreading among the masses. This fact compelled the socialists to criticize the government more sharply and to support, as the Radicals did, certain demands of the people, including the demands for the amnesty of political prisoners and the establishment of "international cooperation."

At its congress in Lyons in January 1921, the PCF worked out its election program, incorporating in it the demands for a peaceful foreign policy, an immediate withdrawal of French forces from the Ruhr region, the annulment of the Versailles Treaty, the reconstruction of all devastated regions at the expense of the bourgeoisie, as well as for an alliance with the USSR.

Under these conditions, following the forced resignation of President of the Republic A. Millerand, whom the "Cartel des Gauches" completely justifiably reproached for violations of the Constitution by siding with the "Bloc National" headed by R. Poincare, a new government was formed under Edouard Herriot composed of Radical ministers and enjoying the support of the Socialists.

New Premier Edouard Herriot visited Soviet Russia in 1922. The visit made a great impression on him and, upon his return, expressed himself in favor of establishing diplomatic relations with the USSR. It is known that having become the head of the government, he kept the promise that he had made as a candidate for that position: It was at his initiative that France recognized de jure the USSR.

This happened on 28 October 1924. Soon afterwards, L. B. Krasin, who had held the post of the USSR's representative plenipotentiary in London since the beginning of 1924, was appointed representative plenipotentiary in Paris, where he took possession of the building of the former Russian Embassy. That was the very same building where the emissaries of Wrangel, Kolchak and Denikin had been receiving subsidies for several years for the enemies of the October Revolution.

The recognition of the USSR did not suit some obdurate circles, who had learned nothing, and this fact was attested to by a malicious article in the newspaper LE FIGARO, which acted as the pioneer of anti-Sovietism. However, there were also other newspapers in which reason and common sense gained the upper hand and which appraised the true value of what had happened. It is a fact that France's recognition of the government of the Soviet Union was a major event and its anniversary has been invariably observed in Lyons, where Edouard Herriot served as mayor for many years.

During the long period of my parliamentary activities, I had the opportunity to cooperate with Edouard Herriot in leading the Chamber of Deputies in the Third Republic and the National Assembly in the Fourth Republic.

We often discussed the Soviet Union and the need for friendship between the two countries, the friendship that, one might say, is dictated by their history and geographical position.

I can firmly say that Herriot was justly proud of his contribution to the cause of recognition of the Soviet Union, and the people of his native city, Lyons, justly pay him the tribute of respect for understanding the entire absurdity of the attempts to ignore the existence of any country, something that his predecessors obstinately refused to take into account.

It is known that as a result, French-Soviet relations developed in a favorable direction and led to the conclusion of a nonaggression treaty that was signed on 29 November 1932 and ratified by the Chamber of Deputies on 16 May 1933 by 520 votes against only one opposing vote. Is not this eloquent testimony to the frame of mind of the French people!

Following the visit of M. M. Litvinov, people's commissar for foreign affairs, to Paris in July 1933, Edouard Herriot³ and Pierre Cot, French minister of aviation, paid a friendly visit to the USSR.

Afterwards, further progress was achieved in the relations between the two countries, which was especially noticeable against the background of uneasiness in Europe as a result of the assumption of power in Germany by Hitler.

The awareness of the growing danger embodied by fascist Germany prompted L. Barthou to take a number of measures aimed at concluding the "Eastern Pact" despite the reserved position of a majority of Western capitalist governments. Britain withdrew into its isolationism in that period. Poland refused to allow the Soviet forces to cross its territory in the event of a Hitlerite aggression and Romania adopted the same position.

Regardless of all this, the conclusion of a treaty between France and USSR opened the road to establishing a genuine French-Soviet alliance. However, L. Barthou was killed on 9 October 1934 while welcoming Yugoslav King Aleksandar in Marseilles, and French foreign policy began to change noticeably. In the final analysis, the French-Soviet treaty, signed in May 1935, was reduced to naught by the beginning of World War II as a result of the French diplomatic maneuvering.

During the war, when both our countries were subjected to brutal trials, the vital need for a firm alliance between France and the USSR was incontrovertibly confirmed. The Soviet government was the first among the allied governments to recognize de jure the provisional government of the Republic of France under the leadership of General de Gaulle. This recognition was followed by the designing of the 20-year French-Soviet treaty in Moscow in December 1944.

It is known that, subsequently, the French foreign policy has undergone many changes, but the French patriots have not forgotten and will never forget the decisive role played by the Soviet Union in the liberation of France.

This is why they so greatly cherish the French-Soviet friendship, which is so important for the preservation of peace.

Proceeding from this, they wish success to the CSCE, which will make an enormous contribution to strengthening peace in Europe and the entire world.

In conclusion, allow me to wish that the celebration of the 50th anniversary of France's recognition of the Soviet Union will help draw lessons from our history, which are vitally needed both for the present and the future.

May the French-Soviet friendship continue to grow and be strengthened from day to day!

FOOTNOTES

1. Gray-blue was the color of uniforms of the French Army in the years of World War I.
2. Toward the end of 1921, Soviet Russia had diplomatic relations with Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Finland, Afghanistan, Persia, Turkey and Mongolia.

3. At that time, E. Herriot was no longer premier, but continued to be a member of the Chamber of Deputies and president of its Commission for Foreign Affairs.

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

CSO: 1802/3

MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS AND THE PHILIPPINES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 84 (signed to press 15 Oct 84) pp 108-117

[Article by Merlin M. Magallona, member of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines]

[Text] The strategy and tactics of multinational corporations (TNC) in the developing countries are experiencing substantial changes in connection with the aggravation of contradictions in the global capitalist system. The Philippines offers a clear example of this fact. The study of the role which foreign monopoly capital plays in our country's economy leads to a number of specific conclusions.

First of all, we can clearly see that world capitalism is trying to direct the process which is under way in restructuring the national economies of developing countries, which are striving toward true and not only political but also economic independence, in a direction it finds desirable. With the penetration of TNC in the economy of developing countries the latter become firmly tied to the global capitalist economy. This is accomplished by subordinating or absorbing entire sectors, imposing their conditions in defining the basic trends of development of the national economies and many other methods, including help in the organization and growth of large-scale national capital and even its monopolization.

Secondly, the scale of such changes clearly indicates the intention of the leading capitalist countries to extend the activities of their state-monopoly mechanisms through the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and the Economic Bank of Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) to the economic management of developing countries, such as the Philippines. The establishment of such control in the interest of the TNC has serious consequences in terms of the national sovereignty and independent development of these countries.

Third, the specific forms and content of internationalization of capital through the TNC (as the Philippine example clearly proves) confirms the process of further intensification of imperialist domination, which is a characteristic feature of global capitalism at the present stage. The leaders of the liberated countries, who support capitalist development, share

illusions on the possibility of the existence of capitalism without a system of exploitation of their countries by TNC's. As a rule, they assume that the countries they lead will be able to follow their own separate "third way," which will be free from the vices inherent in capitalism. The same could be said of our country as well. Thus President F. Marcos wrote that his program for the creation of a "new society" does not involve capitalism and socialism but a specifically Philippine way of development.

Fourth, the involvement of developing countries such as the Philippines in the system of division of labor as imposed by the TNC inevitably presents the danger of a number of negative consequences, including inevitable difficulties in organizing relations with the members of the socialist community.

Fifth and last, taking into consideration the worsening contradictions between the despotic nature of capitalist relations, the promotion of which is assisted by the TNC, on the one hand, and the struggle waged by the developing countries for independent development, on the other, we can claim that the real solution of the political and economic crisis in such countries will inevitably require an anticapitalist development, leading them to an anticapitalist or, more accurately, socialist orientation. In this light the anticommunist psychosis of the American administration, which is trying to block this trend by force, mainly for the sake of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union, becomes entirely clear. One of the objectives of the Pentagon's military strategy of nuclear strike anywhere on earth is precisely to prevent the liberated countries from taking the path of a socialist development. It is on the same level that the U.S. administration considers any manifestation of a rapprochement between the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist community with Third World countries as "communist diversion," which must be blocked. That is why, in its aspiration to return to the sphere of imperialist domination countries such as Grenada and Nicaragua, U.S. imperialism is using all available means, including naked force.

Scale of Changes in the Philippine Economy

The role of the TNC in the economic development of the Philippines is not determined by the number of their subsidiaries in the country or the extent of their economic and financial participation in its economic life. This is indicated also by the nature of the changes which have taken place in Philippine society since the beginning of the 1970s, when the economic reorganization of the country was initiated, and in the course of which foreign monopoly capital was assigned a greater role.

The economic and political changes which occurred during the state of emergency greatly changed both the Philippines as well as its place and role in the world capitalist economy. Essentially, these changes have consisted of a reorientation of the economy, a conversion from colonial-type production to labor-intensive industry for export, increasingly linked to the industrially developed economies of the United States, Western Europe and Japan. The old colonial relations based on the system of trading raw materials for finished goods are yielding to ties of technological dependence. The national economy stops being merely a raw material appendage of a colonial power. Instead, it

becomes, to a considerable extent, a technological part of the industrial conveyor belt of U.S., Japanese and Western European multinationals.

This new level of integration with the world capitalist economy is manifested in a specific method of international division of labor within the TNC system, in which the Philippine economy is assigned a special role in the TNC production cycle as the economy of a developing country. The main aspiration of the TNC is to exploit even further Philippine cheap labor in the production of labor-intensive items and parts and in processing raw materials needed by the TNC for their world-wide operations.

As the TNC strengthen their positions, a considerable share of the Philippine national economy becomes part of the overall conveyor belt of such corporations. Let us all emphasize the fact that the IBRD and IMF, which are controlled by American monopoly capital, are trying to impose their conditions in defining the main trend of economic development of the Philippines, consistent with the economic and financial interests of the TNC but conflicting with the social needs of the people of the Philippines.

A study of the recommendations issued by a group of IBRD and IMF experts, which the Philippine government was forced to accept during the period of monetary and economic crisis, essentially for the sake of obtaining loans and credits, clearly reveals the intention of leading the development of the Philippine economy toward neocolonialism. As a whole, as a center for coordinating financial capital, the IBRD has made tremendous effort to turn the Philippines from an economically backward into an "industrialized state," merely, however, for the sake of meeting the ever-increasing requirements of the TNC.

The reorganization of the Philippine economy, carried out by the present administration largely on the suggestions and diktat of the IBRD, is accompanied by the expansion of production possibilities, including the development of production forces. Essentially, however, it is aimed at meeting the requirements of the TNC and the leading capitalist countries for inexpensive labor-intensive types of output or commodities. The level of the occurring changes would be difficult to overestimate. Nevertheless, let us immediately emphasize that, as a result, the national economy is acquiring a number of features alien to the interests of the people. Such changes are contributing to the definitive elimination of the vestiges of the colonial production structure and to the breakdown of the vestiges of feudalism, which are hindering the development of capitalist production in agriculture. That is why a number of agrarian measures promoted by the Marcos administration, with the financial participation of the IBRD, are of an antifeudal nature. They are contributing to an increase in capital investments in the agrobusiness by national capital and, particularly, by the TNC. Naturally, this weakens the intensity of the struggle waged by the peasant masses for social reform truly consistent with their interests.

Purpose of Industrialization Export

Starting with the 1970s, the implementation of the "new society" strategy resulted in the reorientation of a certain segment of industry toward working

for export, based on the production of labor-intensive inexpensive items. The IBRD, IMF and Asian Development Bank actively contributed to the acceleration of this process. Therefore, the export orientation is increasingly involving the Philippine economy in the internationalized production cycle of the TNC.

The new feature of this phenomenon includes not only the expansion of the existing production of finished items by TNC affiliates but also the increased volume of manufacturing, processing or assembling of individual parts and units and producing semifinished goods for the TNC. It is precisely these initial stages or phases in the production cycle which are taking place in the Philippines essentially on the basis of its available inexpensive manpower. All of this is done by the TNC in the Philippines not in order to meet domestic demand. This entire output is exported in the interest of those same TNC which control the entire production process. Therefore, a specific and growing share of the national economy is reduced to the status of an TNC subcontractor.

It is natural, therefore, that the recommendations issued by the group of IBRD and IMF exports were aimed at adapting the Philippine economy to playing this role in the interest of foreign monopolies. The authors of such recommendations consider as a prerequisite for success the corresponding development of small and medium-sized companies, which could supply complementing items needed by the TNC for the production of finished goods. According to IBRD specialists, who visited the Philippines in 1980, the possibilities of the country's industrial enterprises must be used more extensively for subcontracting operations which would meet TNC requirements. The specialists employed by these international financial institutions consider that the future of small and medium-sized companies lies in fulfilling orders for international subcontracts for the production of parts and assemblies for machine equipment, household electrical appliances and transport and electronic equipment. In particular, they recommended that the Philippines manufacture automobile parts and increase their output for the needs of foreign and local TNC affiliates and to consider such a policy as a governmental program for the development of the automobile industry. Such a program was formulated and is being implemented.

With government approval, foreign monopoly capital is being invested in the developing sectors of Philippine industry, in an effort to increase the volume of work based on international subcontracting for TNC. Thus, the local branch of the Kodak company, for example, increased its production of parts and mechanisms for cameras. General Motors has announced an increase in the production of parts for diesel engines. General Electric asked Philippine manufacturers to produce on the basis of long-term subcontracting about 1,000 different types of parts and assemblies needed for household equipment and electrical goods. Siemens, the West German company, is planning to sign a similar contract for subcontracting in the Philippines. The governmental program for the development of the automobile industry, largely reflecting the interests of Japanese and American TNC, led to the establishment of a large number of local companies producing various automobile parts. Thus, for example, 33 Philippine enterprises do nothing but manufacture parts for the Ford Sierra.

'Modernization' of Industrial Sectors

Toward the end of 1980 the IBRD approved a loan of \$200 million for the "structural reconstruction" of the Philippine economy. This loan was part of the financial aid (totaling \$1 billion) which the IBRD pledged to grant to the Marcos administration if it were to make a number of changes in state and economic policy relative to operations conducted by foreign monopoly capital in the Philippines, including the customs policy in controlling imports, financial-material incentives and other similar measures.

The "modernizing" of a number of industrial sectors is a most important prerequisite for granting loans by the IBRD. As a whole, the "structural reorganization" represents a total reorientation of such sectors from meeting the needs of the domestic market to export production, with the respective restructuring which facilitates international subcontracting. Furthermore, said "restructuring" also includes a reorientation of customs legislation, aimed at increasing the benefits enjoyed by the TNC.

In particular, the "structural reorganization" is extended to the textile industry which is currently still working essentially for the domestic market. Furthermore, in its time this industry was created with a view to eliminating imports with the help of domestic production, for which reason its production parameters are unsuitable for the manufacturing of goods for export. According to the "structural reorganization" program, as stipulated in the loan agreement, following its reconstruction aimed at increasing labor productivity and reducing production costs, the textile industry will convert entirely to work for export. Its competitiveness on the world market will be supported by the "relative advantage" of Philippine low wages.

As far as the food industry is concerned, according to the recommendations of the IBRD, subcontracting will be practiced between small local companies and big foreign capital companies, in the course of which the former will act merely as raw material suppliers. The "structural reorganization" program already includes the metallurgical, cellulose-paper and timber-processing industries, the manufacturing of ceramic and glassware goods, electric appliances, electronic equipment and leather goods.

An important aspect of said program, on which the IBRD loan is based, is reducing protectionist customs duties, particularly for imports needed by the industrial sectors working for export. The implementation of such a customs duties reform means that three-quarters of the goods it covers are raw materials and semifinished goods for labor-intensive export-oriented sectors, such as the textile, clothing, shoe, leather, food, electrical engineering and electronic industries. In encouraging the development of these Philippine sectors, the IBRD considers them as sources of industrial output for international subcontracting and, particularly, supplying foreign production facilities of multinational corporations.

The result is that the customs reform directly stimulates industrial sectors oriented toward exports and abolishes the protective tariffs for industrial sectors working for the domestic market. This means that the country's production resources will be used not in order to satisfy the needs of the

domestic market but to meet the requirements of other countries. Consequently, while enterprises owned by foreign monopolies will acquire labor-intensive items at a low cost or will sell them abroad, thus earning superprofits, the Philippine industrialists working for the domestic market will be virtually thrown overboard. This means that they will be able to survive only if they retool their enterprises to work for export or become TNC subcontractors or dependent partners in the activities of foreign capital.

Plunder of Philippine Agriculture

The Philippine government and the IBRD claim that the "structural reorganization" of the national economy, manifested above all in the development of industrial sectors working for export (or, more accurately, as neocolonialist industrialization), is needed in order to eliminate the country's permanent balance of payment losses. Reality, however, refutes such claims. It was precisely this that the IBRD experts themselves were forced to note in their report "The Philippines: Internal and External Development Resources." Among others, the report noted a drastic increase in payments for ever-rising imports of commodities new to the country, such as textiles or parts of electronic equipment supplied for the production of labor-intensive goods. The cost of imported raw materials and semifinished goods supplying industrial sectors oriented toward exports rather than the domestic market, increased significantly. In order to pay for such imports, as the report noted, the Philippines must use approximately one-third of the earnings from exports of nontraditional goods.

Consequently, as a result of the reorientation of the national economy toward the primary development of export sectors, the balance of payments of the country is not improved. On the contrary, such a "restructuring" has become one of the main reasons for the growing balance of payments deficit.

In persistently trying to turn the Philippines into a source of inexpensive production for the TNC, under the guise of concern for the balance of payments, the group of IBRD-IMF experts suggests that the cost of imports be reduced by "further intensification of relations among existing production facilities and the creation of new types of export commodities essentially based on the use of internal resources." Thus, for example, the program for "modernizing" the textile industry calls for simultaneously increasing the production of clothing (which has already become a separate sector within the international subcontracting system). All of this is accompanied by the recommendation of relying on domestic agricultural raw materials or, in other words, increasing the area in cotton. This is the way in which agriculture becomes involved in an export-oriented policy. In order to resolve the problem of the balance of payments, which became even more aggravated as a result of the financial crisis from the beginning of the 1980s, the Philippines is forced to pay with the use of an increasing amount of its resources, including agricultural ones.

The economic crisis is worsened by a huge foreign debt. That is why recently the IBRD-IMF group demanded that the Marcos administration review its five-year plan and to meet requirements involving even greater "utilization of domestic resources." In the opinion of the authors of the recommendation,

this would facilitate the penetration of TNC capital investments in Philippine agriculture. This is another objective of the loans, concealed behind the screen of the "structural reorganization."

Let us point out that the production of and trade in commodities for export are largely the doing not of independent national companies but of TNC operating in the country, conducted as operations between mother companies and their affiliates located both in the Philippines and elsewhere. This situation is used by the TNC for frequent price manipulations (in price setting, for example), reflected in export data with all related consequences. As a result of the increased number of economic sectors involved in work for export, our foreign trade will become increasingly involved in intracorporate TNC operations. Consequently, the instability characteristic of the world market will increasingly become part of the Philippine economy through TNC activities. This will undermine even further the foundations of our national economy and will increase to a tremendous extent the country's dependence on decisions made by boards of directors of huge multinational corporations.

Export Production Areas

The establishment of so-called export production zones or "free trade" zones has become one of the main components of industrial policy supported by the IBRD in the interest of foreign monopoly capital. Part of the loans granted for "structural reorganization" are used to finance 12 such zones set up in the Philippines. The group of IBRD experts participated in determining their location.

The export production zones are especially assigned territories in which industrial enterprises are located and the necessary infrastructure created. This also involves the training of properly skilled manpower. The companies wishing to organize the production of commodities for export in these areas are offered a number of benefits, including freedom from taxes and duties. Furthermore, they are promised financial aid to increase their export of labor-intensive yet inexpensive goods. Thus, the advertising prospectus for such an area on the Bataan Peninsula, not far from Manila, the capital of the Philippines, states among other things that "this is the most modern industrial park in Asia with the lowest cost of services in the world. It is conveniently located and has a well-trained English-speaking experienced labor force. Wages are minimal: US\$0.15 per hour, the lowest in Asia." It is not astounding that such zones draw the attention of international monopolies and that the IBRD dreams of converting all free countries into a single "export site" for the TNC. Actually, from the economic viewpoint, production in such zones is a kind of enclave unrelated to the national economy. It is merely part of the overall production process of foreign monopolies, transferred to Philippine territory with a view to lowering even further the cost of output through the exploitation of our country's manpower. It is essentially the American and Japanese TNC which operate in these zones. The Japanese monopolies are particularly aggressive: they have been given the right to create special "Japanese export zones" in the Philippines. The Manila TIMES JOURNAL wrote on this subject that "as a result, Japan will move more industrial sectors to the Philippines than to other developing countries." Furthermore, in 1980 the president issued a decree allowing individual

entrepreneurs to create their own similar zones. Some of the foreign monopolies enjoying such privileges include the Royal Dutch Shell which has its own zone spread over 86 hectares of land.

Philippine Capital in the Service of Foreign Monopolies

Industrial construction requires large investments. The Philippine credit system, traditionally oriented essentially toward short-term relatively small loans, is unable to meet the requirements of the newly created economic structure with its new industrial sectors oriented toward the world market and part of the output of international monopolies.

The neocolonialist industrialization which is currently taking place with the participation of the TNC requires tremendous outlays. The IBRD meets a certain share of the need for such capital by granting industrial loans and financing a program for the development of small and medium-sized industrial enterprises and another one for the development of corporations. Furthermore, the same bank issues loans for the creation of an infrastructure, i.e., for building highways, ports, bridges, etc.

Although the IBRD uses its financing to coordinate Philippine economic development with the requirements of the international monopolies, its main role here is to strengthen its positions as coordinator of capital from foreign sources. Such coordination is accomplished through the activities of a Philippine consultative group and through annual consultations between members of foreign banks lending funds to the Philippines and international financial organizations. The consultative group headed by the IBRD makes decisions on the amount of subsidies which could be granted to the Philippines and the type of economic projects to be financed from outside sources. Bearing in mind the size of the foreign financial sources invested in the Philippine economy, it is clear that the legitimized and regularly held consultative meetings have become an effective mechanism for controlling the development and functioning of our economy.

In order to use our country's financial resources to finance its plans for neocolonialist industrialization of our economy, the IBRD suggested the reorganization of the Philippine banking system in such a way as to give it a "unified" structure, which would allow the combination of traditional commercial banking operations with capital investments. The IBRD-IMF group considers the "unification" of the banking system the foundation for extracting even greater funds needed for the development of the various industrial sectors working for export. The main trend of this reform is to concentrate bank capital by merging small and medium-sized financial institutions within consolidated "unified" banks, which could provide investments for new large industrial enterprises and small and medium-sized companies working for export. The International Finance Corporation (IFC), which is a branch of the IBRD, initiated the first such project: a program for financing small and medium-sized companies working as international subcontractors. The IFC has initialed agreements with seven Philippine banks to this effect.

Financing the development of industrial export sectors requires huge loans not only for the building of enterprises but organizing the marketing of their output on the foreign markets and raw material imports. Consequently, once again the small financial resources of the country will be shifted to export operations of enterprises supplying the IFC with inexpensive goods. In this manner as well the Philippine financial system will become largely integrated with TNC activities in order to strengthen their positions both in our country and on foreign markets.

Regional Scope

As member of ASEAN, the Philippines are integrated with the global capitalist economy on the regional level as well. For example, 3 years ago a Basic Agreement on Industrial Reciprocal Complementing Among ASEAN Member Countries was approved at a conference of economic ministers of ASEAN countries. According to this document, the participation of any given member of the association in the elaborated program may involve the manufacturing of parts or assemblies for any type of industrial commodity. The goods produced according to the program are given priority on the markets of ASEAN member countries. Furthermore, not one of these countries "has the right to create new industrial enterprises or to expand existing ones for the manufacturing of said commodity."

An automobile industry was started in ASEAN member countries on TNC initiative. The economic benefits of this project went above all to the American Ford and General Motors companies, the Japanese Mitsubishi and other TNC manufacturing individual parts and spare parts for automobiles in these countries. At that same conference a decision was adopted according to which the output of automobile manufacturing TNC will be included in the list of commodities covered by the agreement on industrial reciprocal complementing. Consequently, the industrial or technological integration of ASEAN countries is structured in such a way that the finished production cycle of the TNC is divided into sections located in the individual members of the association. In this manner the latter are like a production addendum to an TNC assembly line.

In connection with the increased investments by Japanese monopolies in ASEAN countries we must mention the nature of economic relations between them and Japan. The reorganization of Japan's industry, as a result of which labor-intensive production is transferred abroad, in areas with inexpensive manpower, has affected ASEAN as well. Naturally, the transferred industrial sectors are oriented toward the Japanese market or else toward foreign markets of interest to Japan's TNC. Japanese monopoly capital is contributing to the economic specialization of ASEAN countries in the production of technologically simple yet labor-intensive items, concentrating within its country science-intensive industrial sectors involving complex technological processes.

In particular, Japan is transferring to the Philippines labor-intensive sectors such as the manufacturing of textiles, clothing, chemicals, plastics and parts for machine tools, automobiles and electrical equipment. The increased capital investments by Japanese monopolies in the production sectors

of ASEAN members represents the association's integration with the Japanese industrial system. It would be relevant to emphasize at this point that the transfer of labor-intensive industrial output from Japan to ASEAN countries is encouraged by the governments of the association's members.

The Japanese model for the reconstruction of industry and export of labor-intensive production to the developing countries has become the model for the industrial policy pursued by the IBRD toward the latter. In the words of Robert McNamara, the former IBRD chairman, Japan "has achieved great successes in adapting itself to the demands of the time, thanks to which it has ensured its success in trade and economic activities without any delays or hope for aid in preserving losing and inefficient sectors."

Prospects

The study of the industrial situation in the Philippines and other ASEAN member countries indicates that it was developed not under the influence of random or circumstantial factors. The reconstruction of industrial production has become an essential new feature of the internationalization of the production process conducted under TNC aegis. We see, therefore, that the path of capitalist development chosen by a number of liberated countries leads to the increased exploitation of their peoples by the multinational corporations motivated by the desire to earn superprofits. Let us note in this connection that the difficulties experienced by such countries are inherent in the contemporary development stage under global capitalist economy. The reasons for the crisis in these countries are found in the contradictions existing within the capitalist world, which cannot be resolved by any refined halfway measures. Furthermore, it has now become entirely obvious that the crisis in such countries increasingly demands the solution of the basic problem they face--to continue to follow the path of capitalist development or else to take a revolutionary step toward strengthening independent development, which could become noncapitalist or, rather, assume a socialist orientation. Naturally, it would be naive to underestimate in this case the political and military realities of the imperialist world at the present stage or to ignore the role of the very existence of the power of the socialist countries.

As a result of the revolutionary changes which have taken place in the postwar period, the growing aspiration for development through socialist changes, noted in Third World countries, marks a new stage in the transition from capitalism to socialism throughout the earth. The Philippines and the other ASEAN members are subject to the strong pressure of foreign monopoly capital which is doing everything possible to keep them within the capitalist system and "save" them from socialist influence.

The Philippine example proves that the situation in the developing countries within the system of the global capitalist economy, dominated by dependence in the areas of technology, investments, credit, trade and management, will continue to worsen. International monopoly capital intends to continue to resort to new maneuvers and to the use of any available means in the struggle for restraining the advance of socialism and the national liberation movement.

A conflict situation is increasing in the developing countries. On the one hand, by promoting an anticommunist psychosis and relying on nuclear power, imperialism does not cease its persistent efforts to impose the capitalist order on other countries. On the other, a decisive struggle for independent development is continuing. These irreconcilable contradictions will increase in the course of time and will contribute to the growth of the forces struggling for national and social liberation.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/3

ARTISTIC IMAGE AND KNOWLEDGE OF REALITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 84 (signed to press 15 Oct 84) pp 118-119

[Review by M. Rukavitsyn of the book "Gorizonty Khudozhestvennogo Obraza" [Horizons of the Artistic Image] by M. B. Khrapchenko. Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, Moscow, 1982, 334 pp]

[Text] Marxist-Leninist aesthetics traditionally considers art one of the forms of social consciousness which plays a tremendous ideological-educational role in social life. It is precisely this which determines the prime methodological significance of a scientific study of the dialectics of interaction between the image-artistic and ideological-political characteristics of a work of art. That is precisely why the comprehensive study of the crucial problems of artistic creativity cannot be imagined without the profound study of the ideological "fullness" of artistic thinking and without the study of ideological "functions" of the artistic image, which gives art the power of exerting a vital influence.

Such problems, which are of universal conceptual and specific historical significance to the contemporary fate of the artistic process, are the main topics of this book by Academician M. B. Khrapchenko. The author studies the nature of the aesthetic values of developed socialism, their influence on contemporary man and the dependence of the spiritual potential of society on the extent and level of this influence. The scientist is concerned with the fate of socialist culture under the conditions of an intensive rapprochement and reciprocal enrichment among the national cultures of fraternal peoples. He opposes a simplistic view of this process in which the national principle is suppressed and the fact is ignored that in our time not only professional artists but millions of working people in all national republics are drawn to the creation of works of art. The most significant feature of this work, however, is the part the heading of which was used as the book's title. It deals with the search for new solutions based on the achievements of contemporary aesthetic theory of the problems of the artistic image in the knowledge and practical mastery of the world.

The initial position of the author is based on one of the most important stipulations of Marxist dialectics relative to the comprehensive, complex and contradictory ties between art and reality and the variety of means and

methods of expressing life through art. This is essentially what dictates his critical attitude toward the traditional understanding of the original in art as a universal form of depiction of the general and the existing interpretation of the artistic image as a specific form of manifestation of the general in the individual.

The study of the works of Russian and foreign 19th century classics and the artistic discoveries and gains in the 20th century provided the researcher with material for interesting and thoroughly substantiated conclusions on the variety of forms of manifestation of universal concepts and their historical changes and mobility and potential for acquiring an ever-new vital concept.

These observations were essentially dictated by the need to answer the main question: what are the horizons of the artistic image?

One of the outstanding features of the great realists, such as Balzac, Tolstoy and Dostoevskiy, the author writes, is that in their works the depiction of human destiny in the chaos of daily life is supplemented by the creation of an integral picture of the world in which, along with major social types, we see "daily types" in terms of internal and external appearance, which make the historical background, the environment. This has enabled them "to draw the picture of an entire social stratum and to depict a vast gallery of characters belonging to it and characterizing its features" (p 23). The creative experience of the classics indicates that the artistic image can act not only as an individual character, person, event or fact but also as more significant enlarged phenomena in life. Daily life and its mastery and depiction become the base for an extensive epic work (despite Hegel's predictions to the effect that such work will become exhausted in our time). In other words, imagery in art is a phenomenon as comprehensive as the life itself from which it stems. If we speak of the possibilities of artistic typification in this connection, they too appear unlimited.

In characterizing the stylistic and genre variety of 19th Russian literature and the efforts of writers to present the images of their own vision of the world, M. B. Khrapchenko describes clearly and convincingly the ability of every one of them to create his own artistic system and forms of summation of developing reality.

Thus, according to the author, Tolstoy achieves his multidimensional and comprehensive depiction of reality and, consequently, its summation, through the mentality of his different characters (the description of the battle of Borodino in "War and Peace" is recreated as perceived by Pierre, Kutuzov, Napoleon and other characters in the novel). This creative experience of the artist-psychologist was subsequently developed by Romain Rolland, Anatole France, Thomas Mann, Theodore Dreiser, Ivan Bunin, Ernest Hemingway, Mikhail Sholokhov and Leonid Fadeyev.

Gogol' extensively used the method of finding the usual within the unusual and depicting the "imperfections of our life," regardless of the strange clothing in which they were garbed. Conversely, Dostoevskiy achieved his broad characterization through the extreme exaggeration of the qualities of some characters, the increased emphasis on others and a careful attitude toward

matters in a state of development. Chekhov had an entirely different approach to understanding the tasks of artistic characterization. While indicating the "baseness of a base person," and the monotony of types of the sated Philistine petty bourgeois life, the writer was able to see behind all that also that which opposed this type of life and was typical of a normal human existence. We always feel in the subtext of Chekhov's works the breath of something fresh, young and developing, taking over from the old.

The art of the 20th century, particularly of today, is considered by the author in the light of the universal social shifts which have radically changed our view on the development of global politics and culture. As he points out, in Soviet literature and art this has been expressed above all through the choice of targets of depiction (the people as the makers of history and creators). The variety of this target of artistic depiction has determined the variety of forms of artistic summation (such as the heroic character, the positive hero, the heroic aspect of daily life, realism and romanticism). Characters--bearers of the common, the collective genius of the people and the revolutionary masses--were created in the epic historical canvases painted by Gorkiy, Sholokhov, A. Tolstoy and Fedin and in the works of contemporary novelists. These characters have been created by the literature and art of socialist realism: they do not blindly follow life. However, they are suggested by the trends, by the tempestuous events of the revolutionary age. Consequently, according to the author, the artistic image is not a fabrication of the writer, imposed by what is desired and what is possible or the work of his creative imagination, but a specific depiction of the various aspects of reality and of the objective laws of life through artistic means.

The scientific study of the best characters in Russian and world literature and close observations of the dynamics of the development of the traditional and the birth of new artistic methods have enabled the author to provide a contemporary scientific classification of the artistic character, in four aspects of its existence: as a summation of essential characteristics and features of reality, and man's concepts of the world; as an expression of the emotional attitude toward anything which may be an object of creativity; as an embodiment of the ideal of perfection, the beauty of life and nature and the creation of an aesthetically significant material world; and as an inner concept of the artist relative to the education of the reader, the viewer, the listener, inherent in the creation of images and the related potential of aesthetic influence.

In drawing attention to the basic features of the artistic character, which appears in a great variety of forms, we cannot ignore related or correlated concepts and distinguish between that which is part of the system of realism and that which is far from or alien to it. This applies to correlations between "word and image," "image and symbol," "image and character," and "image and myth." For example, myth in the aesthetics of realistic art is interpreted as a form of artistic-imagistic perception of the world developed in the people. In the modernists this is presented as a deliberately structured model of an illusory vision of the world. That is precisely the way the author assesses in his book the desire to bring closer the scientific with the artistic methods of knowledge based on semiotics which, according to

this scientist, do not pertain to or resolve problems of the artistic character. The proper solution of the question is found through the Marxist-practical method of knowledge. "The horizons of the artistic image are the infinite panoramas of life, creativity and construction" (p 105), the author says in concluding his study of this complex problem.

The concept of the artistic character as a comprehensive phenomenon, the scale of which exceeds our habitual concepts of its limits and expressive possibilities, opens the way to new studies of the current situation in our literature and the experience of contemporary writers.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/3

HISTORY AND LESSONS OF WORLD WAR II

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 84 (signed to press 15 Oct 84) pp 120-124

[Review by Academician S. Tikhvinskiy of the book "Vtoraya Mirovaya Voyna. Kratkaya Istoriya" [World War II. A Short History]. International Editorial Collegium: P. A. Zhilin and Ye. M. Zhukov, chairman (USSR); D. Sirkov (Bulgaria); E. Liptai (Hungary); W. Schuman (GDR); Sh. Natsagdorzh (Mongolia); R. Dzipanov (Poland); M. Fetu (Romania), V. Pesa (Czechoslovakia). Nauka, Moscow, 1984, 592 pp]

[Text] In the worsened international situation of today, again and again the Soviet people and the world public are turning to the events and outcome of World War II. The lasting significance of its historical lessons was reemphasized in the CPSU Central Committee decree on the 40th anniversary of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War: "The main one is that one must struggle against war before it has broken out.... In order to defend peace we need the united, coordinated and active efforts of all peace-loving forces against the aggressive and adventuristic course of imperialism."

The definitive work by a collective of scientists from eight socialist countries--Hungary, the GDR, Mongolia, Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, the USSR and Czechoslovakia--which came out recently is of great interest in this connection. The multinational group of authors, which includes leading historians of the members of the socialist community, has been able not only to sum up the results of a tremendous amount of work, which has become significantly energized in recent years, on the study of the history of the past war but also, using new documentary sources, to make significant progress in interpreting a number of aspects. The work under review contains concise yet extensive characteristics of the most important events of each of the stages of the war. It assesses the contribution which the members of the anti-Hitlerite coalition made to the defeat of the common enemy and substantiatedly refutes the latest efforts of bourgeois historiography to revise the results and lessons of World War II.

The study of the origins of the war is an unquestionable success of the authors. Using extensive historical data, they prove that its deepest reasons were rooted in the very nature of imperialism, its aggressive character and internal contradictions and the policy which the most reactionary circles in

the imperialist countries were pursuing on the eve of the war. The uneven economic and political development of the capitalist countries and the profound crisis which had developed in all areas of their existence led to the appearance of fascism and hotbeds of war in the Far East and Europe. The attention of the readers is drawn to the inseparable link between fascism and war. Today, when fascist ideology is once again gaining supporters in a number of capitalist countries, the FRG and the United States in particular, and when revanchist feelings are increasing in West Germany and Japan, it is extremely important to recall the misanthropic, aggressive nature of this disgusting phenomenon, which is the offspring of the most reactionary imperialist forces.

Many bourgeois historians and political experts are making a great effort to confuse the question of the reasons for the outbreak for World War II, to reduce the culpability of imperialism for its outbreak and even to exonerate it entirely. However, it is precisely the policy pursued by the Western countries, manifested in "pacifying" or, more accurately, encouraging the aggressive aspirations of the ruling circles of Germany, Italy and Japan, which allowed fascism to undertake the successful implementation of its aggressive plans.

The first socialist state in the world proved itself to be the only firm and consistent opponent of fascism which, among other things, threatened the "Western democracies" as well. However, the ruling circles in the capitalist countries rejected the Soviet proposals for organizing a collective resistance to the aggressor. Conversely, they did everything possible to assist the aggressor in his preparations for and unleashing of a new world war, in the hope of directing said aggression against the USSR. The results of this short-sighted policy proved to be catastrophic for the Western countries themselves. This is confirmed by the battles of the spring and summer of 1940, when virtually all of Europe fell to Germany and Italy. France capitulated and a most difficult situation developed for Great Britain. The Japanese aggression was expanding in the Far East, threatening not only British but U.S. interests as well.

Historical experience proved that the policy of pacifying aggression is fatal above all for those who pursue it. The struggle against the growing threat of war must be developed long before it appears. The unity among the working class, all working people and the progressive and peace-loving forces on the planet is needed in order successfully to counteract imperialist aggression and war.

Thanks to the steadily growing activeness of the broad toiling masses in the countries attacked by the Hitlerite hordes and the resistance movement which developed in the occupied territories, World War II, which broke out within the imperialist system, gradually began to acquire a liberation and antifascist nature. The escalation of fascist aggression created a real threat to the national independence of a number of countries. The main and decisive factor which determined the liberation nature of the war against the members of the Hitlerite coalition was the entry of the USSR into the war, after the treacherous attack mounted on our country by fascist Germany. A new period began in World War II and a radical qualitative change took place in

its sociopolitical nature, scale, course and prospects. It became a joint struggle waged by all forces of democracy and progress against the misanthropic fascist system, the victory of which would have thrown humankind back several centuries. The heroic struggle waged by the Soviet people blended with the antifascist and liberation struggle waged by the peoples of Poland, France, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and all European countries enslaved by the Hitlerites.

The Great Patriotic War and the combat operations on the Soviet-German front hold a central place in the book. This is natural, for not only the question of the existence of the first socialist country in the world but the fate of world civilization was being resolved on the fronts of the Great Patriotic War.

By the end of 1941 the Red Army was already able to receive Hitler's "blitzkrieg" plan and mount a counteroffensive. In analyzing the results of the historical battle for Moscow, the authors convincingly refute the version disseminated in bourgeois historiography according to which the reasons for the defeats of the Wehrmacht be exclusively in the errors made by Hitler, who had removed from the conduct of military operations experienced generals and had made serious strategic errors. In reality, from beginning to end, the notorious Barbarossa plan was adventuristic. It was based on the underestimating by the fascist military and political leadership of the power of the Soviet state and its armed forces and overestimating the capabilities of Hitlerite Germany and its army.

The victorious actions of the Soviet army were backed by the power of the socialist state, the selfless toil of the people, who were hammering out the weapons for the front, and the heroic struggle waged by the Soviet people behind enemy lines. The communist party was the organizer and inspirer of our people in the struggle against fascism. It assumed full responsibility for the fate of the socialist fatherland, strengthened the ideological and political unity of society and rallied the people and the army. The party raised the working people and the troops in a spirit of patriotism and proletarian internationalism, developing in them qualities such as courage, firmness in the face of severe trials and heroism. It directed their energy, will and actions to resisting the enemy.

The authors pay great attention to the organization and strengthening of the antifascist coalition. On 1 January 1942, 26 countries, including the USSR, the United States, Great Britain and China, signed the United Nations declaration on the joint struggle against the signatories to the Berlin Pact of 1940, with which they were in a state of war, and on reciprocal cooperation. They assumed the obligation not to make a separate peace or armistice with the common enemy. The 26 May 1942 Soviet-English treaty on alliance in the war against fascist Germany and its accomplices in Europe and on cooperation and mutual aid after the war, and the 11 June 1942 Soviet-American accord on the principles to be used in reciprocal aid in waging the war against the aggressor were events of great historical importance, which led to the creation of the antifascist coalition. Toward the end of 1942 a firm system of economic, political and military relations had been established among the allies in the coalition. The Soviet Union and the progressive

forces in Great Britain, the United States and other countries ensured the effective utilization of the resources of the antifascist coalition and promoted the unification of countries and peoples in the struggle against the main enemy--Hitlerite Germany.

Unlike the USSR, which had invested all its efforts in the common cause, the ruling circles in the United States and Great Britain, while joining the antifascist coalition, pursued above all their imperialist objectives: while hoping that Germany would be weakened by its main rival, they also tried to subordinate the Soviet Union to their own power. Although expressing the wish to give comprehensive aid to the USSR and wage with it a joint struggle against the fascist bloc, in fact they frequently avoided the implementation of specific economic and military obligations. This aspect of the policy of the allies was manifested most clearly in the matter of opening a second front in Europe.

The Soviet government ascribed exceptional importance to this matter, for it was a question of hastening the end of the war. However, Great Britain and the United States did everything possible to delay the initiation of military operations in Western Europe. As the authors prove, this was a manifestation of the "contradictions related to the affiliation of the members of the antifascist coalition with different social systems: the old desire of Anglo-American reaction to weaken the USSR was a durable one" (p 357).

The military operations which were conducted by the Allies in the Pacific, East and Southeast Asia, North Africa and Sicily, and which Western students of World War II occasionally try to present as the opening of the Second Front, were actually extremely limited in scale. They could neither threaten the vitally important centers of Germany and Japan nor draw any significant forces of the fascist bloc away from the Soviet-German front.

The leadership of the communist party and the Soviet state, who based their attitude toward their Western allies not on circumstantial considerations but objective factors, held an essentially different position. These factors were the need for comprehensively hastening the defeat of fascist German and strengthening normally mutually profitable relations based on the principles of peaceful coexistence among the victorious powers in the future. Unlike Great Britain and the United States, the USSR always rendered unconditional support to its partners whenever their situation became critical. Thus, in January 1945, on the request of the government of Great Britain and the United States, unhesitatingly the USSR changed the time of the offensive to be mounted by the Soviet troops, initiating it considerably earlier and under more difficult circumstances than initially planned.

Subsequently, when the Second Front was finally opened in Western Europe in June 1944 (the landing of the Allies in Normandy), the activities of the Anglo-American-French forces unquestionably made a positive contribution to the victorious completion of World War II. However, by that time its outcome had already been predetermined by the crushing defeats inflicted on the German-Fascist forces on the Eastern Front, above all in the battles for Stalingrad and Kursk. In assessing the results of the military and political significance of these largest operations in the Great Patriotic War, the

authors note that their determining factors were the mass heroism of the Soviet troops and the high skills of the supreme command. They resulted in the total defeat of the Wehrmacht's offensive strategy, which was forced to convert to defense in all theaters of military operations. The backbone of Hitlerite Germany was broken and its troops were severely weakened. The entire world clearly realized the superiority of the Soviet army in combat skills, armaments and strategic leadership. The international response to our victories was tremendous. The prestige of the Soviet Union as a decisive power in the struggle against the members of the fascist bloc strengthened even further. The offensive which the Soviet forces mounted during the winter and spring of 1944, the liberation of Poland and the countries in Central and southeastern Europe, and the Berlin operation have also been extensively and accurately reflected in the work under review.

In terms of scope, fierceness of combat and duration of the struggle, the Soviet-German front is unparalleled in the history of mankind. The Soviet army fought the strongest group of forces of the fascist bloc and it was precisely the Soviet forces which inflicted the greatest harm to the enemy and made a decisive contribution to the victory. It was precisely here, on the Eastern Front, that the German-Fascist army suffered more than 73 percent of its overall casualties and left behind three-quarters of its war equipment.

The 40th anniversary of the opening of the Second Front, commemorated not so long ago, drew the close attention of the world public to the relative contributions of the individual members of the anti-Hitlerite coalition to the defeat of fascism. As we know, many Western researchers to this day deliberately belittle the role of the Soviet Union, claiming that the outcome of the war was allegedly determined by the efforts of the Anglo-American forces. This is a naked lie. The real facts, presented in full and impartially in this book, convincingly refute such misrepresentations.

The Soviet people and their armed forces, which selflessly defended their socialist fatherland, fulfilled their international mission honorably. Fascism, which tried physically to annihilate hundreds of millions of people or to turn them into its slaves, was routed. This is the greatest contribution of the Soviet people to humankind. The decisive role which the USSR played in defeating the aggressive fascist bloc was entirely natural. It proved the superiority of socialism over capitalism and of socialist ideology over the misanthropic ideology of imperialism and fascism.

The book extensively covers the ideological aspects of World War II as the confrontation between two ideologies: imperialist, in its most advanced and disgusting clothing--the ideology of fascism--and the communist, which proved its progressive and viable nature and ability to become efficiently materialized in the activities of millions of people. The ideological factor was one of the decisive factors in the victory of the Soviet Union over fascist Germany and militaristic Japan. Furthermore, the lessons of history prove the tremendous danger to peace of the ideology of militant anticommunism and anti-Sovietism, which to this day are extensively used in the war preparations made by the most aggressive militaristic and chauvinistic forces of international reaction.

The labor exploits of the Soviet people, their high patriotism and the dedicated efforts of the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry and the intelligentsia, are clearly reflected in the book. The heroic toil of our people was the inviolable foundation which revealed in full the advantages of the socialist economy and which led to victory in an unparalleled economic confrontation with fascist Germany, which had used the economic resources of the enslaved European countries to wage the war. The socialist economic system withstood the most severe trials of the war. It proved its viability, dynamism and flexibility. The alliance between the working class and the peasantry was the most important source of our outstanding successes at the front and the rear.

The book under review extensively covers the antifascist liberation struggle waged by the peoples in the European and Asian countries occupied by German, Italian and Japanese troops. Communists and members of national liberation forces were invariably in the vanguard of the resistance movement. They proved during the war that they are the most consistent and firm defenders of democracy and peace. The struggle waged by the partisans and clandestine workers in occupied Soviet territory assumed a mass national nature. The distinguishing feature of this struggle was the leading and organizing role of the communist party, which ensured the coordination of combat operations among patriots behind enemy lines and the activities of regular army units.

The losses which the occupation forces of Germany and its allies suffered on the Soviet-German front weakened their strength. This tremendously facilitated the struggle waged by the peoples for their liberation and favored the successes of the resistance movement. At the final stage of World War II, 8.5 million Soviet troops were fighting abroad. The armed forces of the USSR liberated fully or partially 13 European and Asian countries. More than 1 million Soviet people lost their lives for the sake of victory, fulfilling their sacred liberation mission. The fact that national units and formations of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Rumania were raised and trained on Soviet territory was of major political and military significance. By the end of the war the overall number of such forces had reached 555,000 men.

The authors briefly cover the final stage of the war and the defeat of militaristic Japan. The main emphasis here is put on the entry of the USSR and Mongolia in the war against Japan and the defeat of the Kwantung army. These operations were carried out by the Soviet Union in accordance with its obligations as an ally, assumed at the Crimean conference. Furthermore, the USSR was guided by the aspiration to ensure the security of its Far Eastern borders, bearing in mind the long years of anti-Soviet aggressive policy pursued by militaristic Japan. During World War II the Japanese military grossly violated the neutrality pact. It organized provocations on the border, sank or captured our vessels and constantly threatened the Soviet Union with a powerful army deployed close to its borders. Therefore, the entry of the USSR into the war against Japan was a historically inevitable step, dictated by its state interests and the great and humane objective of the struggle for universal peace and social progress.

For a long time a discussion has been taking place in bourgeois literature on the contribution of the Soviet Union to the victory over Japan. The Western

authors are doing everything possible to belittle its significance. The book suitably rebuffs such falsifications: the defeat of the Kwantung army, the best-trained and equipped Japanese group of land forces, deprived Japan of its principal means of further waging the war and forced it to surrender. "Without the Soviet Union," the authors emphasize, "the United States and Great Britain would have been unable successfully to resolve this problem" (p 560).

The decisive participation of the USSR in the defeat of militaristic Japan was of the greatest possible international significance, above all on the level of the struggle for peace and social progress in Asia. Together with units of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Army, the Soviet armed forces liberated vast areas of northeastern and northern China from Japanese occupation. This enabled the Communist Party of China to create a revolutionary base in Manchuria. Subsequently this factor played a decisive role in the course of the national liberation struggle waged by the Chinese people against the Kuomintang dictatorship. The liberation of North Korea by the Soviet troops, with the participation of Korean partisans, also created favorable conditions for the free manifestation of the will of the people's masses and the establishment of its democratic government in the north of the country. The successes of the national liberation struggle waged by the peoples of Indochina, Burma, Indonesia and other Southeast Asian countries, contributed to the unconditional surrender of militaristic Japan.

In the concluding part of the work, the authors draw attention to the program for the postwar structure of the world, which was developed in the course of the war by the governments of the members of the anti-Hitlerite coalition at the conferences in Teheran, the Crimea and Berlin and in the course of founding the United Nations. Major political problems were resolved, such as designing the sociopolitical nature of the future of Germany, the boundaries separating European countries, the prospects of postwar cooperation among the allies, etc. The principle-minded and consistent Soviet international policy and its party-oriented Marxist-Leninist nature contributed to the political strengthening of the successes achieved through the armed struggle waged by the Soviet people and its armed forces.

The decisions on the postwar structure of the world, jointly made by the USSR, the United States and Great Britain, could have become the base for a stable system of international security. However, the cold war which was unleashed by the Western countries delayed the reaching of this objective for a long time. It was only in the 1970s, during the period of detente, which had marked a radical change in the ratio of forces in the world, that the results of World War II in Europe were definitively codified. The progressive and peaceable international course pursued by the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist community, on whose initiative the Helsinki Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe was held, and at which the leaders of 33 European countries, the United States and Canada signed the Final Act, was of determining importance in this connection.

Since the end of the 1970s the most reactionary imperialist circles, those of the United States above all, have begun openly to implement adventuristic and hegemonistic plans, trying to establish their own order in the world through

naked force. Such a policy proves not only the deliberate rejection on their part of the realities of the existing international situation but a total forgetfulness of the results and lessons of World War II. The results of the war convincingly prove the victory of socialism, progress and humanism over the shock forces of imperialist reaction. The outcome of the war proved not only the viability but the economic and moral-political superiority of the socialist social system. The comprehensive experience of the CPSU in leading the armed struggle of the socialist fatherland and achieving victory in the war is of international importance: it has entered the treasury of the international worker and national liberation movements and is a serious warning to the forces of reaction and aggression which are trying to unleash a new war.

The defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism had a profound impact on the entire course of global development. Imperialism came out of the war greatly weakened. It lost its former positions and the area under its domination narrowed. Socialism came out of the struggle much stronger, with increased prestige and influence in the world arena. The world socialist system was formed and has already become the most powerful and dynamic force in the contemporary world. The international labor movement has significantly broadened and strengthened. The peoples of the colonial and dependent countries have awakened to life: having actively participated in the liberation struggle against the fascist aggressors and realized their actual situation in the world, they were unwilling to tolerate the power of imperialist mother countries any longer. The national liberation movement which developed led in subsequent decades to the gain of political independence by virtually all countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The authors substantiatedly emphasize the tremendous importance of the active foreign political course charted by the members of the socialist community in preventing a new world war. As Comrade K. U. Chernenko has pointed out, "success in preserving and strengthening peace largely depends on the extent of the influence of the socialist countries in the world arena...." Peace has been preserved for nearly 40 years at the cost of their dedicated efforts and the efforts of all progressive forces on earth.

In interpreting world developments, past and present, and analyzing their prospects for the future and finding in past events facts corresponding to current affairs, the scientists in the socialist countries are helping the people better to understand the history of their fatherlands, to see who the true enemies and true defenders of peace are and to realize that the socialist community alone, together with the peoples and democratic masses of other countries, can ensure firm international security.

The work under review is quite extensive and saturated with historical data and profound conclusions. It is an eloquent example of the fruitful cooperation among social scientists of socialist countries and confirms the unity of their views and methodological principles and firm support of the Marxist-Leninist method of analysis.

The introduction written by the International Editorial Collegium emphasizes the main trend of the study: "The last war is now history. However, the

people remember it and are trying to interpret the lessons of the past. They would like to know why mankind found itself plunged into a blood-shedding slaughter, the reasons for which it could not be prevented and what were the forces which defeated the aggressor" (p 5). The book provides a substantiated answer to this question: "...The people turn to their history in order to prevent an even more terrible tragedy for mankind" (p 567). Such are the final words in this interesting and quite timely work.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/3

WHEN THE SECRET BECOMES OBVIOUS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 84 (signed to press 15 Oct 84) pp 125-127

[Review by Yu. Novopashin, candidate of philosophical sciences, of the book "Krakh 'Operatsii Poloniya.' 1980-1981 Gg." [The Failure of "Operation Polonia," 1980-1981] by V. P. Trubnikov. Documentary essay. Izdatel'stvo Agentstva Pechati Novosti, Moscow, 1983, 253 pp]

[Text] The intensity of the class struggle waged between socialism and capitalism in the international arena has increased and the nature of the class struggle become more complex in recent years. The reactionary imperialist circles, American above all, are relying on a policy of counteracting the process of detente, promoting new rounds in the arms race and engaging in a dangerous confrontation with the socialist world. It is within the framework of this policy that all possible attempts at undermining the new system from within and weakening the unity among fraternal peoples and states have become noticeably energized. As the French reactionary publicist Michel Tatu has acknowledged in characterizing the "philosophy" of today's U.S. president and his advisers, all such attempts pursue a single objective: "If possible to reduce to naught by peaceful means a system which is essentially considered harmful and aggressive" (FOREIGN AFFAIRS, no 3, vol 61, 1983, p 592).

The perennial strategic objective of world imperialism, headed by the United States, is "to reduce to naught" or perhaps only to hinder the development of the new system and to undermine the international unity of the socialist countries. This objective is pursued regardless of whether or not they try, as they are doing now, to organize a total "crusade" against the socialist countries or operate, as in the past, on the basis of the doctrine of selective "bridge-building." In other words, the tactical surroundings of anticommunist strategy may vary while its essence consists of the aspiration to encourage a retreat from the principles of scientific socialism and to make use of any difficulty or error in the activities of Marxist-Leninist parties and governments of socialist countries with a view to provoking social discontent and the manifestation of nationalism, particularly in the form of anti-Sovietism.

Naturally, those in the bourgeois camp who promote such a foreign policy course toward the socialist countries prefer not to publicize the subversive nature of this course, ascribing it as part of "communist propaganda" fabrications. However, when the secret becomes open the sinister role played by the American and other theoreticians and practitioners of anticommunism and the henchmen of political, economic and "psychological" warfare waged against the commonwealth of socialist countries becomes particularly clear. In this connection, we can only welcome the work by V. P. Trubnikov, the genre of which the author himself describes as a documentary essay and which is based on interesting and until now materials largely unfamiliar to our readers concerning the 1980-1981 Polish events. "The comprehensive interpretation of the nature and forms of the acute development of the crisis, which began with the stormy events of the middle of 1980," the author writes, "is continuing to this day, not only in Poland but among Marxists in other countries as well. This is understandable, for the only possible answer to the questions which were raised by life itself at that time could be provided by a close study, layer after layer and in the light of newly discovered facts and circumstances, of the conflicting and confused picture of those 16 months most difficult for the Polish people" (p 64).

When we study the reasons for the 1980-1981 events in Poland we must proceed from the actual correlation between internal (errors and blunders in PZPR policy) and external (subversive imperialist activities) factors and their interconnection. In pointing this out, the author explains that in his work he has paid "most of the attention to the activities of counterrevolutionary forces and their imperialist allies and inspirers" (p 9).

The author begins the consideration of this aspect of the problem with a description of a top secret document of the previous administration in Washington, which found its way into the Western press, entitled "United States Plan for the Destabilization of Poland." This plan was submitted for approval by then-President Carter by his national security adviser and noted ideologue of anticommunism Z. Brzezinski on 17 March 1978. It described knowledgeably and in detail the means and methods for U.S. interference in Polish domestic affairs and means of disorganizing Poland's entire social life. It offered a most detailed scenario for the preparations for and making a coup d'etat in that country. The author traces in chronological sequence the stages through which the "Brzezinski Plan," code-named "Operation Polonia," was approved by the U.S. senior authorities. For entirely understandable reasons, the American administration tried to conceal the fact of the existence of such a plan and its direct involvement in its implementation. However, the publication of the plan for secret subversive activities against socialist Poland in the Spanish press in February 1983, a plan which, as the author emphasizes, "brought such hardships to the 36 million-strong nation, exposes the entire extent of U.S. participation in giving the Polish crisis its catastrophic nature" (p 13). Incidentally, Washington did not refute the Madrid publication. Nor could it, however, for the present U.S. administration has long dropped the fig leaf of "nonintervention" in Polish affairs and has openly converted to a policy of destabilizing the situation in Poland with the help of blackmail, economic sanctions, an unparalleled anti-Polish propaganda campaign and other forms of subversive activities. The author extensively discusses problems related to

the activities of counterrevolutionary forces within Poland itself. These forces maintained close contacts with intelligence and propaganda centers in the West, acted in concert with them although frequently concealing their antinational and antisocialist activities behind extreme patriotic and pseudo-Marxist phraseology. The author has collected curious and instructive data on the counterrevolutionary leaders who had taken over the leadership of the now-disbanded Solidarity Trade Union. What is instructive in this respect is that all of these Kurons, Mikhniks, Modzelevskis and others were experienced and suitably trained to fight socialism, for which reason they were a serious opponent who was long underestimated by the previous PZPR leadership. It must be openly admitted that the cost of this underestimating was high. Such self-promoted pretenders to the role of spokesman for the interests of the working people were able to cause the PZPR and the cause of socialism in Poland a great deal of harm through their refined demagoguery and destructive actions ("striking terrorism") conducted on a scale of the entire country.

For a while such "fighters for the workers' cause" strengthened within Polish society their influence, resting on errors in building socialism, and successfully speculating with the accumulation and intensification of such errors, which led to increased social discontent. As the author points out, "the violated relations between the PZPR and the authorities, on the one hand, and significant toiling masses on the other, made themselves felt ever more tangibly. However," he assumes, "without the purposeful work of the counterrevolutionary elements such a discontent would not have developed into destructive actions but found other, perhaps sharply critical but constructive methods" (p 38).

The book provides extensive information on the creation by the Polish counterrevolutionary underground of "alternative structures" or "antipower" in the country. It was believed that the first brick in the building of such structures was the so-called "Workers' Defense Committee" (KOR) which was created in September 1976 and which subsequently became notorious as the mainspring of the 1980-1981 counterrevolutionary events. At the beginning of 1983, however, it was discovered that the KOR had a "master"--a most profoundly clandestine organization which had not appeared even a single time in the open in the Polish political arena throughout the time of the crisis. This referred to the "Polish Independent Agreement" (PIA), which was drafted at the very beginning of 1976. The organizational system of the PIA was substantially similar to the principle of activities and structure of Masonic lodges and the Mafia. As it became clear, the PIA performed triple functions: first, it was the organizer and coordinator of activities of the antisocialist opposition in all of its manifestations and aspects: clandestine, semiclandestine and open; second, as a political leader of the entire underground network during the stage of preparations for the counterrevolutionary action and during the events themselves; finally, the PIA was the main channel of contacts between the Polish counterrevolution and the CIA and the other special services.

There is obviously no need to comment on all the documentary data contained in the book on the implanting by the Polish counterrevolution of its own "self-management" organs in industry and efforts to create "other alternative structures," which were openly named in the aftermath of the congress of

Solidarity, which was held in Gdansk in the autumn of 1981, aimed at taking over the entire power of the state with a view to eliminating the gains of socialism in Poland. Let us only note that such efforts to "shift the power" yielded the opposite results: they proved to be the catalyst of a process which began in the autumn of 1981 of withdrawal by rank-and-file participants from the policy pursued by the Solidarity leadership, which was increasingly exposing its antisocialist nature. The counterrevolutionaries, as the author emphasizes, "clearly underestimated the depth of the attachment of the bulk of the Polish working class and the other groups of working people to the principles and foundations of socialism" (p 156).

Despite its entire contradictory nature, the process of disappointment experienced by the Polish people with Solidarity increased. Realizing this, the counterrevolutionary staffs charted a course of fast seizure of power and, as the author points out, to this effect "drastically accelerated the further disorganization of the already weakened economic and political structures of socialism, trying to 'turn loose' the ship of state to the maximal extent and within the shortest possible time. Roughly from mid-November events developed particularly rapidly and purposefully" (p 174).

It was precisely at that time that the extremist organization "Independent Polish Confederation" became energized. From the very beginning its purpose was to serve as a reserve of the counterrevolution. By that time it had set up in Warsaw and other large cities assault detachments staffed by its own "fighters." It was precisely then that the leaders of the "trade union" unilaterally broke the talks with the authorities on the subject of a national accord front. The author discusses in detail the final 15 months of the activities of the conspirators, particularly concentrating, first of all, on the Radom meeting of its leadership on 3 December 1981, at which a decision was made to overthrow the socialist system in Poland in the nearest possible future and, secondly, the feverish practical preparations which followed in the various areas for a decisive offensive to be mounted by the counterrevolutionary forces and, thirdly, the Gdansk meeting of the All-Poland Solidarity Committee on 11-12 December, which issued provocative ultimata which were clearly unacceptable to the constitutional Polish authorities. The government was given a deadline--17 December. On that day mass demonstrations were to be held in support of the Gdansk ultimatum, which was to develop into the direct seizure of the most important strategic sites. It was thus that the putschists led Poland to the brink of the precipice and into a fratricidal war. Under those circumstances, was there a chance of sparing the Polish people from the developing threat of bloodshed without the use of emergency measures by the state authorities? "No," the author emphasizes, "at that time this was no longer possible" (p 210).

A state of emergency, as we know, was proclaimed. Precisely at midnight on 13 December the higher constitutional authorities of the Polish People's Republic proclaimed martial law throughout the country and set up a Military Council for National Salvation. All efforts on the part of domestic and foreign enemies of socialist Poland to push the masses into the struggle against its decisions failed. In other words, "Operation Polonia" ended with full and justifiable collapse.

Unquestionably, the strong side of the book on "Operation Polonia" is its firm documentary base, which allows the reader to gain a sufficiently complete idea of this broadly planned subversive operation and to understand a number of complexities related to the crisis events in Poland in 1980-1981. However, one consideration should be expressed on this subject: the documentary data cited in the book on the coordinated subversive activities of imperialism and counterrevolutionary forces in Poland are so extensive and eloquent that the somewhat uninformed reader may develop the impression that it was precisely these factors that were virtually the only reasons for the chaos and anarchy in Poland during that time. Yet the author himself cautions with full justification--for it is a question of a multiple-system society of transition from capitalism to socialism--against such a view, pointing out the need for a specific consideration of the complex, interwoven and sometimes conflicting factors and events involved in the Polish social crisis (see pp 7-8).

This precisely is the attitude of the Polish communists when they turn to the reasons and lessons of the 1980-1981 events in their country. This was reemphasized in the documents of the all-Polish PZPR conference, which was held in Warsaw on 16-18 March 1984. "The contradictions which appear in the complex process of profound changes," we read in the declaration of the conference "For What We Fight and What Our Aspirations Are," comprehensively piled up and developed into dangerous conflicts and crises. Their common feature was the weakened ties between the party and the working people and the loss of worker trust. This stemmed from violations of the principles of socialism, the laws of socioeconomic development and the Leninist norms of party life and principles of popular rule and the weakening of class vigilance. The enemies of socialism wanted to use all of this for their purposes mercilessly and cynically. The imperialist forces, the U.S. government in particular, were seeking a possibility of using Poland, which was weakened and torn by contradictions and threatened by internal confrontation, to weaken the socialist commonwealth and international security."

It is only the specific consideration of the entire set of such problems that provide an idea of the true picture of Polish events in 1980 and 1981. We repeat, however, that the author especially stipulates in his preface that his purpose is not to cover all the happenstances of this dramatic period in the life of the fraternal Polish people. He has dealt successfully with the topic of his study by presenting in an intelligible form the material needed by and important to the Soviet reader in a good literary style. Let us add that his documentary essay has met with a broad response in the Polish press.

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

5003
CSO: 1802/3

BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 84 (signed to press 15 Oct 84) p 128

[Text] 1. "Ikh Prostota i Chelovechnost'" [Their Simplicity and Humaneness]. Compiled by S. Vinogradov. Sixth edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 367 pp with illustrations.

2. "Vospominaniya o V. I. Lenine" [Recollections About V. I. Lenin]. In five volumes. Vol 3. CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism. Editorial collegium: M. P. Mchedlov et al. Third volume compiled by G. S. Zhuk and V. S. Sergeyeva. Third edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 526 pp with illustrations.

3. Ul'yanov, D. I. "Ocherki Raznykh Let" [Essays From Different Years]. Recollections, correspondence, articles. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 335 pp with illustrations.

4. Chernenko, K. U. "Vysokiy Grazhdanskiy Dolg Narodnogo Kontrolera" [The High Civic Duty of the People's Controller]. Speech delivered at the All-Union Conference of People's Controllers on 5 October 1984. V. A. Pechenev and V. V. Pribytkov responsible for publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 15 pp.

5. Gromyko, A. A. "Zashchitit' Ustoi Vseobshchego Mira" [Preserving the Foundations of Universal Peace]. Speech at the 39th United Nations General Assembly session on 27 September 1984. A. S. Chernyshev responsible for publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 31 pp.

6. Andropov, Yu. V. "Leninizm--Neischerpayemyy Istochnik Revolyutsionnoy Energii i Tvorchestva Mass" [Leninism--Inexhaustible Source of Revolutionary Energy and Creativity of the Masses]. Selected speeches and articles. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 559 pp, one illustration and photograph.

7. "Geroicheskiy Put' Bor'by i Istoricheskikh Sversheniy" [Heroic Path of Struggle and Historical Accomplishments]. Editorial collegium: P. A. Rodionov (Head) et al. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 351 pp.

8. Zis', A. Ya. "Estetika: Ideologiya i Metodologiya" [Aesthetics: Ideology and Methodology]. USSR Academy of Sciences. All-Union Scientific

Research Art Institute, USSR Ministry of Culture. Nauka, Moscow, 1984, 237 pp.

9. "Kommunisticheskoye Vospitaniye" [Communist Education]. Dictionary. L. N. Ponomarev and Zh. T. Toshchenko general editors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 302 pp.

10. Mareyev, S. N. "Dialektika Logicheskogo i Istoricheskogo i Konkretny Istorizm K. Marksa" [The Dialectics of the Logical and the Historical and K. Marx's Specific Historicism]. Nauka, Moscow, 1984, 158 pp.

11. "Marksizm-Leninizm o Dialektike Revolyutsii i Kontrrevolyutsii" [Marxism-Leninism on the Dialectics of Revolution and Counterrevolution]. From the experience of the struggle against counterrevolution and contemporaneity. Authors: M. P. Mcherdlov, V. G. Mosolov, N. Yu. Kolpinskiy et al. Editors: M. P. Mcherdlov et al. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 382 pp. Under the supervision of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

12. Oyzerman, T. I. "Glavnyye Filosofskiye Napravleniya" [Main Philosophical Trends]. Theoretical Study of the Historical-Philosophical Process. Second revised edition. Mysl', Moscow, 1984, 303 pp.

13. "Podvig Naroda" [The Exploits of the People]. Monument of the Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945. Compiled by V. A. Golikov, general editor. Second enlarged edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 341 pp with illustrations.

14. "Sovetskiy Soyuz na Mezhdunarodnykh Konferentsiyakh Perioda Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny, 1941-1945 Gg." [The Soviet Union in International Conferences During the Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945]. Collection of documents. Vol 5. "United Nations Conference in San Francisco (25 April-26 June 1945). Vol 6. "The Berlin (Potsdam) Conference of Heads of the Three Allied Powers--The USSR, the United States and Great Britain (17 July-2 August 1945)." USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Main editorial commission: A. A. Gromyko (editor in chief), I. N. Zemskov, V. A. Kryuchkov, Sh. P. Sanakoyev, P. P. Sevost'yanov (responsible secretary), S. L. Tikhvinskiy and K. U. Chernenko. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984. Vol 5, 654 pp; Vol 6, 511 pp with illustrations.

15. "Sovremennyy Kapitalizm: Politicheskiye Otnosheniya i Instituty Vlasti" [Contemporary Capitalism: Political Relations and Power Institutions]. USSR Academy of Sciences. Institute of World Economics and International Relations. By a group of authors. S. P. Peregudov responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1984, 336 pp.

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

5003

CSO: 1802/3

INDEX TO KOMMUNIST, NO. 15, OCTOBER 1984

[The following index, compiled by JPRS, is provided as a service to its consumers.]

A

ASEAN

Philippine participation, 131

C

Capitalism

evils of, 10

CEMA

economic conference, 8

Chernenko, K. U.

speech to people's controllers October 1984, 13

CIA

activities in Poland, 149

Communist International

1st International, 84

2nd International, 85

D

Duan, Le

July 1984 6th CPV CC Plenum speech, 69

Vietnam, economic development of, 69

Duclos, Jacques

article on French-Soviet relations, 113

E

Economy, domestic

gross output indicator faulty, 58

scarce consumer goods, 63

socialist management indicators, 53

F

France

relations with USSR, 113

G

Great October Revolution, 98

impact on the world, 1

Great Patriotic War, 6

I

Ideology

- communist peace efforts, 109
- contradictions, 107
- development of international socialism, 98
- international communist activities, 4
- lack of party and state discipline, 26
- Marxism-Leninism on direct social production, 41
- Marxist-Leninist aesthetics, 134
- socialist revolution, 41
- world communist movement, 108

Imperialism, 6

- U.S., 8

J

Japan

- USSR role in defeating in World War II, 143

K

Kampuchea, 79

L

Laos, 79

M

Magallona, Merlin M.

- article on Philippines, 123

P

People's control

- alcohol abuse, 17
- bribe-taking and speculation, 17
- effectiveness of, 13

Philippines

- multinational corporation activities in, 123
- role of world banks, 123

Poland

- CIA activities, 149
- counterrevolutionary activities in, 147
- Operation Polonia, 147
- reactionary nature of Solidarity, 147
- Solidarity, 147
- U.S.destabilization activities, 148

S

Solidarity

- activities in Poland, 147

Solomentsev, M.

- article on party control, 22

South Vietnam

- economy during transition, 78

U

United States

- "Brzezinski Plan", 148
- destabilization activities in Poland, 148

V

Vietnam

- cadre problems, 83
- Chinese expansion and hegemonism in, 82
- cooperation with CEMA, 79
- cooperation with USSR, 79
- economic development, 69
- relations with Kampuchea, 79
- relations with Laos, 79

W

Williams, Albert Rice, 1

World War II

- book on events, lessons of, 138
- bourgeois revisionism, 138
- effects on socialism and imperialism, 145
- ideological aspects, 138
- Red Army participation, 140
- relevance to contemporary events, 138
- USSR role in defeating Japan, 143

END