JPRS-UKO-86-007

16 APRIL 1986

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 18, DECEMBER 1985

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.

JPRS-UKO-86-007

16 April 1986

USSR REPORT

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 18, December 1985

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

CONTENTS

REALITIES OF THE CONTEMPORARY AGE

BOOK REVIEWS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

PUBLICATION DATA

English title	:	TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 18 December 1985
Russian title	:	KOMMUNIST
Author(s)	:	
Editor(s)	:	R. I. Kosolapov
Publishing House	:	Izdatelstvo "PRAVDA"
Place of Publication	:	Moscow
Date of Publication	:	December 1985
Signed to press	:	11 December 1985
Copies	:	930,000
COPYRIGHT	:	Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

NEW DOCUMENT BY FRIEDRICH ENGELS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 3-7

[Text] The following is a first publication in the Russian language of the full text of the rough draft of the first chapter, first section, of "Anti-Duhring," which subsequently Engels combined with the second chapter as a general "Introduction" to the entire work.

"Anti-Duhring" is an outstanding work of scientific communism and a true encyclopedia of Marxist knowledge. In assessing its significance, V. I. Lenin wrote: "...this is an analysis of the greatest problems in the areas of philosophy, the natural sciences and the social sciences....It is an amazingly meaningful and instructive book" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 2, p 11).

The immediate reason for the writing of this work was the urgent need felt by Engels to criticize the views of the German petit bourgeois ideolog E. Duhring, which had become quite popular in the mid-1870s among the German Social Democrats. Engels' work was of major importance in defending the ideological purity of the entire international labor movement. Furthermore, his criticism of the "all-embracing" theoretical structure by Duhring enabled Engels to sum up the results of more than 30 years of development of Marxist theory and systematically present its basic concepts and take a substantial step forward in the development of this great revolutionary theory and its disemmination among workers.

Engels began work on "Anti-Duhring" in the middle of 1876. That autumn he wrote and sent the first part of the text to VORWARTS, the central organ of the Socialist Workers' Party of Germany, which began publishing it in January 1877. It was precisely at that time that the rough draft of the "Introduction" published here was written. This document is of great importance in the study of the history of the creation of "Anti-Duhring." It clearly shows the course followed in Engels' intensive efforts on this work.

The main problem which Engels set himself in the "Introduction" to his work was to depict the historical foundations for the appearance of scientific communism. He considers some characteristics in the development of utopian socialism and communism and classical German philosophy as the theoretical prerequisite for Marxism. The study made by Engels indicates once again,

convincingly, that as the ideology of the most progressive class Marxism could appear only on the basis of the critical mastery of the highest achievements of human thought and world culture.

The final and unfinished part of the work notes the fast development of capitalist production and the aggravation of class antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, which Engels considered a social prerequisite for the creation of a scientific theory for the communist reorganization of society.

The manuscript of the rough draft of the "Introduction" to "Anti-Duhring" was stored with data on "Dialectics of Nature," by Engels himself. A section of the rough draft was published in Russian by the K. Marx and F. Engels Institute in the work by F. Engels "Anti-Duhring," Gosizdat, Moscow-Leningrad, 1928. In its original language, the full version of the rough draft was included in the publication Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe. F. Engels. "Herrn Eugen Duhrings Umwalzung der Wissenschaft. Dialektik der Natur." Sonderausgabe. Moskau-Leningrad, 1935. The most substantial differences between the rough draft and the final draft of the "Introduction" are noted in footnotes included in vol 20 of the second edition of the works of K. Marx and F. Engels. The full rough draft of the "Introduction" is included in vol 5 of the Selected Works by K. Marx and F. Engels, in 9 volumes.

The document was prepared for publication by N. Kolpinskiy and V. Kuznetsov, senior scientific associates, CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

Rough Draft of the 'Introduction' to 'Anti-Duhring'

Although it essentially appeared from observations of class contradictions between rich and poor and workers and exploiters in a given society, in terms of its theoretical form modern socialism initially represented a more systematic and further development of the principles formulated by the great French enlighteners of the 18th Century, for the first expounders of this socialism, Morelli and Mably,[1] also belonged to the enlighteners. Like any new theory, contemporary socialism must proceed above all from the available ideological data, although its roots are in material facts.

The great people who wrote of the approaching great revolution in France themselves acted in an extremely revolutionary manner. They did not recognize any acknowledged authorities. Everything: religion, the understanding of nature, the governmental system, and society, was subjected to the most merciless criticism. Everything had to justify its existence to the supreme court of reason or cease to exist. The thinking mind became the only criterion. This was a time when, in the expression of Hegel, the world was put at the head of everything,[2] initially in the sense that the head of man and concepts discovered through the mind were also to be acknowledged as the foundations of all human views, action and social relations and, subsequently, in the sense that the moment the total contradiction between reality and these concepts was established, everything was actually turned upside down. All previous forms of society and state and all traditional views were rejected as unreasonable and lumped together; until that time the world was guided by

stupid prejudices; now, for the first time, the sun rose and the kingdom of the mind came to be, and everything of the past became worthy only of pity and scorn.

We now know that the kingdom of the mind was nothing other than the idealized kingdom of the bourgeoisie and that the eternal justice which was proclaimed then was correspondingly implemented in bourgeois justice and that the kingdom of the mind--Rousseau's social contract[3]--turned out and, in terms of practice, could be nothing but a bourgeois democratic republic. The great philosophers of the 18th Century, like their predecessors, were unable to go beyond the limitations of their own age.

However, along with the conflict among the nobility, the monarchy and the bourgeoisie, there was a general contradiction between exploiters and exploited, between the poor working people and the rich parasites. It was precisely this circumstance that enabled the members of the bourgeoisie to act as representatives of suffering mankind; also extant, although underdeveloped and not considered first-rank, was the contradiction between workers and capitalists. This motivated some people to make their criticism even greater: to extend the demand of equality not only in terms of political rights but social status and to demand the abolishment of class differences. The two trends became interwoven in Saint-Simon and the second dominated the thinking of French ascetic communists; in the country where capitalist production had become most developed, developed the second trend as a system very close to French materialism.

From the very beginning, this contradiction was inherent in bourgeois development. There were T. Muntzer,[4] the levelers,[5] T. More's "Utopia," and others.

The new reorganization of society must also be based on the eternal laws of intelligence and justice. However, these laws are different, as the sky is from the earth, from similar laws proclaimed by the bourgeois enlighteners. The world which these enlighteners structured in accordance with their principles is as unreasonable and unfair, for which reason it too was dumped, like all previous forms of society and the state. The reason for which true reason and justice had not prevailed until then was that they simply had not become properly known. There simply was no brilliant person to appear and know the truth and whose appearance would not be a necessary, an inevitable event related to human progress but a purely lucky accident. Such a brilliant person could have been born just as successfully 500 years ago, thus saving mankind 5 centuries of suffering and error.

This concept is profoundly characteristic of all English, French and first German socialists, including Weitling.[6] Socialism is an expression of absolute truth, reason and justice and the moment it is discovered it will conquer the entire world; as to when precisely it will be discovered, this becomes a matter of pure accident. Absolute reason, truth and justice vary with every individual founder of one school or another--compare Owen, Fourrier, the followers of Saint-Simon, Louis Blanc, Proudhon, Pierre Leroux,[7] and Weitling; since for each one of them the criterion of truth and justice is his own subjective judgement, volume of knowledge and extent of development of

the mind, there can be no outcome other than the elimination of distictions among them. In order for socialism to become a science it had to be set on real grounds and have a firm and inflexible foundation. This was accomplished by Marx.

Meanwhile, alongside French 18th Century philosophy, and subsequent to it, there appeared the latest German philosophy, which culminated with Hegel. Its greatet merit was a return to dialectics as the highest form of thinking. The ancient Greek philosophers were all innate, spontaneous dialecticians, and Aristotle, who was the Hegel of the ancient world, had already studied the most essential forms of dialectical thinking. Conversely, although here as well dialectics had its brilliant representatives (such as Descartes and Spinosa[8]), it degenerated, particularly under English influence, into a metaphysical way of thinking, which also affected the 18th Century French. Metaphysical thinking looked at objects and their mental reflections as separate concepts, one following the other and independent of the other, as topics of study set, and frozen once and for all. Something either exists or does not; an object cannot be what it is and, at the same time, something else. This way of thinking, acceptable on the surface, was a metaphysical way of thinking. Conversely, dialectics is not satisfied with it but considers objects and concepts in their interconnection, in their interrelationship and in their interaction and change, determined by such interraction, in their appearance, development and death. However, since objects do not exist in the world by themselves but are interrelated and influence each other, changing, appearing and disappearing, it is easy to understand that metaphysical thinking, although accurate in some quite extensive but nevertheless limited areas, the size of which is determined by line beyond which it becomes one-sided, limited and abstract and falls into insoluable contradictions which can be resolved only with the help of dialectics. In daily life, for example, we know whether or not an animal exists. A more thorough study, however, reveals that it is absolutely impossible to determine precisely as of what point it begins to exist. The jurists know this and they have vainly tried to establish the point beyond which the destruction of a human embryo is considered murder (in precisely the same way that it is impossible to determine the moment of physiological death, which is a lengthy multiple-stage process, as any manual of physiology stipulates). Equally, any organic being at each instant is both itself and not itself; at each instant some cells die and new cells are formed, so that the individual is always the same yet, always not the same. An accurate concept of the universe and its development and the development of mankind and the refection of this development in the human mind can be obtained only dialectically, by paying constant attention to the overall interaction between appearance and disappearance and between progressive and regressive change. That is precisely the way the lastest German philosophy acted immediately. Kant turned Newton's solar system, which is eternal and unchanging, after the initial impetus had been provided, into a historical process of the appearance of the sun and all planets from an initial foggy mass. Fifty years later this hypothesis was mathematically substantiated in all its details by Laplace[9] and is now acknowledged by all natural scientists. Hegel completed this philosophy by creating a system in which the entire natural, historical and spiritual world is presented as a process, i.e., in a state of continuous movement, change, transformation and development. From this viewpoint the history of mankind stopped appearing

like a wild chaos of senseless violence, equally worthy of the now matured mind of the philosopher of nothing but condemnation and fastest possible rejection when exposed to the bright sun of eternal truth; conversely, it appeared as a process of development of mankinds itself, and the task of philosophy was reduced to discovering the consecutive stages of this process in the midst of all its wanderings and trace its internal pattern among all such seeming randomnesses.

Whether or not Hegel himself resolved this problem is a matter of indifference to us. His merit was that he raised it. However, he was totally unable to resolve it, for he was an idealist, i.e., he did not consider thinking a reflection of objects but, conversely, that objects in their development were merely embodied reflections of some kind of "idea" which existed somewhere even before the appearance of the world. It was precisely for this reason and because of the subjective limitations of its creator that the Hegelian system collapsed.

The Hegelian system was the final and most complete form of philosophy, for philosophy is considered to be a separate science claiming to stand above all other sciences. With it all philosophy collapsed. All that remained was the dialectical way of thinking and understanding of the entire natural, historical and intellectual world as an endlessly moving, changing world, in a permanent process of appearance and disappearance. Today not only philosophy but all sciences are faced with the demand of discovering the laws of motion of this eternal process of transformation in each separate area. This was the legacy which Hegelian philosophy left to its descendents.

Meanwhile, the development of capitalist production advanced with seven-league steps, particularly in its homeland, England. Antagonism between bourgeois and proletarians became encreasingly sharp and in 1842 the Chartist movement reached its peak and facts indicated with increasing clarity the falseness of bourgeois political economic theories. In France the 1834 uprising in Lyon as well proclaimed the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. The English and French socialist theories assumed historical significance and could not fail to be reflected in German criticism, although in Germany the production process was merely beginning to exceed the framework of agriculture. Theoretical socialism, which now made its appearance less in Germany than among Germans, had, consequently, to borrow all of its data....(the manuscript ends at this point--editor).

FOOTNOTES

1. Morelli and G. Mabli were representatives of French 18th Century utopian communism.

2. In his "Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science," Engels includes the proper quotation from Hegel's "Philosophy of History" (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 19, pp 189-190).

3. According to the theory of the social contract, which was supported by J.-J. Rousseau, the French philosopher and writer (1712-1778), the state appeared as a result of a contract among people, which stipulates the voluntary reliquising by individuals by some of their natural rights in favor of governmental power, the purpose of which is to protect the property and safety of the citizens.

4. T. Muntzer (circa 1490-1525) was a German revolutionary and a leader and idealog of the peasant-plebian masses during the Reformation and the Peasant War of 1524-1526 in Germany.

5. Engels is referring to the "true levelers" ("true equalizers") or "diggers," who were representatives of the extreme leftist movement during the period of the 17th Century English bourgeois revolution, who called for the abolition of private property on earth and theelimination of exploitation.

6. W. Weitling (1808-1871) was a noted leader of the German labor movement during the period of its birth and a utopian communist.

7. L. Blanc (1811-1882) was a French utopian socialist. P. Broudhon (1809-1865) was a French petit bourgeois socialist and theoretician of anarchism. P. Leroux (1797-1871) was one of the founders of christian socialism.

8. R. Descartes (1596-1650) was a French philosopher, mathematician, physicist and physiologist. B. Spinosa (1632-1677) was a Dutch philosopher.

9. Kant's nebular hypothesis (from the Latin nebula--fog) stipulated that the solar system had developed from an initial foggy mass. It was presented in his work " Universal Natural History and the Theory of the Sky," published in 1755. Laplace's "Presentation of the System of the World" was published in 1796.

5003
CSO: 1802/6

EDITORIAL -- RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FATE OF THE WORLD

AU150753 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 8-14

[Uppercase passages published in italics]

[Text] The Soviet-American meeting at the highest level was anticipated by the entire world with mixed feelings of hope and apprehension. The hopes were engendered by the activation of the peace-loving policy of the Soviet state on a broad front of international relations, a policy that has become obvious to all peoples in the recent period. The demands of the April (1985) CPSU Central Committee plenum to spare no efforts to prevent the forces of militarism and aggression from prevailing in the world arena and to strive for an immediate end to the arms race and for providing a fresh motive force for the process of disarmament and development of equal, correct, and civilized relations between states were embodied in concrete acts and large-scale peaceful initiatives. The energetic and purposeful foreign policy course of the land of the soviets inspired the people everywhere with a new confidence about possibilities for strengthening peace and international security and ensuring the conditions for calm and peaceful work without fear for their and their children's future. Broad circles of the democratic public proceeded from the belief that the dialogue between the highest leaders in the present difficult situation represents in itself a stabilizing factor. But at the same time they had no illusions about the U. S. policy, which has been by no means peace-loving in recent years, and they saw that the arms race unleashed by Washington is intensifying and that the threat of war is not declining. The actions of the United States could not but create the impression of an insufficient sense of responsibility for the fate of the world.

In that situation life itself and the will of the world public confronted the participants of the meeting--M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U. S. President R. Reagan--with the following main and fundamental question: What can and must be done to stop the unprecedented arms race that has developed on earth, to stop the spreading of this arms race to outer space, to release mankind from the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, and to ensure the further fruitful cooperation between peoples. People in all countries judged the Soviet-American dialogue held in Geneva from 19 to 21 November, first and foremost, by the positions which the sides had taken on this question, by the principled and practical conclusions made by them, and

by the effect the results of the meeting can have on the course of world affairs.

The general conclusion is that the meeting was a most important political event of international life, that the Geneva talks were necessary and useful, and that the general result is absolutely positive. As the resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet "On the Results of the Soviet-American Summit Meeting in Geneva and on the International Situation" points out, the results of the talks "create possibilities for transition from the present state of dangerous confrontation to a constructive search for ways to normalize Soviet-American relations and improve the international situation as a whole."

The road to the Geneva meeting was long and difficult. It confirmed in particular the view of the Soviet Union that now it is already very difficult for the two powers to start a productive dialogue and negotiations on the question of stopping the arms race and of nuclear disarmament, the most urgent problem that is at the center of international life. At the same time, the road traversed in this connection also demonstrated the necessity and inevitability of a joint search for a way out of the present difficult situation, that is, a search now, today, because tomorrow it will be even more difficult to do.

Never before has such a grave threat hung over mankind as is the case today. Through the fault of imperialism, mankind has found itself confronted with the choice: either a further intensification of tension and confrontation under conditions where the stockpiles of weapons accumulated in the world hold in themselves the threat of an end of civilization and of life itself, or a constructive search for mutually acceptable accords that would stop the process of material preparations for a nuclear conflict.

The development of world events has reached the point where especially responsible decisions are required and where inaction and even procrastination in action are essentially criminal. Harsh reality urgently dictates the necessity of international cooperation and of arranging a political dialogue that would remove the deposits accumulated in international relations, reduce world tension, and help bar the path to the arms race. The meetings and talks between the statesmen who shape the policies of their countries assume a particularly great importance.

The Soviet Union proceeds from the fact that the present world situation urgently calls, first and foremost, for responsible decisions and responsible actions of the countries that carry great weight in international affairs and which, by virtue of their military, economic, and scientific-technological potential, have a special responsibility for the course and consequences of world events. And although Moscow by no means views the world situation only through the prism of Soviet-American relations, it justly sees them as an extraordinarily important factor of international politics. The fate of the world in fact depends on these relations. However great the differences between the USSR and the United States may be, the acuteness of the situation in which we live leaves the leaders and the Soviet and American peoples no other alternative but to learn to live together by arranging their relations in ways that are worthy of their historical role.

However, as is known, something resembling an ice period has been observed in the relations between the two countries in recent years. In the situation that had developed, the Soviet leadership strove to return these relations to a course of normal and equal cooperation and mutual respect in the interest of the peoples of both countries and of recovery of the entire international situation. It did not think in the past and does not think now that some kind of fatal conflict of national interests is at the basis of the tension that has developed in the relations between the two countries. On the contrary, it is convinced that their dominant common interest, the interest of ensuring their security, can unite the peoples of the countries and that they can both gain much from the development of broad and fruitful cooperation.

It can be said that, following the inevitability conditioned by the fundamental trends of world development, both sides moved toward the search for joint ways of improving their relations and of making these relations more stable and constructive. However, they followed paths that were different from each other in many respects.

The course of the Soviet Union is clear and consistent and its policy is predictable. In its very first days the Soviet state proclaimed peace as its most important goal and as the highest principle of its foreign policy activities, and it has unswervingly pursued this goal. V. I. Lenin worked out a clear program of establishment and development of good-neighborly and equal relations with states with different social systems. Never and under no conditions whatsoever has our country made any ambitious plans to win for itself a dominant position in the world.

The principle of the primary importance of peaceful negotiations and the political settlement of difficult international issues has been firmly incorporated in the arsenal of Soviet policy measures. All this makes up the USSR's immutable foreign policy course that is based on the principles of peaceful coexistence of the two opposite social systems.

The present stage of international development has especially brought to light the most important role of the policy of peaceful coexistence, that is, the decisive role of that policy in ensuring the very survival of mankind in the nuclear age. Accordingly, in these recent months, the Soviet leadership has been engaged in reinterpreting [pereosmysleniye] many of the customary notions, including those in the military and political spheres. The task of taking all measures to break the vicious circle of the arms race and to miss no chances to achieve a turn for the better in the course of events has been given the place of paramount importance.

"The only sensible and acceptable way out in the present-day world, which is rife with acute contradictions and which faces impending catastrophe, is PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE OF STATES WITH DIFFERENT SOCIAL SYSTEMS," the draft new edition of the CPSU Program emphasizes. "This means not merely the absence of wars. It is an international order in which neighborliness and cooperation rather than armed force dominate and in which broad exchanges of achievements of science and technology and cultural values are practiced for the good of all peoples. Delivery from the expenditures of huge resources for military purposes would make it possible to use the fruits of labor exclusively for

purposes of construction. The states that have embarked on the roads of independent development would be shielded from external encroachments, which would facilitate their advance on the road of national progress. Auspicious opportunities would also be provided for the solution of the global problems of mankind by the collective efforts of all states. Peaceful coexistence meets the interests of all countries and all peoples."

In the context of the general peace-loving course of its foreign policy, the Soviet Union has stated more than once during the past year that it considers the possibility for improving Soviet-American relations to mutual advantage and without any attempts to infringe upon the rights and interests of each other as being not only desirable but also realizable. Because nothing can be done here without mutuality, the USSR, acting with the force of example and reasoning, took all possible steps in its striving to create a more favorable climate for the Geneva meeting. The substance of these steps is widely known.

The American leadership followed a complicated and tortuous road toward the Geneva dialogue. The U. S. Administration, which had come to power at the beginning of the eighties, frankly embarked on a course of confrontation by rejecting the very possibility of a positive development of Soviet-American relations, proclaiming the relaxation of tension as contrary to the interests of the United States, endeavoring to relegate to oblivion the many years of effort to establish a minimum of confidence in its relations with the USSR, and breaking nearly all lines of bilateral cooperation, Washington staked on achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union and embarked on the implementation of an extensive program of nuclear and other rearmament.

The United States openly claimed the right to interfere in the affairs of other peoples and states everywhere in the world and ignored and even flouted their interests, the traditions of international communication, and effective treaties and agreements. It continued to inflame the hotbeds of conflict and military danger in various regions of the globe. It heated up retrogressive rhetoric to the limit. The course toward dominating the world by force was covered under the screen of such arguments as the one claiming that "there are things that are more important than peace," and the reactionary and antisocialist edge of the course was concealed by profuse statements on the topic of the Soviet Union as the "focus of evil."

All this was on the surface. However, different processes were taking place in the background. The belligerent course of the United States inevitably came into conflict with the fact of world reality. The understanding of the fact that the Soviet Union of our time is a great scientific-technological power that is successfully developing its productive forces and ensuring a reliable defense for itself and its allies and friends could not but break through the crust of self-laudatory propaganda. The USSR's firm rebuff of the United States' policy aimed at breaking up the military-strategic equilibrium, the rebuff which was combined with large-scale peaceable initiatives and a display of restraint and constructive approach to the central issues of peace and security, also could not fail to have an appropriate impact. At the same time the rejection and rebuff of American policies continued to grow throughout the world. Confusion grew even among the United States' allies in the face of Washington's clear disregard for their interests and security.

Wide circles of the American public and many realistically thinking political, social, scientific, religious, and other figures increasingly unambiguously voiced their doubts about the policy course of the United States.

As a result of this, the atmosphere of Soviet-American relations and, to some extent, the international behavior of the United States began to change. Notes of a demonstrative love for peace, including expressions of the view that nuclear war is impermissible because there would be no winning side in such a war, appeared in statements by the U. S. Administration. Statements were also made about the absence of any aspirations on the part of the United States to achieve military superiority over the USSR. The very fact that new Soviet-American negotiations on the reduction of nuclear weapons and the prevention of militarization of outer space began in 1985 attests to changes in the frame of mind in the American capital.

Thus, the United States proceeded to the Geneva summit by actually overestimating a number of its foreign policy postulates of the recent period. And in this connection this overestimation occurred under conditions of intensified internal political conflicts because powerful political forces continued to be active in the country which opposed the changes and aspired to do everything to at least emasculate the substance of the meeting if they could not undermine it altogether.

As is known, the Geneva summit dialogue was extremely frank and, at times, very sharp. It was concrete and it provided the opportunity to clearly compare positions. M. S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan examined thoroughly, in depth, and with all directness a number of major problems in the relations between the USSR and the United States and of the contemporary world situation. This examination made on the basis of the mutually confirmed intention to improve their relations was useful in itself. Its results found their expression in the joint Soviet-American statement that included the main coordinated viewpoints. "...The general balance of the Geneva meeting is positive," M. S. Gorbachev pointed out at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 27 November. "Our country's constructive and consistent policy absolutely and decisively helped achieve this hope-inspiring result. At the same tine, it would be unjust not to say also that certain elements of realism manifested themselves in the position of the American side at the meeting and that this fact contributed to the solution of a number of questions." At the meeting of the cabinet of the U. S. Administration on 22 November, R. Reagan stated: "We have taken the tension out of the atmosphere. I think that we have found a sense of meeting points between us."

The joint statement by the leaders of the two sides that nuclear war must never be unleashed is a result of the meeting of principled importance. They stressed the importance of preventing any kind of war--nuclear of conventional--between the USSR and the United States and pledged not to strive to achieve military superiority. The significance of these agreed-upon principles will be all the greater if they are consistently implemented with practical steps and, first and foremost, by giving a new impulse to the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space-based weapons, bearing in mind the accomplishment of the tasks on which the two sides agreed in January 1985, as well as the implementation of other measures noted in the joint

statement. In this sense the results of the Geneva dialogue can have a positive effect on changing the political and psychological climate in contemporary international relations and on the improvement of these relations and can reduce the threat of outbreak of nuclear war.

As a result of the Geneva accords, a number of bilateral contacts and ties, severed by the American side after 1979, are being restored, and the style of relations should be marked by a correctness that is generally recognized in the sphere of foreign policy. All this will also help raise the level of trust. The agreement concerning a certain institutionalization of regular political contacts and, first and foremost, of meetings at the highest level, is of special importance. Thereby, the Geneva dialogue has been extended in some way to the forthcoming period, something that opens up additional possibilities to strive for changes for the better both in Soviet-American relations and in the world in general.

The questions of war and peace and of ensuring security were pivotal questions at the meeting, as had also been proposed by the Soviet Union. Without diminishing the overall significance of the achieved accords, it has to be noted that the meeting itself did not succeed in solving the tasks connected with stopping the arms race. The reason for this was the unreadiness displayed to this day by the American side for a cardinal turn in international affairs. Demonstrating its direct unwillingness to renounce the infamous "star wars" program even though this is dictated by the logic of strategic balance and represents an indispensable condition for a substantial reduction of the strategic nuclear forces, the U. S. Administration graphically demonstrated that it still has not rid itself of the temptation to try to achieve military superiority. Thus, the arms race continues.

Concerning this as well as a number of other questions, certain forces in the United States, not changing their formerly stated global pretensions, have also demonstrated a pronounced and persistent aspiration in the post-Geneva period to also correspondingly interpret to their advantage the results of the Geneva meeting or, more correctly, to dissolve their contents by means of reservations and interpretations that have nothing in common with these results. This is a dangerous and foolish aspiration! It is so even if one could agree for a minute that this aspiration may be prompted to some extent by a concern for the security of the United States. This aspiration basically attests to the unwillingness to seriously rethink the new realities of the nuclear age and to break with the outdated way of thinking and acting.

An even wider circle of political and public figures of the entire world agrees that in our period security cannot be achieved--as it was believed possible in the past--by increasing any kind of weapons. The nuclear age has changed everything, including the essential conception of the problems of national and general security. The language of force in the relations between nuclear powers has become useless and dangerous. It is only together that they can survive or perish, pulling with themselves all mankind to the abyss. And therefore the notion that is being earnestly thrust upon the American people by the military-industrial circles and their political allies about an alleged existence of some kind of an American discovery of a technological way

of overcoming the nuclear confrontation by creating an antimissile system with space-based elements represents a dangerous illusion.

This is the viewpoint of the Soviet Union which it defended at the Geneva meeting. Undoubtedly, no one can forbid further discussions of this topic. But it is important, vitally important that these discussions do not become a placebo concealing the symptoms of the mortal and suicidal disease of the arms race. The fact is that the so-called "strategic defense initiative" of the United States is by no means a defense program. What is involved is the creation [sozdaniye] of a new class of weapons that would result, in combination with the offensive nuclear weapons, in giving the United States the capability of making a first nuclear strike under the cover of the "shield" and which, in the event of a conflict, could also themselves be used as offensive weapons. However, the United States has no monopoly on scientific-technological achievements. In the interests of preserving the military-strategic parity, the Soviet Union will be compelled--as has happened more than once in the past--to give an effective and sufficiently quick answer to the American program. It is no accident that important specialists in the United States call this program a "reckless gamble" with the security of America and the entire world.

Security in our period cannot be achieved by disregarding the interests of other states and even less by trying to deprive them of the right to choose their social system on their own. Under conditions of the present changeable and variegated political, cultural and economic development of the world it is impermissible to base foreign policy on imperial considerations. As experience has shown, the denial of the right of every people to choose their own road inevitably leads to undermining regional security in one or another area and, consequently, to weakening general security.

A great deal is being said in the world today about the urgent necessity of directing international relations to a new path of development. This implies the need for mastering the art of living together and getting along on our small planet, and first and foremost, renouncing all incitement of hatred on the ground of differences in social systems of these or those countries. At the present stage of development this concerns, first and foremost, the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. In a certain sense the Geneva summit meeting represented a step of no small importance on the path of overcoming the accumulated mutual suspicions, mistrust, and prejudices. All the more urgent then is the task not only of consolidating what has been achieved but also advancing along the outlined path. This is not a simple or easy task. However, despite all differences in political systems, ideologies and world outlooks, it is simply necessary.

CSO: 1802/6-F

SPEECH BY M. S. GORBACHEV ON THE OCCASION OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN-SOVIET TRADE AND ECONOMIC COUNCIL (ASTES) 10 DECEMBER 1985

LD102116 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 15-19

[Text] Esteemed ladies and gentlemen.

Comrades!

I am pleased to greet the participants in the regular annual meeting of the U. S.-Soviet Trade and Economic Council in the Kremlin. We value the great work which the council has been carrying out for 10 years now, in assisting the development of contacts between American firms and Soviet foreign trade organizations. We value it all the more because, as we know, these years have not been easy.

I also want to address words of greetings to Mr Baldrige, U. S. secretary of commerce, who has come to the meeting. We value his presence here.

The present meeting again bears out the fact that the cooperation among peoples, of peoples and states with different social systems and different ideologies, is quite feasible--and today, I would say, very necessary.

Whether we like one another or not, we have to live on this planet together. And for this reason, a very important task for us--and I spoke about this both in Geneva and after Geneva--is to master the art of getting on with one another. And since this will be for a long time to come, we should learn to live side by side in a human and civilized manner.

And here arises the question about trade-economic and scientific-technical links between the United States and the USSR, and in general as people tend to say, between East and West. We look at these links first and foremost from the point of view of politics, because, first, it is in the sphere of politics that the chief question of our relations is decided--the question of war and peace. All the other aspects of our relations, including trade and economic links, are called upon to serve this main cause. Second, this is because our countries are two economic giants, quite capable of living and developing without any trade with one another.

This is what is actually happening. Judge for yourselves: In our trade, the United States, the greatest trading power in the world, holds 13th place--way behind Finland, Belgium, and Austria. And we occupy 16th place in U. S. trade. U. S. imports from the USSR are approximately equal in volume to its imports from the Ivory Coast republic.

I do not see any economic tragedy in this. You can get by without us just as we can without you, all the more since there are quite enough trade partners in the world today.

But is this politically normal? I reply decisively: No, and again no. In this dangerous world we simply cannot and we do not have the right to disregard such stabilizers of relations as trade, economic and scientific-technical links. And if we desire really strong and stable relations capable of ensuring a reliable peace, their foundations must include developed trade relations as well.

Our age is one in which each country and each people, not just the large ones but even the very smallest, regard their independence as being of the greatest possible importance and defend it with all their strength. Nevertheless, we all have to deal with the growing interdependence of states. This is an objective consequence of the development of the contemporary world economy and, at the same time, an important factor of international stability. We should welcome such mutual dependence. It could become a powerful stimulus for the establishment of stable, normal and, I would even not be afraid to say, friendly relations.

Esteemed guests, we well understand the difficulty of the tasks facing all of us. I know that among you there are head of firms which occupy eminent positions in the U. S. military business. I shall not hide the fact that we consider that this military business has a dangerous influence on politics. Indeed, this is not only our opinion. The very concept of the military-industrial complex was formulated not by Marxists but by the conservative Republican, U. S. President Eisenhower, who warned the American people about the negative role which this complex could play.

I am speaking thus not in order to reproach our guests today who have contracts with the Pentagon. They have come to Moscow and we welcome this fact. It seems to me that it is evidence of the common sense of certain representatives of the military business. As far as I can see, some of them--like business circles in the United States in general--cannot fail to be worried by the economic and financial consequences for a country of excessive military expenditure, as well as by the consequences caused by militarization and the one-sided development of the economy.

As for the Soviet leadership, we are deeply convinced that halting the arms race is in keeping with the genuine and vital interests not only of the Soviet Union, but also of the United States; that is, of course, if we look at the essence of the question and are not guided merely by the transient advantages of a particular contract.

To learn to live in peace--and I think that this is our common and prevailing interest--means not only to refrain from wars. Full-blooded life differs from being chilled with fear at the fresh growth in the danger of war in that it presupposes the development of multilevel contacts and cooperation, including in trade.

I consider the development of trading and economic links between our countries to be a political problem also because the main obstacle on their path has a political rather than an economic nature.

The first such obstacle is that the so-called most favored nation status has not been extended to the USSR. This term is sometimes misleading in that it creates the impression that it is a matter of a particular favorable inclination on the part of the United States toward those to whom this status is granted. But American businessmen are well aware that this is not so. In fact, most favored nation status is no more than an absence of discrimination, above all, of course, of customs tariffs. About 120 countries, as I have been told, enjoy such a status in the United States.

The Soviet Union is refused this. This, of course, creates barriers in the way of our exporting many types of goods to the United States. This deprives us of the possibility of earning the means necessary for the purchase of American goods. We cannot, after all, go on indefinitely earning foreign currency from let us say, Western Europe, and spending it in the United States. Our trade partners would not understand that.

Second, the obstacles imposed on us in the United States with respect to credits. It is not up to me to prove to you experienced businessmen that there can be no serious trade without credits.

The third obstacle is the so-called "export control," that is, the ban on the export of very many types of goods, under the pretext that this may help military production in the USSR and thereby harm United States security.

There is particularly much speculation on this theme.

I would like to say above all, that the version that the defense potential of the USSR is allegedly virtually completely based on Western technology which has been bought, and cannot develop without it, is the most utter nonsense. The authors of this story have simply forgotten what country they are dealing with--either they have forgotten, or else they just want to force others to forget that the Soviet Union is a country of great sciences and great technology, a country of outstanding scientists, engineers and highly skilled workers.

Of course, just like any other country, we rely, as well as on our own, on world achievements of science and technology, on worldwide production experience. That is life, it is an inevitability, and the United States itself is an example of this. It is no secret that, let us say, a decisive role in creating nuclear weapons and missiles, was played not by American science and scientists, but by European scientists--including Russian and Soviet Scientists.

One must not forget neither the real facts of the present, nor the lessons of history. Allow me, in the interests of truth, to recall a few of them.

It is a fact, after all, for example, that the theoretical foundations of missile technology were discovered and developed by the outstanding Russian scientist Tsiolkovskiy; that it was in our country that the foundations of the concept of multistage rockets were laid, that the first experimental rockets were created; and that, finally, the first artificial earth satellite was launched--not to mention man's first flight into space.

One could say a great deal about the contributions of Russian and Soviet scientists, from Mendeleyev to the present day, to the development of modern chemistry. I will limit myself to recalling the fact that from 1950 to the present day one-half of the transuranic elements have been discovered by Soviet scientists.

The enormous, and in many ways decisive, contribution of Soviet scientists in the development of the theory of chain reaction, the theory of light and radio waves, and the discovery of the laser is an indisputable fact. Modern aerodynamics, super-low temperature and super-high pressure, almost all types of technology used in present day metallurgy--all this would have impossible to imagine without the accomplishments of the scientists of the Soviet Union.

But we are not saying, in this instance, that American corporations are working on technology stolen from the USSR!

We, like you, are interested in the development of scientific and technological ties and in cooperation. This is a normal and legitimate interest, and I would like everyone in the United States to understand that we will not become a market for obsolete goods. We will only buy things that correspond to high world standards. And if the United States continues its present policy, then we will make what we need ourselves or acquire it from other countries.

There is one other obstacle to the development of our commercial and economic ties--this is the policy of boycotts, embargoes, "punishments," violations of commercial contracts, that has become customary for the United States. You yourselves know what the results are: The Soviet Union did not sustain particular damage, but the commercial reputation of American business, and thus its competitiveness on the Soviet market, suffered seriously. Our economic planners have lost confidence in their American partners. So, most often, they give preference to others.

This is what happened with major orders for pipe-layers, for equipment for the Novolipetsk metallurgical combine, for an aluminum plant in Siberia, not to mention the purchase of oil and gas drilling and prospecting equipment, where the share of the United States in our purchases has fallen to less than 0.5 percent. Nevertheless, you know better than I the state of the world economic market, and specifically, the fact that in the foreseeable future one should expect an exacerbation of competition on the world market.

I will be totally frank with you: Until these obstacles are eliminated there will be no normal large-scale development of Soviet-American trade nor any other economic ties. We regret this, but we will not beg the United States for anything.

But if these political impediments are removed, I am sure that broad prospects will open up before us. We are not your competitors on the world or domestic markets. The Americans have more difficulties in this with their allies than with us. But we could become partners, natural partners and, I assure you, honest and reliable ones.

For this, of course, both you and we would have to work some: make a better study of each other's markets and improve the mechanism of economic cooperation. I know that we too are not innocent here. The Soviet Government has adopted a rather critical attitude toward our foreign trade organizations too; in our view, new forms of production and scientific-technological cooperation are possible.

We are presently doing much work on this level with the socialist countries. We consider the deepening of economic integration with them to be a most important task. We will also be expanding trade and other forms of economic cooperation with Western Europe, with Japan, and with the developing states.

We would like economic relations with the United States not to be left out of this process--both for the political reasons I mentioned and for economic ones. We have very great plans for the development of our economy, science and technology. And for this purpose we would like to make maximum use of the additional opportunities provided by international cooperation, including also with the United States. Big long-term projects can be involved, along with a multitude of medium and even small deals, which can interest both giants and small and medium-sized business. If the situation is normalized and if a reliable political and legal contractual basis is created for the development of trade and economic relations, we will find things both to buy from and sell to you.

We could invite American companies and firms to take part in our programs for the further development of the energy sector of the economy. We could also consider partial participation by American firms and companies in our large-scale work on fundamental updating of machine-tool manufacture and other sectors of the machine-building complex. It they show appropriate interest, American firms could probably join in what is being done in our country in the agroindustrial complex, chemicals, petrochemicals, the production of sets of machines, and facilities for the introduction of intensive technology in land cultivation and animal husbandry.

But, for all this, the appropriate political will is necessary. Economic relations must be built on a long-term basis. Guarantees are needed that some or other political fads will not start undermining business relations again.

And now permit me to return to politics once again.

Only 3 weeks separate this ASTEC meeting from the Soviet-American meeting in Geneva. Herein lies its special significance. As I understand it, it is devoted to the analysis of potential opportunities for cooperation between the USSR and the United States in the economic sphere, to seek out what must be done for the sake of the broadest interests both of the Soviet and the American peoples.

The understanding that the present state of Soviet-U.S. relations is unsatisfactory and dangerous was the main thing which led myself and President Reagan to the meeting and talks in Geneva. I am sure that the President of the United States, just as I, felt at the time that hundreds of millions of men and women, and even children, of both our countries and also of all other countries, were looking to Geneva, were looking with hope and at the same time with anxiety.

I will tell you outright that it was not at all an easy experience. But neither I, nor, as I assume, the President found it possible to turn aside from this immense burden of human anxieties and hopes.

If one takes into account how complicated the road to Geneva was, one can consider that it was something of a success. But this is only the first step. And each subsequent step will require even greater efforts and even greater readiness to listen, desire and ability to understand and to meet one another half-way and, most importantly, the readiness to master the very difficult art of reaching agreements on an equal and mutually acceptable basis, without which serious problems can never be solved by us.

In other words, we have entered an exceptionally crucial period when words, intentions and political statements need to be translated into concrete decision and deeds. As you will understand, it is a matter of decisions and of deeds which could contribute to smoothing out Soviet-U.S. relations and to a general improvement in the world political climate.

A high degree of enterprise, a sense for the new, an ability to find unexploited possibilities for growth are characteristic of many representatives of American business circles. I am convinced that the best and truly promising possibilities of this kind lie today not on the path of destruction and death, but on the path of peace, on the path of the uniting of efforts in the name of equitable and mutually beneficial cooperation among all countries and peoples. In this there is life, and the benefits from it are indisputable.

Allow me to wish ASTEC success in its useful activity.

Thank you all for your attention.

CSO: 1802/6-F

TOWARDS THE 27TH PARTY CONGRESS -- DISCUSSION OF CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE DRAFTS

GENERAL COMMUNIST PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM AND THE PARTY'S ECONOMIC STRATEGY

AU150641 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 20-31

[Article by Professor V. Kulikov, doctor of economic sciences. Uppercase passages published in italics, uppercase passages between slantlines published in small print]

[Text] In presenting the draft new edition of the party program at the October (1985) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Comrade M. S. Gorbachev particularly accentuated the continuity of the fundamental theoretical and political aims of the CPSU. This is a shining embodiment of the theoretically principled nature and the consistency of the party, and of its faithfulness to Marxism-Leninism. One of the main manifestations of the continuity of the Third Program and its new edition is its precise orientation of the entire course of society's development toward a communist future.

Stressing the decisive significance of this purposeful orientation of our historicl movement with all force, the project simultaneously enriches the characterization of its content. "The party," the draft notes, "keeps correlating its policy, economic and social strategy, and the tasks of its organizational and ideological work with the communist prospect." The orientation toward a communist future thus determines not only long-term but also short-term tasks and highlights the forms of managing the functioning of real socialist society in a scientifically aware manner. In other words, it amounts to a key link in the party's entire strategy.

1

The constant orientation of party policy toward a communist future has firm ideological and theoretical foundations, the sources of which lie in the classic works of Marxism-Leninism. As is known, V. I. Lenin regarded the most outstanding service of K. Marx as the fact that for the first time the theory of development was applied "to the IMMINENT collapse of capitalism and to the FUTURE development of FUTURE communism." (Complete Collected Works, vol 33, p 84). The main result of this application was, first of all, the conclusion that "between capitalist and socialist society there lies a period of the

corresponding laws, taken in their objective unity, form the deepest foundation and assume a primary role. What is involved in the relations of commodity-producers (the law of value) and the relations of the exploitation of hired labor (the law of surplus value).

In examining the communist method of production, which passes through two phases, as an objectively necessary historical product of true resolution of the contradictions of capitalism, the classic authors of Marxism-Leninism defined the constituent features of this new social system extremely precisely. These features include social ownership of the means of production; the establishment of socioeconomic equality; the universality of work; the orientation of production toward satisfying society's needs and toward the comprehensive development of all its members; collectivism; self-government; cooperation of all the people in work; a directly social form of production possessing a unified economic center; and planned organization of this production.

As far as the primary production relations of the communist (in the broad sense) system are concerned, these seem to be characterized in the well-known formula advanced by Lenin in his "Notes on the Second Draft of Plekhanov's Plan;" "It would be more acurate to say 'through THE WHOLE OF society'/ (since this both includes the planned nature and indicates the directing force of this planned nature), and not only to satisy the needs of society's members, but to ensure the COMPLETE welfare and COMPLETE and free COMPREHENSIVE development of ALL members of society (Complete Collected Works, vol 6, p 232). What is thus involved is the law of planned development of the whole of social production and the law of subordination of the latter to its leading associated workers, that is, the basic economic law. It is in precisely these laws, to whose operation we link the decisive superiority of socialism over capitalism, that all-people's ownership of the means of production--the same for both phases of communist formation--is most profoundly and most substantially embodied.

The constituent position of the general foundations of formation mean that the essence of its advance along an ascending course lies in the increasingly full realization, and the strengthening, and enrichment of the content of these foundations. In other words, they do not at all represent some stale, unchanging essence, but ARE IN A STATE OF HISTORIC DYNAMISM AND ARE SUBJECT TO CONSTANT HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT. This tenet is true for communism and for the socialist phase of its evolution. "...The development of socialism, an ever fuller revelation of its potential and advantages, and consolidation of the general communist principles characteritic of it is what is meant by the actual advance of society to communism," reads the first paragraph of the second part of the draft new edition of the program, the part entitled "CPSU's Tasks in Upgrading Socialism and Making a Gradual Transition to Communism."

This is an enormous thesis of exceptional theoretical and practical political importance. It makes it possible to transfer ideas about the construction of communism from "lofty heights" to real ground. The more effectively and rapidly the problems advanced by our socialist reality are solved, the more

revolutionary transformation of the former into the latter." (K. MARX AND F. ENGELS: Works, vol 19, p 27), and second, the discovery of the stages of maturity of the unified communist formation: socialism and full communism.

A genuinely scientific characterization of socialism and communism as objectively necessary historically successive phases in this formation, between which there is and can be no sharp boundary (for all of their differences), presupposes an absolutely indispensable element of recognition of the REALITY OF GENERAL COMMUNIST PRINCIPLES FOR SOCIALISM AND OF THE IMMINENCE OF THESE PRINCIPLES TO THE SOCIALIST SYSTEM. Such a recognition is only the concrete realization of a universal methodological principle" Every formation is based on unified foundations at all stages in its development. F. Engels considered as self-evident the fact that "laws which are in force for certain methods of production and forms of exchange are also in force for all historical periods to which these methods of production and forms of exchange are common" (K. MARX AND F. ENGELS: Works, vol 20, p 151).

/Properly speaking, it is possible, merely by analyzing this proposition, to make an objectively truthful judgement as to whether the historical changes which are occurring will lead to a change of formations or whether they are merely alterations within the framework of the same formation. It is no accident that for Marx the stages of the appearance and historical advance of capitalism coincide with the development of forms of production of surplus value and with that of the subordination of labor to capital. The obligation to preserve the general foundations of the capitalist method of production is a most important and initial precondition of Leninist study of imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism. It is precisely this methodological precondition that has been reflected in the concept of imperialism as the "superstructure of capitalism." Thus, in substantiating the undermining of commodity production as one of the features which form the criteria of imperialism, Lenin considered it necessary to stress that this production "continues to 'reign' and is considered the basis of all production..." (Complete Collected Works, vol 27, p 322)./

The presence of general principles in each of the methods of production means the existence of a special group of socioeconomic relations and laws making up the essence of production and playing a decisive role at all stages of its development without exception. The revelation and careful investigation of this kind of relation and law is the fundamental task of political-economic science.

The assortment of these relations and laws is fairly extensive and can, of course, be characterized with varying degrees of concreteness. thus, in bourgeois society their sum total includes private capitalist ownership of the means of production, capital and hired labor, surplus value and the methods of producing it, the universal law of capitalist accumulation, anarchy and competition, and the commodity (and money) in the role of the initial and universal form of economic system. First of all, the given enumeration is undoubtedly not exhaustive. Second, it includes both primary (sometimes called "system-forming" in contemporary economic literature) and derivative relations and laws. The works of Marx, Engels and Lenin have exhaustively proved that in the capitalist economic system two concrete relations and two

developed by the party of comprehensively perfecting socialism is in fact the path which will lead to complete communism in the final analysis.

THE PRECISE DEFINITION OF SCIENTIFIC IDEAS ABOUT THE GROWTH OF THE FIRST PHASE OF COMMUNISM INTO THE SECOND, WHICH IS FIXED IN THE PARTY'S MAIN THEORETICAL AND POLITICAL DOCUMENT AND WHICH IS CONNECTED WITH MARKING OUT THE GENERAL COMMUNIST PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM AND INDICATING THE NEED TO STRENGTHEN THEM IS DIRECTED AGAINST THE KNOWN ATTEMPTS (WHICH HAVE, UNFORTUNATELY, SOMETIMES BEEN REPRODUCED IN SOCIOLOGICAL LITERATURE IN RECENT YEARS) TO THEORETICALLY SUBSTANTIATE THE POSTPONEMENT OF SOLVING THE TASKS OF BUILDING COMMUNISM TO AN INDETERMINATE DISTANT FUTURE, OR ELSE TO OPENLY DECLARE COMMUNISM TO BE MERELY AN "ABSTRACT POSSIBILITY" OR AN "ABSTRACT IDEA." INVARIABLY IGNORING OR DIRECTLY NEGATING THE EXISTENCE OF THE GENERAL COMMUNIST PRINCIPLES OF OUR SOCIETY, THE AUTHORS OF THESE ATTEMPTS HAVE SHELTERED BEHIND COLORFUL AND LOUDLY-ADVERTIZED WORDY CALLS FOR "REALISM AND SOBRIETY" IN INTERPRETING THE ESSENCE AND GOALS OF SOCIALISM, FOR A RESOLUTE STRUGGLE AGAINST VOLUNTARIST RUSHING AHEAD, AND SO ON.

THE FACT THAT THEORY WHICH CLAIMS TO BE OF A GENUINELY SCIENTIFIC NATURE AND THE PRACTICE OF REGULATING SOCIOECONOMIC PROCESSES WHICH STRIVES FOR REAL EFFECTIVENESS MUST BOTH BE REALISTIC IS AN ABSOLUTE TRUISM. EXPERIENCE HAS PROVEN JUST AS INDISPUTABLY THAT ARTIFICIALLY "FORCING ON" SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT LEADS IN THE END TO CONSIDERABLE LOSSES, AND SOMETIMES TO REVERSE MOVEMENT, EVEN PAST THOSE BOUNDARIES FROM WHICH THE "FORCING ON" BEGAN. BUT THIS IN NO WAY CANCELS OUT ANOTHER TRUTH: IN EVERYDAY SOCIAL PRACTICE A RENUNCIATION OF THE ORIENTATION TOWARD A COMMUNIST FUTURE, AN ORIENTATION WHICH EXPRESSES THE GENERAL TREND OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALISM, IS A SERIOUS ERROR WHICH IS FRAUGHT WITH TOTAL DISORIENTATION IN THE MATTER OF CORRECTLY SETTING AND EFFECTIVELY SOLVING BOTH LONG-TERM AND CURRENT TASKS. "TODAY THE PARTY UNDERSTANDS MORE DEEPLY THAN EVER BEFORE THE INADMISSIBILITY OF RUSHING AHEAD, OF JUMPING OVER HISTORICALLY NECESSARY STAGES IN SOCIAL PROGRESS, AND OF INTRODUCING COMMUNIST PRINCIPLES AND FORMULAS WITHOUT TAKING ACCOUNT OF SOCIETY'S MATERIAL AND SPIRITUAL MATURITY," YE. K. LIGACHEV HAS EMPHASIZED. "AT THE SAME TIME THE PARTY IS A RESOLUTE OPPONENT OF ARTIFICIALLY RESTRAINING SOCIETY'S DEVELOPMENT AND OF MARKING TIME....THE PARTY PROCEEDS FROM THE FACT THAT SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM ARE TWO SUCCESSIVE PHASES IN THE SINGLE COMMUNIST SOCIAL FORMATION. AND IN SOLVING CURRENT TASKS CONNECTED WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PERFECTING OF DEVELOPED SOCIALISM, WE MUST NOT AND HAVE NO RIGHT TO FORGET EVEN FOR A MOMENT ABOUT THE COMMUNIST FUTURE."

At the present time the "simplified" ideas about the ways and time-spans of shifting to the highet phase of communism, which were current for a certain time and which are connected with uncorroborated aims regarding the briefness of the socialist phase and the possibility of passing through it rapidly, can be considered to have been completely overcome. The party's conclusion about the duration of this stage did, however, produce a very peculiar reaction from some sociologists. Thus, there have been known attempts to interpret this conclusion in such a light as to deal with the situation which appeared in the form of a reaction to the slowdown in the rates of economic development in socialist countries in the seventies, and which was supposedly not envisaged by the classic authors of Marxism-Leninism. There were also people to be found who wished to test their strength in the cause of a "reconstruction" and

"more precise definition" of the essence and evolution of the views of the classic authors of Marxism-Leninism whereby Marx, Engels and Lenin were declared to be founders of the idea of a strict division between socialism and communism. Constructions of this kind (which, in their authors' opinion, were derived from the classic authors) were most consistently expressed in the revival of the concept of socialism as a separate and particular form of production (distinct from communist production) which accordingly does not have general communist foundations.

The above-noted commentaries on the classic ideas about the duration and historical place of socialism are in direct, polar, diametric opposition to both the letter and spirit of the real teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

It suffices to turn to the ample characterization of the highest phase of communism in Marx's "Critique of the Gotha Program" in order to be convinced of the grandeur of the tasks with the solution of which the founder of Marxism connected entry into this phase. And the time required to solve some or other tasks is naturally predetermined by their scale. It is thus no accident that after he had cited Marx's characterization of full communism, and on the basis of an analysis of it, Lenin emphasized the "long duration" of the process of the withering away of the state in his work "State and Revolution" (see Complete Collected Works, vol 33, p 96). He followed Marx and Engels in linking this process to precisely the growth of socialism into full communism. By explaining the conclusion that the withering away of the state "represents a process which is known to be lengthy" (Ibid., p 84) by the exceptionally great historical caliber and complexity of the tasks of turning work into the primary vital need and of creating the conditions for implementing the principle "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs," Lenin is consequently accentuating attention, for all intents and purposes, on the duration of the socialist phase of development. This understanding of the issue was reflected in Lenin's subsequent statements, and specifically in the thesis accourding to which "long years" would be required for the achievement of a "fully developed, fully consolidated and formed, fully expanded and matured communism" (Complete Collected Works, vol 41, p 33). For this reason it has to be stated with regret that for many years proper attention was not paid to the corresponding ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. And these are, meanwhile, an organic and inseparable component part of their teaching on the socialist stage of the development of communism.

The classic authors of Marxism_leninism have shown that each new social system arises on the basis of the production forces inherited from the previous method of production, and that it is only with time that it introduces fundamental changes to them and raises them to the level which is adequate for that system, a level which is in principle unattainable for the previous method of production. Only the latter ensures that the new system reaches a mature state. Marx wrote the following about this with respect to capitalism: "The means of communications and the means of production and consumption must develop within the framework of the previous method of production, these means going beyond the boundaries of the old production relations and forcing them to turn into capitalist relations. But they must be developed only far enough for there to be a formal subordination of labor to capital. On the basis of this changed relation a specifically changed method of production develops

which, on the one hand, creates new material production forces and, on the other hand, itself develops only on the basis of these forces...." (K. MARX AND F. ENGELS: Works, vol 49, p 118). The tenet quoted above is of general significance in its methodological essence.

The new system and its constituent--general communist--relations at first also arise and function historically on the basis of the production forces inherited from the previous system. Properly speaking, it is this which predetermines the absolute necessity of communism passing through its first--socialist--phase of development. In order to solve those grandiose tasks with which the classic authors of Marxism-Leninism linked the achievement of full communism, it is indispensable that there be a fundamental upheaval and revolution in production forces. Picking out this aspect of the matter, Engels described as "puerile" Duehring's idea "that society could assume ownership of the sum total of means of production without bringing about a fundamental upheaval in the old method of production and without eliminating primarily the entire old division of labor..." (K. MARX AND F. ENGELS: Works, vol 20, p 308).

Thus, in order to explain the duration of the phase of socialism there is no need to set it in opposition to communism or to declare it to be a special method of production. This feature is predetermined by the exceptional scale of the tasks of communist construction. It is possible for these tasks to be solved only on the basis of profound revolutionary changes in the production forces which raise them to a level adequate for the constituent production relations fo the communist method of production, permitting the entire wealth of the content of these relations to be developed, and fundamentally unattainable for capitalism.

It stands to reason that the "long duration" of the socialist stage is not at all equivalent to "slowness" or "stagnation" of movement at the given stage, which is what interpretations of socialism as an independent formation which negate its general communist principles "work" on. Socialism is by nature a HIGHLY DYNAMIC SOCIAL ORGANISM, and the question is one of making full use of all its colossal potential constructive possibilities and all its historical advantages, which arise primarily from the principles which have been noted. It is precisely toward this that the concept developed by the party of the acceleration of society's socioeconomic development is aimed. Taking into account the circumstances which have been set out, it would seem important to reflect the ideas about the necessity of a fundamental, revolutionary upheaval in production forces for the shift to a higher phase more precisely in the characterization of the material-technical basis of communism. The corresponding place in the party program could take, say, this form: "The material and technical basis of communism presupposes the IMPLEMENTATION OF REVOLUTIONARY CHANGES IN ALL ELEMENTS OF THE PRODUCTION FORCES AND A FUNDAMENTAL UPHEAVAL OF THEM, which opens up opportunities for full satisfaction of the reasonable requirements of society and ALL ITS MEMBERS, AND FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF EVERYONE'S PHYSICAL AND SPIRITUAL POTENTIAL" (new proposals in italics--/V. K./). It would also seem to be more precise to talk about "elimination of the remnants of the old division of labor and the essential socioeconomic differences associated with it."

An analysis of contemporary political-economic literature shows that negation of the reality of some or other general communist principles of the system of socialist production relations is fairly widespread and that it can take place even when there is formal recognition of the thesis of socialism as the first phase in the unified communist method of production.

Thus, according to one point of view, a formal equality and an actual inequality of working people with regard to the means of production are inherent in socialism. Of course, unlike the highest phase of communism, socialism does not and cannot provide total socioeconomic equality for all members of the association of working people, but the decisive step in this direction has already been taken. And it has been taken precisely on the basis of the establishment of the real equality of workers with regard to the means of production, reflected primarily in the elimination of the exploitation of man by man and in the establishment of the universality of work and of distribution based on work.

There is also sometimes a lack of precision in interpretations of the comprehensive development of the individual as the objective goal of socialism and communism. Its realization is frequently associated exclusively with the highest phase of communist society. This approach belittles such a principle as ensuring the priority of social goals in economic development, a principle which is a fundamental advantage of socialism and which is noted in the party documents. Sight is also lost of the fact that, although the objective poetentials for realizing the given goal at different stages in the evolution of socialism are of course very different and will develop in an unlimited manner only with the shift to full communism, this goal constantly serves as one of the most important criteria in the selection of the directions of increasing the welfare of working people, of changing the conditions and content of work, and of improving the utilization of free time. That is why it is of exceptional importance to restore the Leninist formulation of the highest goal of socialist production to the draft edition of the CPSU Program.

Underestimation of the reality and effectiveness of the need for work can still frequently be encountered in theory and practice. It is sometimes supposed that work as a need is a distant guideline which is non-existent today.

As is known, turning work into the primary vital need is a long and complex process which occupies an entire historical epoch. Much has still to be done on this road, but the initial targets have already been reached. The establishment of the workers' ownership of the means of production, of free work, and of self-government is the key component in socialism's fulfillment of its historical mission of turning work into the primary vital need of each person. Without this, not only the shift to full communism but also the achievement of socialist principles of the highest world level of social labor productivity, which has been fixed as a most important program goal, are unthinkable.

Until recently the concept of "self-government" was also clearly held in low esteem in theoretical studies of socialism. It was largely passed "into the hands of others," and if it was specially analyzed it frequently received a sometimes implied and even false interpretation (straying toward anarcho-syndicalism and toward calls for unlimited development of group ownership and of forms of independence for enterprises alternative to economic management by all people). The All-Union Scientific Practical Conference in December 1984, which was devoted to the perfecting of ideological work, subjected to criticism a number of interpretations of self-government under socialism, which had become widespread in sociology. "In some of them," M. S. Gorbachev said at a conference, "self-government is linked to the life activity of only individual cells of socialist society (production or territorial cells); in others it is set in opposition to state government; and in yet others the practical implementation of the principles of self-government is postponed until the shift to the highest phase of communism." Criticizing the second of these three groups of erroneous interpretations in his exposition of the tasks defined by the draft new edition of the CPSU Program of further perfecting socialist democracy, Ye. Ligachev particularly emphasized that socialist self-government of the people "has nothing in common with the anarcho-syndicalist variant of self-government, which is opposed to socialist statehood, based on group ownership, and which pursues only group interests. Our party condemned anarcho-syndicalism long ago."

Involvement of working people in production management in every possible way and increasingly full development of genuinely socialist self-government from one of the essential areas of realizing all-people's ownership of the means of production and of increasing its maturity. For this reason it is difficult to overestimate the theoretical and political significance of the restoration, establishment, and enrichment, in application to contemporary conditions, of the Leninist concept of self-government in the draft new edition of the CPSU Program.

At the same time, attention is drawn by the fact that the organic link between the development of self-government and the perfecting of the political system is expressed with maximum precision in the text of the draft, while this development's link with the perfecting of the system of production relations and of the economic mechanism is expressed less clearly. Meanwhile, it follows from the entire context of the program's characterization of socialism and communism that the self-government activity of working people extends to all spheres of social life, including the decisive sphere--the economy. One would have thought that one of the possible variants of a more definite reflection of this circumstance in the program would be a direct coordination of this activity with a characterization of democratic centralism in social production management. The corresponding place in the text might look like this:

"There must be consistent implementation of the Leninist principles of management and, above all, of the principle of democratic centralism which IS AIMED AT INCREASING FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF GENUINE SOCIALIST SELF-GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE IN THE ECONOMIC SPHERE ON THE BASIS OF DAY-TO-DAY-, ACTIVE, AND EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION OF WORKING PEOPLE, THEIR COLLECTIVES, AND THEIR

ORGANIZATION IN LEADING SOCIAL PRODUCTION AT ALL LEVELS OF ECONOMIC OPERATIONS, FROM THE WORKPLACE AND BRIGADE TO THE NATIONAL ECONOMY A A WHOLE" (V. K.).

From time to time, assertions appear in political-economic literature according to which the directly social form of work and production, the cooperation of all the people in work, and the unified socioeconomic center are not real facts of socialist reality but a matter (and a highly problematical one) for the communist future. It is clear that all these aspects of production relations are inseparable from one another: the unified coordination of work on the scale of the entire national economic whole makes work directly social, and of necessity presupposes unified centralized management. The alternative to the unified cooperation of all people in work in conditions of a developed social division of work, which is what exists in real socialist society, is an "atomistic" structure of social production, detached economic management, and an economic link between production units exclusively through the market. Such is the logic, and it is binding.

Another extreme is also found, where the directly social form of socialist production is declared to be fully mature. This assertion absolutely excludes the existence (in some or other spheres, branches or regions) of any elements of really detached economic activity by socialist enterprises and asociations, these elements arising from the objective state of the social nature of production forces (from the existing level of technical and economic socialization).

It appears tht the introduction into the draft party program of a proposition on the establishment of work and production of a directly social nature in the highest phase of communism is aimed at overcoming these extremes in one of the fundamental questions of the theory and practice of scientific socialism. The ideas on which this proposition is based consist, on the one hand, in the strengthening recognition of the nature of production of a society which replaces bourgeois society, and on the other hand, in a precise statement of the evolution and historical nature of this fundamental sign of a communist method of production.

At the same time, it can hardly be admitted that the literary formulation of these ideas is irreproachable in the following specific respect. In our view, it does not set up an absolutely insurmountable barrier against possible (biased or frankly erroneous) deductions to the effect that "since the directly social nature of work and production is fully established only in the highest phase of communism, at the socialist stage it is in an embrionic state or is totally lacking." For this reason the following wording seems preferable: "At the highest phase of communism in action the directly social character of work and production, WHICH HAS ALREADY BECOME ESTABLISHED WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF SOCIALISM, WILL REACH FULL MATURITY" (V. K.)

It would also seem to be useful to introduce into the text of the program a thesis, in the form of an independent proposition, on the collectivist basis of socialism and communism as a whole. In essence, the ideas of the collectivist principles of socialist society are widely represented in the draft, but it would be of importance to mark them out in a clear

terminologically formulated form. This would correspond both to the classic definitions of communism and to the theoretical developments of recent years, and to contemporary practice, which is aimed at strengthening the collectivist--general communist--principles of our life.

To sum up the above, let us stress with all certainty that THE GENETIC COMMUNITY AND UNITY OF THE FUNDAMENTAL RELATIONS AND LAWS OF SOCIALISM AND FULL COMMUNISM DOES IN NO WAY NEGATE THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THEM, WHICH ARE VERY CONSIDERABLE INDEED. What is primarily involved is AN ESSENTIALLY DIFFERENT DEGREE OF MATURITY AND DIFFERENT FORMS OF REALIZING THE GENERAL FEATURES OF THE COMMUNIST METHOD OF PRODUCTION IN ITS FIRST AND SECOND PHASES. A proportion of forms of implementing general communist principles which are specific to socialism has already been revealed, but there is undoubtedly much that still has to be done in this area of science.

What is involved at the same time is that due to the objective historical immaturity of the general communist principles inherent in socialism, there are also groups of relations within the system of its economic relations which will either be fundamentally transformed or will wither away with the shift to full communism. Those which will be transformed primarily include THE RELATIONS OF DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO WORK as the main and absolutely indispensiable feature determining the specific nature of the first phase of communism as distinct from its highest stage.

The experience accumulated in the countries of the socialist community has provided irrefutable grounds for concluding that one of the groups of production relations which play an important role in the functioning of real socialism (but undoubtedly not extending to the highest phase of communist society) is formed by COMMODITY-MONETARY RELATIONS. The search for ways of perfecting a rational utilization of them which corresponds to the nature of socialism (that is, utilization which derives from the subordination of these relations to the fundamental--directly social--principles of the socialist economic system) remains on the list of the most relevant problems of the contemporary theory and practice of economic management, precisely the problems which the precongress program documents are aimed at solving in an accelerated manner.

It would be a serious error to assert that the role of those groups of relations which exist under socialism but which will be removed in the highest phase of communism will steadily decrease in an obligatory order and at all stages in line with the advance toward this phase. Such an idea simplifies the real process. The dialectics of this process are such that GENERAL COMMUNIST RELATIONS, RELATIONS SPECIFIC TO THE LOWER PHASE OF THE METHOD OF PRODUCTION, AND COMMODITY-MONETARY RELATIONS FORM AN INDISSOLUBLE UNITY IN THE SHAPE OF THE REAL SOCIALIST ECONOMY, A UNITY WITHIN WHICH THIS ECONOMY FUNCTIONS AND DEVELOPS AND WHICH CANNOT BE IGNORED IN THE COURSE OF THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE SYSTEM OF ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT ON GENUINELY SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATIONS. This is the most important political-economic conclusion arising from analysis of the draft new edition of the program.

In defining more precisely and concretizing the achievements of the sociological research of socialism of the last 25 years, the draft demonstates not only the continuity but also the SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PARTY'S THEORETICAL AIMS.

The conclusions reached by social science which have become established during this period and which have enriched the new, as opposed to the existing, edition of the program specifically include ideas about socialism as a dynamic, constantly developing organism; about the development of socialism having nothing in common with flat, "creeping" development, but presupposing qualitative shifts in all spheres of social life, breaks in continuity, and passage over a number of boundaries (each of which does not by itself bring socialism outside its own framework, but is a historic milestone in the process of socialism's growth into communism); about the long duration of the socialist phase of development; about contraditions as a source of the progressive development of socialism and about the absolute necessity of developed analysis of them.

In its new edition the CPSU Program also substantially furthers the solution of the question of adequate evaluation of the level of development of socialism at which our country finds itself, a question of exceptional theoretical and political importance. A comprehensive analysis of this level has been crowned with the elaboration and inclusion in the draft of a substantive formula which runs: "The Soviet people's hard work, the big successes in the economy, in the social and political spheres, in science and culture, brought our country to new historic frontiers that opened the stage of developed socialism.

There appeared on the agenda the task of the utmost and all-round refinement of socialist society, of fuller and more effective utilization of its possibilities and advantages." This formula, which realistically characterizes both what has been achieved and the prospect in concentrated form is directed both against rushing ahead in evaluating the existing situation and against postponing the problems of communist construction to an indefinite distant future. Our country has entered the stage of developed socialism, but ahead lies the solution of the task of ACHIEVING A QUALITATIVELY NEW STATE OF SOVIET SOCIETY which fully reveals the developing superiority of the socialist system in all its aspects, a task which is on a historic scale and which will require enormous creative work.

The development and enrichment of ideas concerning socialism's passage through a number of stages of maturity on the road to full communism could not but make the question of the precise scientific criteria for marking out the successive qualitative states of socialist society more acute, and could not but bring it to the forefront. These criteria embrace the different spheres of socialist society--economic, social and political. Within the framework of the decisive sphere--the economic sphere--they embrace all of its structural elements: production forces, the level of socialization of production relations proper.

The criteria for demarcating the qualitatively different states of socialism as it gradually grows into full communism are primarily aimed at reflecting the CONCRETE DEGREE OF MATURITY OF THE GENERAL COMMUNIST PRINCIPLES IMMINENT IN SOCIALISM, AS WELL AS THE ACTUAL EXTENT TO WHICH THE PRODUCTION FORCES ARE CAPABLE OF REALIZING THESE PRINCIPLES. Characterizing the boundaries which open the stage of developed socialism, the precongress documents accentuate attention on the creation of mighty economic, scientific-technical and cultural potential; on the formation both of a unified national-economic complex as a whole and of its constituent subcomplexes (inter-branch, territorial-production and inter-unit) which form the material basis for the unified cooperation of labor and for the planned organization of social production; on the constant growth in working people's welfare; on fuller implementation of the principle of socialist social justice (which, being conditioned in its concrete form by the operation of the law of distribution according to work--a law which is specific to the first phase--is, in the final analysis, rooted in the foundations of this law); on the establishment of people's equality of rights, cooperation and mutual assistance; on existing successes in the matter of utilizing the advantages of the plan system of the economy and the principles of socialist self-government.

In scientifically delineating the contours of the positive shifts which must take place in the economic and other spheres of social life as a result of the program's implementation, the party once again concentrates attention on strengthening the general communist principles inherent in socialism in every wasy possible, on the basis of the development of production forces. Thus, with regard to the sphere of these forces what is involved is further development of the scientific-technical revolution, new technical reconstruction of the national economy, renewal of the production apparatus, priority development of those branches on which scientific-technical progress depends and which are directly aimed at satisfying the personal needs of working people, and a radical reduction in manual work (the proportion of this work in the production sphere is expected to drop by up to 15 to 20 percent even in the coming 15 years). An increase in labor productivity of 2.3 to 2.5 times by 2000 is regarded as an important boundary on the road to labor productivity which is higher than that under capitalism. As is known, it will be impossible for the higher phase of communism to begin without the achievement of this level of labor productivity.

With regard to the sphere of socialization of work and production, what is involved is the achievement of an optimal structure and balance of the country's unified national economic complex and the completion of its formation, the intensification of the directly social link between production and consumption, and the increasing of the effectiveness of the consumers' control over the producers. To put it briefly, it is the full implementation of what Lenin called actual socialization of production (see Complete Collected Works, vol 36, p 171).

The draft new edition of the program provides a characterization of the general directions of perfecting socialist production relations. These directions are primarily connected with steady improvement of the above-noted forms of implementing all-people's ownership of the means of production.

The highest goal of the party's economic strategy has been and continues to be the constant rise in the people's material and cultural standard of living, and thus also the fuller implementation of the basic economic law of socialism. It follows from the precongress documents that what is involved here is far from confined to quantitative aspects: The welfare of Soviet people is expected to reach qualitative parameters which signify the rise of consumption to the level of rational norms and also the ensuring of a structure of consumption which corresponds to the tasks of forming a harmoniously developed individual to the greatest extent. Another aspect of a qualitative order is also important: In the precongress documents the growth in welfare is regarded in organic unity with a sharp improvement in the conditions of the main sphere of man's life activity--work in the social economy. What is involved is that the intensification of the creative content of work and the rise in its standared are directly included in the content of the goal of production development.

Thus, IF THE BOUNDARIES WHICH SOCIALIST SOCIETY MUST PASS ARE OUTLINED BY THE PARTY TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE COMMUNIST FUTURE, THE PARTY REGARDS THE DECISIVE MEANS OF REACHING THESE BOUNDARIES AS ARISING FROM THE GENERAL COMMUNIST PRINCIPLES INHERENT IN SOCIALISM. The last fact is predetermined by the fact that the main role in the functioning and development of socialism is played precisely by economic laws which form part of the range of these principles, and primarily by the law of planning and the basic economic law which have already been mentioned. If the former of these laws conditions national economic planning as the leading and universal form of utilizing the economic laws of socialism and as the heart of the economic mechanism, the latter law forms the basis of those goals of economic development which the system of management and economic operations is expected to achieve. If this fundamental circumstance is ignored, genuinely scientific elaboration of an integrated concept of the economic mechanism and of its perfection are excluded.

Recapitulating, it is possible to say that it is precisely in the general communist principles of socialism and in the strengthening of them that an objective basis exists for intensifying the social orientation of production, its orientation toward the satisfaction of man's needs and the development of his abilities. And this orientation in turn is expected to serve as a powerful means of sharply accelerating our socioeconomic development and of raising the work and sociopolitical activeness of the masses. The circumstance which has already been noted--that the substantiation of the USSR's communist future and of the need to accerlerate socioeconomic development begins in the draft new edition of the program with the paragraph which concludes the thesis cited above regarding the existence of general communist principles of socialism and their leading role in its progressive advance--is far from being a formal one. THE PROPOSITION ON THE GENERAL COMMUNIST PRINCIPLE OF REAL SOCIALIST SOCIETY AND ON THE IDENTITY OF STRENGTHENING THEM WITH THAT SOCIETY'S REAL ADVANCE TO FULL COMMUNISM IS THE STARTING-POINT OF THE STRATEGIC CONCEPT DEVELOPED BY THE PARTY OF ACCELERATING THE COUNTRY'S SOCIOECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

General communist principles are the "common thread" which ensures the internal organic connection the real continuity of all times and stages in the new formation. And this means that in singling out the general communist principles of socialism we are posing the question not only of its present, which is aimed at a communist future, but also of its past, of the real history of its formation. This is because such principles arise at the same time as the socialist structure of a transitional economy, immediately forming the foundations of this structure. The transitional period between capitalism and socialism forms an inseparable historical stage of communist socioeconomic formation because production relations within the framework of the socialist structure are regulated by the general communist economic laws which make social ownership of the means of production a reality--the law of planned development of socialist production and the basic economic law. In 1919, emphasizing that "the transitional period cannot be other than a period of struggle between dying capitalism and arising communism," Lenin explained this proposition in the following extremely concrete manner. "Labor has been associated in a communist manner in Russia," he wrote, "first, insofar as private ownership of the means of production has been abolished, and second, insofar as proletarian state power organizes large-scale production of state land and in state enterprises on an all-national scale, distributes the workforce among different branches of the economy and among interprises, and distributes massive quantities of consumer goods belonging to the state to the working people" (Complete Collected Works, vol 39, pp 271-273).

Over the almost seven decades which have passed since the "abolition of private ownership," our society has accumulated enormous experience of using the fundamental advantages of a general communist nature of socialism, the mobilizing force of communist ideas. The fulfillment of the aims of the CPSU program and the future triumph of these ideas are undoubted.

CSO: 1802/6-F

ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOVIET SOCIETY TOWARD A CLASSLESS STRUCTURE

AU40601 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 32-43

[Article by M. Rutkevich, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Uppercase passages published in italics]

[Text] The documents of the April and October (1985) Plenums of the CPSU Central Committee provide a profound and balanced appraisal of the changes that have taken place in the development of production forces, the perfecting of social relations, and the growth of the material prosperity and culture of the working people of our country in the last quarter century. At the same time, the documents note that in recent years unfavorable tendencies have developed, quite a few difficulties have appeared, and a number of negative phenomena have spread in the people's behavior and in social mentality.

Preparing for the regular 27th CPSU Congress, the party has worked out and substantiated a comprehensive concept for the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development and for achieving a qualitatively new state of Soviet society on this basis.

The economic sphere is indissoluble and most directly connected and interwoven with the social sphere. The latter comprises the society's social structure in all of its aspects, that is, the socioclass, professional, settlement, and demographic aspects, the aspects concerning economic branches and labor collectives, and so forth. Here we will limit ourselves to an analysis of changes in the socioclass structure, that is, the structure that occupies a central place in the system of social relations. The general appraisal of the situation that has developed, as provided by documents of the plenums, is fully applicable to this analysis. The achievements--historical in their significance--in moving the basic social groups and their strata and detachments closer to each other and effacing the remaining social boundaries have been accompanied lately by a number of phenomena that are directly connected with the stagnation of some links in the management system and of the entire economic mechanism; by slow rates of progress in making manual labor obsolete; by a certain spreading of tendencies toward leveling in remuneration for work; and by lagging in the professional training of young people as compared with their general education.

The draft new edition of the CPSU program points out that the "establishment of an essentially classless structure of society; gradual disappearance of substantial differences in the socioeconomic, cultural, and living standards between the town and the countryside; an increasingly organic combination of physical and mental labor in productive activities; a further cohesion of the Soviet people as the social and international community..." must be achieved as early as during the first stage of communist formation. The following objective circumstance is emphasized in this connection: The overcoming of class differences and the formation of a socially homogenous society is achieved by bringing closer together the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry and the intelligentsia, WITH THE WORKING CLASS PLAYING THE DECISIVE ROLE IN THAT PROGRESS.

But before going on to a direct examination of the aforementioned questions in light of the theoretical generalizations and conclusions made in the draft, it seems necessary to make one observation.

According to the materialist dialectic, the periodization of the society's history in general and the individual socioeconomic formations in particular must take account of the fact that substantial differences are of a DIFFERENT ORDER and that they are distinguished in their depth, degree and "rank." Thus, this is the most profound and cardinal difference in the qualitative distinction of the communist formation from the capitalist one. At the same time, it is presupposed that gradations also exist within the communist formation itself: between the transitional period from capitalism to socialism and the first (socialism) and second (communism) stages of communist formation. Moreover, there is a certain difference between the early stage of socialism, when the foundations of socialism are built, and the stage of developed socialism. Finally, it is also necessary to differentiate between different stages with the framework of the latter. This is why there are now good reasons for raising the question about the idea of what Soviet society, being now at the beginning of a relatively long stage of developed socialism, must achieve in the process of perfecting a qualitatively new stage when it will fully correspond to the high criteria of this stage, first and foremost, in the sphere of material production.

The forthcoming change of the socioclass structure will be at the center of attention here. The correct understanding of the scale of this task requires an HISTORICAL APPROACH. Therefore, it is necessary to note the general features and, at the same time, the substantial difference of the socioclass structure of the present Soviet society as compared with the stage when the foundations of socialism were built in the USSR.

The class structure of the socialist society which had developed by the end of the thirties has been preserved in its most general outlines to this day. Its main elements continue to be: the new workers' class, the new cooperative (kolkhoz) peasantry, and the new people's intelligentsia. At the same time, relations of friendly alliance have developed between these three social forces with the leading role being played by the workers' class whose historical mission continues to be a complete transformation of the society on communist principles. The moving together of these social forces and the consolidation of the alliance between them as well as between nations and

nationalities have conditioned the formation of a new historical community of people, the Soviet people, and the constant growth of their sociopolitical unity under the inspiring and organizing influence of the Communist Party.

However, during these decades significant changes have taken place in the socioclass structure of Soviet society itself. The quantitative correlation between social groups has changed sharply: In 1939 the workers class (together with families) represented 33.7 percent and, in 1885, 61.6 percent of the population. The proportional share of kolkhoz peasantry declined from 47.2 to 12.4 percent of the population, something that has been conditioned both by the growing urbanization and the growth of industry and transport, as well as by the formation of new sovkhozes in virgin lands and the transformation of some kolkhozes into sovkhozes. The proportional share of intelligentsia (in a broad sense, that is, the total number of workers engaged in mental work) increased in that period from 16.5 to 26 percent as a result of the development of science and technology, education, health care, and culture and the increase of administrative apparatus.

At the same time, profound qualitative changes have also taken place within each of these groups: The content of labor has changed and the level of skills and education has become higher. Whereas in 1939 only 18 of every 1,000 working kolkhoz member, 97 of every 1,000 workers, and 546 of every 1,000 employees had higher or secondary (complete or incomplete) education, in 1984 the corresponding numbers increased to 695, 825 and 987, respectively.

The small-scale private production operation in which 2.6 percent of the population (individual peasants, non-cooperative craftsmen) were engaged in 1939 had virtually disappeared as early as by the middle of the sixties. The scale of private work activities allowed under the USSR Constitution is very insignificant.

The levels of remuneration for work have also moved closer together. The real incomes of kolkhoz members per working member increased by 7.9 times in the period from 1940 to 1984 (at the same time as the remuneration of workers and employees increased by 4.3 times). In the period from 1960 to 1984 the real incomes of kolkhoz members increased from 70 percent to over 90 percent of the real incomes of workers and employees per family member. The incomes of workers and employees also moved closer together. If we single out among the latter the specialists with diplomas of higher education, it turns out that their earned pay has in fact become equal to the earned pay of workers (something that reflects a tendency toward leveling) whereas the earned pay of other employees has lagged behind the earned pay of workers, a fact that is connected among other things with the easier conditions of office work as compared to work conditions in a workshop, the levels of education and skills being equal.

At present the basic differences in the nature of work and its remuneration have changed from INTER-CLASS to INTRA-CLASS differences, that is, differences between skilled STRATA of workers, kolkhoz members, and intelligentsia as well as between their DETACHMENTS engaged in various economic branches. The remaining social differences are being overcome through the obliteration of boundaries in the ENTIRE SYSTEM of socioclass relations, between the system's

main elements and their structural parts. Thus, the convergence of kolkhoz peasantry and its closest agrarian detachment of the workers class is inseparable from the convergence of the latter and its industrial core; the convergence of the highly skilled stratum of workers (many of them now hold diplomas from technical schools, and, at times, even of higher education institutes) and the engineering-technical workers is inseparable from the higher qualification standards of the workers class and from a reduction of the still numerous stratum of workers engaged in unskilled or low-skill work, including heavy manual labor.

The perfecting of the socioclass structure of the contemporary Soviet society, briefly characterized here, and its transition to a qualitatively higher level presuppose the fulfillment of the task of BUILDING THE FOUNDATIONS OF A SOCIALIST CLASSLESS SOCIETY, the task set by the 26th CPSU Congress and concretely defined by subsequent party documents.

The Leninist theoretical heritage includes a scientifically substantiated differentiation between the SOCIALIST classless society in which the social heterogeneity has not yet been completely overcome because distribution is carried out according to work, and the COMPLETE "ANNIHILATION OF CLASSES' as the more distant goal of communist construction the achievement of which will be marked by the overcoming of all roots and recurrences of socioclass differences, that is, by the attainment of complete social homogeneity.

In 1919 V. I. Lenin wrote the following about the prospects of building a socialist classless society: "socialism is annihilation of classes" (Complete Collected Works, vol 39, pp 276, 279). "In order to annihilate the classes," he explained this formula, "it is necessary, first, to overthrow landowners and capitalists. We have accomplished this part of the task but this is still only a part of the task and NOT the most difficult part at that. To annihilate the classes, it is necessary, second, to destroy the differences between workers and peasants and transform ALL OF THEM INTO WORKERS. It is impossible to do this all at once. This task is an incomparably more difficult and, of necessity, a long-term one" (Ibid., pp 276-277).

In the same year of 1919 Lenin, dealing with the task of "annihilation of classes," also noted, in addition to the aforementioned prerequisites, that it is necessary to "annihilate both the differences between the town and the countryside and the difference between the people of physical and the people of mental work" (Ibid., p 15). Thereby in the second stage of communism a complete social homogeneity is achieved and a complete social equality of all members of society as regards their place in the system of social relations is established, including herewith also distribution according to needs. The draft new edition of the CPSU Program determines, completely in accord with Lenin's prediction, that the "formation of a socially homogenous society will be completed at the highest stage of communism."

By now the main part of the historical path has been traversed in the process of building the socialist classless society. This society is--by the overwhelming mass of its members (with the exception of parasitic and criminal elements)--a society of the WORKING PEOPLE, a society of WORKERS. However, to ensure that members of the society become WORKERS WHO SHARE THE SAME

RELATIONSHIP TOWARD THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION AND WHO RECEIVE THEIR REWARD FROM THE SOCIETY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLE OF SOCIALISM, it will be necessary to carry out extensive work to further perfect the socialist relations and to advance them to a QUALITATIVELY new level, corresponding to the high criteria of developed socialism and marking IN ESSENCE the achievement of a classless structure. Let us consider some of the key elements in the fulfillment of this task.

First, the perfecting of the socioclass structure of Soviet society toward a socialist classless society presupposes the overcoming of differences between the kolkhoz peasantry and the workers class, that is, more precisely, the AGRARIAN DETACHMENT of the latter living in the village, engaged in sovkhozes, in the auxiliary farms of industrial enterprises, and so forth, on the basis of acceleration of the intensification of agricultural production by means of changes to new technical supply and equipment, introduction of order, and consolidation of work and technological discipline. A further moving closer together of the two basic forms of social ownership of means of production, the all-people's and the kolkhoz-cooperative forms, up to and including their complete merging must play the decisive role in this connection. At present the kolkhoz peasantry bases its work both on the cooperative and the all-people's ownership because land belongs to the state. The original shares of peasants contributed during the organization of kolkhozes have been dissolved long since in the basic production funds of kolkhozes which have been created by kolkhoz members with their work and with colossal investments of the socialist state and this means also with the work of the workers class. In the 1970-84 period alone these funds increased from R42.6 to R119.9 billion, that is, nearly threefold and they increased at that to a decisive extent as a result of the state's planned capital investments, the loans received (and not always repaid) from the state bank, and the patronage assistance of industrial enterprises.

A further real socialization of labor and production in the agroindustrial complex must play a decisive role in the process of bringing the two forms of social ownership closer together. The formation of inter-sovkhoz and inter-kolkhoz enterprises and organizations is spreading and there are now more than 10,000 such enterprises and organizations and their basic funds have grown to a total of R22 billion. Formed on the basis of decisions of the May (1982) CPSU Central Committee plenum, the rayon and oblast agroindustrial associations (republican management organs in Georgia and Estonia) have the right of redistributing a part of incomes of all sovkhozes and kolkhozes incorporated in them in the common interest of advancing agricultural production. Agroindustrial combines at the levels of rayons (Timashevskiy Rayon in Krasnodar Kray) are also being formed. In all types of these associations the kolkhozes work side by side with the state enterprises and organizations as equal participants with all the rights and obligations emanating from their participation. Thus, by virtue of their role in the social organization of labor, the kolkhozes stand in the same front with other enterprises and organizations of the agroindustrial complex.

At the same time, the process of bringing closer together kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the form of work organization and remuneration continues. The practice of autonomous work teams and economic accountability brigades with

payments for work on the basis of final results is becoming increasingly widespread in agriculture. It is important to note that the democratic forms of production management originally introduced in kolkhozes are also being increasingly introduced in sovkhozes.

Thus, in our opinion, in the relatively near future the differences between the two forms of social ownership in the village and between the forms of organization of work and distribution connected with them will become unessential, that is, the remaining socioeconomic differences between the kolkhoz peasantry and the agrarian detachment of the workers class will be mainly overcome. In this sense the kolkhoz members engaged in mental work will merge with the main mass of specialists and employees. As a result of this, all working people will be placed in the same position in relation to social means of production and in equal position in the sphere of distribution.

However, considerable difficulties will have to be overcome on this path. The formation of rayon agroindustrial associations has still not resolved the question of the real rights of economic management of kolkhoz and sovkhoz lands. Relations between these basic producers of agricultural products and the departmental enterprises and organizations servicing them have not been regulated by far. The departmental interests in this connection often come into conflict with the interests of the state and society as a whole. The formation of the USSR Agroindustrial Committee [Gosagroprom] and its local organs will most certainly help solve these contradictions.

The intensification of agriculture on the basis of scientific-technological progress urgently requires the introduction of further essential changes in the economic mechanism IN THE GENERAL DIRECTION OF STRENGTHENING AND DEVELOPING ECONOMIC ACCOUNTABILITY in relations between the participants units of the agroindustrial complex (including acceptance of products, marketing and trade) as well as in relations within collectives between their subdivisions according to the results of their yearly economic activities. At the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum it was stated: "...We are firmly convinced that there must be a unified management of land and the agroindustrial associations have full responsibility for the implementation of the Food Program..."

Here is seems necessary to also note a very important SOCIAL aspect of the process. The introduction of economic accountability relations is inseparable from broadening the participation of the working people in management, that is, both in the management of kolkhozes and sovkhozes themselves and in the management through their representatives, the agroindustrial associations, and from overcoming illegitimate administrative interference of local organs in the leadership of kolkhozes and sovkhozes. The development of democratic principles in management is a most important lever in advancing labor activeness to a higher level, strengthening discipline, mobilizing social reserves for production growth, improving production efficiency, and in the struggle against losses. We note in this connection that certain forms of participation of the working people in production management (at times forgotten) which have been characteristic of our society since the time of the formation of the kolkhoz system, are now experiencing a revival and are spreading not only in kolkhozes but also in sovkhozes. Therefore, in our

opinion, the question of overcoming the social differences between the kolkhoz peasantry and the agrarian detachment of the workers class must be considered not as a one-sided process of moving the status of kolkhoz members close to the status of sovkhoz workers but as a TWO-SIDED process the core of which is the growing role of the masses in management.

The second direction of process of perfecting the socioclass structure of Soviet society is connected with the role of the REMNANTS OF SMALL-SCALE PRODUCTION OPERATIONS. During the process of collectivization in our country the agricultural collective farms [artel] were formed, which presupposed--side by side with work in social farms--the preservation of the "kolkhoz farmstead" assigning a part of land for the use of families and granting them the right to keep livestock (the size of the land sections allotted for this purpose and the norms concerning the livestock breeding in this connection were different in different zones of the country). As the kolkhoz social farm grew, the significance of the private auxiliary farm gradually declined: Before the war a kolkhoz family obtained about one-half of its common income from its private farm and now it obtains about one-quarter of its income in this way. Private auxiliary farming is also carried out by workers, the specialists and employees living in the villages, and partly also in workers' settlements, small towns, and on the periphery of urban concentrations. Private farming is intended, first and foremost, to meet the food needs of the family and this is why it is called PRIVATE. However, it produces certain surpluses which are bought up by procurement organs and consumer cooperatives and are also sold at kolkhoz markets. In 1984 the private farms of the population delivered 11 percent of the country's agricultural COMMODITY products, including 38 percent of the potatoes, 14 percent of the vegetables, 13 percent of the meat and 23 percent of the wool. Thus, under the contemporary conditions the private auxiliary farming appears a very specific RESIDUAL FORM OF SMALL-SCALE PRODUCTION OPERATIONS to which a private character is PARTLY inherent in the extent to which the produced product assumes the form of commodity.

In recent decades the attitude to private farming has passed through certain fluctuations. Following the introduction in their time of certain limitations which led to a reduction in the extent of private farming, the decisions adopted in 1977 and 1981 amounted to a directive to support this farming as an important supplementary source of supply of food and raw materials for light industries. This support is provided by kolkhozes, sovkhozes and local organs of authority in the form of the plowing of private plots, sales of young cattle and poultry as well as feed to citizens, allotment of sectors of land for haymaking, the organization of regular purchases of milk, meat, eggs, potatoes, vegetables and the like by consumer cooperatives, contracts for fattening publicly owned livestock and poultry (side by side with private livestock and poultry)) in private farmsteads and so forth. All this helps to turn private farming into a special kind of "auxiliary workshop" of social farms.

At the same time, with such a complex socioeconomic phenomenon, it is also necessary to see its other side. The families obtaining a part of their income from work in their private farming are not quite in an equal social position with the workers who work only in social production operations. The attempts of some sociologists to distinguish the ablebodied population engaged

ONLY in private farming as some kind of a special social group seem to us theoretically groundless. According to census figures, 9.8 million persons were fully occupied in private auxiliary farming in 1959 and the corresponding figures for 1970 and 1979 were 1.8 million and 564,000, respectively. Thus, this category has been sharply reduced as a result of the fact that people are being drawn into the social economy, and it is now insignificant. As a rule this group includes women with several children who cannot combine care for their family with permanent work in the kolkhoz or sovkhoz. In 1979 only 0.4 percent of the USSR's rural population indicated their private auxiliary farming as the main source of their means of existence. There is no doubt that this farming is mainly carried out by family forces, including workers engaged in public farming as well as pensioners and adolescents. Therefore, considering their social positions, the persons engaged only in private farming are justifiably included by statistics in the numerical strength of the society's main social groups because their way of life is determined by the social position of the head of the family.

Supporting the private farming of citizens does not mean that we should not take account of possibilities for the revival of negative phenomena connected with it. In many cases private work leads to the preservation of vestiges of private ownership among some parts of population. This especially applies to the citizens who market their surplus products at prices that substantially exceed the expenditure of labor. For a comparable range of products the kolkhoz market prices exceed the state retail prices more than twofold.

The cases in which work in private auxiliary farming represents the main form of occupation and source of income and is wholly oriented to the existing market shortages must be especially singled out. Considering very modest expenditures for the lease of land and electric power consumption (all the more so in view of purchases of grain and groats from state stores to feed cattle and poultry), the private auxiliary farm in fact turns into a small private farm. The periodical press frequently reports such facts, especially noting the "specialization" of private auxiliary farming in growing early vegetables, flowers and the like and the sales of these products at speculative prices in the markets of large cities. Quite considerable efforts are needed in the struggle against these negative phenomena, engendered, first and foremost by shortages as well as by clear miscalculations of social farms concerning the production of agricultural products and miscalculations in the organization of purchases of these products from the population and of trade in the kolkhoz market place. In our opinion, certain changes are necessary, among other things also in the rules of the marketable trade.

At this point we have come close to the third most important direction in the perfecting of the society's socioclass structure under socialism, the struggle against the IDLE ELEMENTS. Dealers-speculators in the kolkhoz market place represent one of these categories. The products purchased in the state trade system are often sold at a profit in the kolkhoz market place. Speculations with industrial goods, especially those with foreign "firm" labels, yield even more solid "dividends." The methods of avoiding honest work and of obtaining unearned incomes are very multifaceted and carefully "worked out" by unconscionable individuals in trade and in the sphere of services. So far we have not managed to set up the necessary barriers in the path of obtaining

unearned incomes. Another variety of these phenomena is petty theft. This is especially widespread in those enterprises where the control over preservation of valuable goods in workshops is weak and the nondepartmental protection organs, together with the administration, are either unconcerned about the gaps in the fence or even directly participate in theft.

There is bribery in the administrative apparatus where officials are enriching themselves at the expense of bribe givers for irregular allotments of housing, for a plot in the fruit growing association, for registration, for changing examinations for admission to a higher education institute, for a place in hospital and other "services." Unlawful private forms of medical, coaching and other services, usually not registered with the state organs and often representing a source of income that is out of proportion to labor expended, have become widespread among a section of the intelligentsia.

We have not set it as our goal here to list all the phenomena that concern social pathology. Hardened criminals are the most "accomplished" representatives of this "species" of the people.

"The Party attaches essential importance to the resolute eradication of unearned income, of any deviations from the socialist principles of distribution, of antisocial forms of redistribution of incomes and goods, and of parasitism and speculations," the draft new edition of the CPSU Program states. Much work will still have to be done to fully implement the basic principles of behavior of citizens of the new society. "The Party will continue to wage a most resolute struggle against all negative phenomena that are alien to the socialist way of life and our communist morals," M. S. Gorbachev emphasized at the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

It is especially necessary to dwell on the theoretical question of the NATURE OF CONTRADICTIONS between the interests of the people and the interests of the individuals who come into conflict with the principles and norms of socialism. The negative phenomena discussed above undoubtedly cannot be treated as an indication of preservation of a special type of antagonistic socioclass contradictions under socialism. Marx wrote that the bourgeois production relations represent the last antagonistic form of the social production process, a form that is antagonistic not in the sense of individual antagonism but in the sense of an antagonism resulting from the social living conditions of individuals..." (K. Marx and F. Engels: "Works," vol 13, pp 7-8). And Lenin, too, having in mind precisely the class antagonism, noted that "antagonism and contradictions are not quite the same thing. In socialism the former disappears but the latter remains" ("Leninist Collection," XL, p 391). However precisely in this connection erroneous views have been expressed in our sociological literature about possibilities for nonantagonistic contradictions of socialism to grow into antagonistic ones, this conclusion is completely incorrect because it is based on a confusion of concepts.

Criminals and all those who commit unlawful and immoral acts come into conflict with the socialist society, a conflict which we rightfully characterize as antagonistic. However this antagonism is of an individual nature and does not depend at all on the class structure. Moreover these phenomena absolutely show NOT ONLY A CONTRADICTION BETWEEN A GIVEN INDIVIDUAL

AND THE SOCIETY BUT ALSO A CONTRADICTION WITHIN THE INDIVIDUAL PERSON HIMSELF, especially if this person leads on the whole a working way of life which is normal for socialism It is no accident that our society makes great efforts to correct and reeducate even the malicious violators of social discipline and order.

Yet another aspect of the changes in the socioclass relations in socialism is inseparably linked with the perfecting of production relations in conformity with the requirements of the development of productive forces on the new scientific-technological basis.

An especially important role here belongs to the perfecting of DISTRIBUTION RELATIONS, which Lenin considered as one of the main class forming symptoms ("Complete Collected Works," vol 39, p 15), in the direction of an ever more complete implementation of the principle of remuneration according to work. What is involved here is not only a matter of closing off the sources of unearned incomes, which was discussed above, but also a matter of overcoming those elements of LEVELING which have noticeably grown in the last decade and a half. The leveling tendencies fetter the work initiative, slow down technological innovations and create an atmosphere of indifference toward the results of work and the quality of products. The perfecting of distribution relations is an economic problem but, at the same time, it also represents a SOCIAL problem because it concerns, first, the relations between the detachments of working people engaged in various branches and belonging to various labor collectives and, second, the relations between the classes and social groups and strata within them.

At present the most noticeable results in overcoming the leveling tendencies have been achieved at the lower levels of the labor collective, in the production brigade. The brigade form of work organization on the basis of economic accountability and with remuneration for work according to the end result and taking into account the individual contributions of members of that collective (coefficient of labor participation) makes it possible to more fully implement the principle of remuneration according to work within the individual brigade and essentially increases the work activeness and initiative of its members. However, the introduction of the brigade form of work organization and stimulation on the basis of economic accountability is encountering great difficulty. Experience shows that it is impossible to gradually introduce the economic accountability methods at the LOWEST levels of management without a corresponding restructuring of management at its HIGHEST levels.

The participants of the CPSU Central Committee's conference on the questions of acceleration of scientific-technological progress raised in their speeches in all of its magnitude the question of changing enterprises and associations to the system of complete economic accountability and of broadening the rights of their leaders by making the technical reequipping of production operations and the economy of resources economically advantageous for the labor collective of the enterprise (association) and by letting them be organically incorporated in their planned tasks. The proposals on radically changing the functions of the ministries and on liquidating such intermediate links in

management as the all-union industrial associations are being widely discussed in this connection.

The perfecting of production relations of socialism on the basis of a broadening of the rights of labor collectives and an increasingly wider introduction of economic accountability relations, while preserving and consolidating the strategic importance of central organs, will undoubtedly intensify the DIFFERENTIATION in the work remuneration of workers and collectives. Their skills and professions being equal, workers in some enterprises will receive much more on the basis of the results of work than workers in some other enterprises; the same can also be said about individual brigades and individual persons. The dialectic of socioeconomic progress in socialism is such that the growth of INEQUALITY based on the quantity and quality of work performed for the society represents a lever of the scientific-technological and economic development and thereby also of creating the prerequisites for the growth of EQUALITY in the process of consolidating socialism and its growth into communism. On the other hand, the leveling of its social essence indicates an attempt to rush ahead and, similarly to every other manifestation of voluntarism in socioeconomic policies, in fact turns out to represent a brake on the development of socialism.

This general law is also valid in relation to the overcoming of elements of leveling in the work remuneration of social groups and of their branch detachments and skilled strata of working people. As examples, let us consider two problems.

As is known, the society's social structure continues to develop through its constant reproduction, the change of generations. There is still considerable demand for workers for unskilled and low-skill labor but it is increasingly difficult to complement these strata of workers and kolkhoz members from among the ranks of young people. Having completed secondary education, young people do not aspire to these types of work. This situation compels the administrations of enterprises and institutions to take various "compensatory measures" that are sometimes contrary to labor laws. Thus, the actual work remuneration of a low-skill worker (cleaning woman, loader and so forth) is often as high as that of a skilled or even highly skilled worker and specialist with higher education, as a result, in particular, of assignments of double (and at times even more) positions, unsubstantiated bonus payments, irregular allotment of housing, and so forth. At the same time, skilled workers are also pulled from their main tasks to perform unskilled work. Such pictures as those of a technician working with a broom in the workshop, an engineer tightening bolts (especially toward the end of a month) on a conveyer, a scientific worker sorting potatoes in a vegetables storage depot, and so forth are well known. It was emphasized at the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum: It is necessary to "strive and ensure that everyone will work in his place conscientiously and wholeheartedly."

The second problem: overcoming a certain lag in the remuneration of persons of highly skilled mental work for whose training in the higher and medium-level specialized education institutions the state spends large sum. The figures characterizing the dynamic development of correlation between the work remuneration of engineering and technical workers and that of industrial

workers are well known: 215 to 100 in 1940 and 111 to 100 in 1984. This situation especially unfavorably affects the position of young specialists. A skilled worker who completed the vocational training school usually earns one and a half to twice as much as his equal of the same age, the young engineer who spent the same number of years studying in a higher education institute. This situation is reflected in the declining prestige of engineering work and a declining competition for studies in higher technical education institutes. Unsubstantiated requests for additional engineering and technical workers that are not based on precise information about future retirements and necessary replacement of "practical workers" and on long-term future prospects for changes in the production technology and which are made several years prior to the assignments of new graduates of higher education institutes, frequently lead to uneconomical employment of young specialists and result in a worse distribution and employment of engineering and technical workers in production operations. That is why the measures now taken to strengthen the material and moral prerequisites for considerably increasing the creative return of technical specialists and raising the role and authority of engineers to a higher level are so important.

As early as several decades ago, science appraised the movement of the workers class closer to the detachment of production intelligentsia, related to it by the conditions and nature of its work, as the appearance of a border stratum of engineering and technical workers, the stratum of "workers-intellectuals," within the ranks of the workers class. A few years ago the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems expanded nearly tenfold the list of working professions that must be filled by technicians. The social importance of the appearance and growth of the aforementioned stratum of workers is great indeed. Already today the work of the operator of the electric steel furnace, a blooming mill, or any complex chemical production unit, the installation fitter of electronic equipment, and so forth, is the work of a WORKER who directly sets in motion the means of work and produces material goods and, at the same time, it is also the work of a SPECIALIST. This type of work can no longer be called PHYSICAL (and not even "predominantly physical"). The nervous and mental strain and intellectual effort are predominantly in the work of this type of worker who is required to make technically correct and, at times, even unexpected decisions on the basis of scientific knowledge. Therefore, in our opinion, the definition of the workers class as a class of people engaged in physical (or, what is essentially the same thing, predominantly physical) work on the basis of all-people's ownership of the means of production is, to say the least, obsolete. The workers class of the socialist society under contemporary conditions (and, to an even greater extent, under the conditions of automated production operations with the use of microprocessors in the near future) can be more correctly defined as an aggregate of workers directly operating the means of work to produce material goods. The development of the above-discussed stratum of workers, the stratum of workers who organically combine skilled physical and skilled mental work--indicates the features that are characteristic of the production worker of the future.

It goes without saying that the increase in the number of specialists employed in workplaces is a phenomenon that permits no simplified evaluations. Numerous sociological research projects attest to the fact that a considerable

number of specialists with diplomas, who are engaged in workplaces, are doing the work requiring third and fourth grade education and, consequently, in fact are not using the knowledge acquired by them in technical vocational schools (or even in higher education institutes). Specialists holding diplomas of different other training are often engaged in workplaces in industry or construction. On the other hand, workers, including those who have obtained diplomas of specialists without interruption in their production work, often refuse to accept the position of a foreman, a section chief, or so forth, for material considerations, not wanting to suffer loss in earnings.

The urgent need to introduce corrections in remunerations for engineering work cannot be satisfied by simply raising the official salaries for the positions concerned. The basic way of correcting the existing disparities in the work remuneration of workers and engineering and technical workers is to overcome the leveling which fetters the "human factor."

This social necessity also manifests itself in science and the non-production sphere of activities. The increase of salaries of teachers and other workers of people's education by an average of 30 to 35 percent in accordance with the general education and vocational school reform has been received with general approval. However, the questions of higher work remuneration for some other departments of intelligentsia continue to be unsolved. It is quite obvious that these questions cannot be solved by a one-time act. The necessary resources can only be created on the basis of the growth of the consumption fund and national income as a whole. It is clear that, in solving the complex tasks of increasing the salaries and rates for the specialists engaged in non-production branches and administration, the increase in work remuneration must be more closely linked to the growth of real returns from their activities, that is, to the improvement of medical and cultural services, to greater results of the scientific research projects, to the improvement of the process of training and education of students in higher schools, and to a greater efficiency of workers in administration organs. And in this case, too, bringing the system of work remuneration into greater accord with the socialist principle of distribution is inseparable from differentiations in the material position of workers as well as in the moral evaluation of their merits before society.

Objections in this connection are heard not only from the financial organs but also from certain representatives of social sciences. The latter express concern over a possible intensification of differentiation in the material position of workers because, they say, this is contrary to the general tendency of development of the socialist society toward increasing social homogeneity. These comrades presume that the development under socialism can ONLY move toward a growing social INTEGRATION and thereby also toward growing social equality and that therefore the social DIFFERENTIATION in all of its forms is allegedly 'counterindicated' to socialism.

These objections appear to be erroneous. According to dialectic, integration in general does not exist without differentiation just as equality does not exist without inequality. The entire matter is in the question IN WHAT FORMS each of these tendencies is implemented in some or other specific socioeconomic conditions.

Two forms of inequality, existing in our society today, have been discussed above. The first of these forms exists when the individual citizens rob the society in one or another way and live at its expense, at the expense of honest working people. This type of inequality is in direct conflict with SOCIAL JUSTICE and its form that corresponds to a given historical stage. The concept and the sense of justice change together with society's development. If under socialism it is just to receive according to work in accordance with the achieved stage of the new society's socioeconomic development, this means that all forms of inequality connected with the violation of this principle, too, are unjust.

At the first stage of communism certain forms of social inequality resulting from the principle of remuneration according to work are internally inherent in society and they, too, are inseparable from the concept and sense of social justice. If the distribution system existing today is at variance with the society's strategic economic and social goals and the interests of social progress, then it is perfectly correct to continue to perfect this system and bring it ever more into accord with the socialist principles of distribution. It is true that in this connection some measures aimed at perfecting the distribution relations lead to a certain extent to increasing inequalities in accordance with differences in work contributions. However, there is nothing in this that would contradict the principles of socialism or the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

The socialist classless society, attainable at a certain stage of maturity of socialism, marks the achievement of a completely definite degree of social equality: equality in relation to the means of production and, at the same time, inequality in the distribution of produced goods according to work. "The CPSU will promote in every way the elimination of class and social distinctions. At the same time as long as such distinctions exist, the party considers it as a matter of prime significance to take account meticulously of distinctive features characterizing the interests of the classes and social groups in its policies. Major importance will be attached to making the working and living conditions of the population even in different regions of the country," the draft new edition of the CPSU Program states. Real socialism in the USSR has ensured a heretofore historically unprecedented equality of members of the society. THE USE BY ORGANS OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE FORMS OF INEQUALITY CORRESPONDING TO THE NATURE OF SOCIALISM in order to accelerate the growth of productive forces, increase social wealth, educate the new man, and thereby to create the conditions FOR PROGRESS TOWARD EVER GREATER SOCIAL EQUALITY--this is the GENERAL DIALECTIC LAW OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIALIST SOCIETY AND OF ACHIEVEMENT OF A NEW QUALITATIVE LEVEL OF ITS MATURITY.

CSO: 1802/6-F

MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE PRESENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 44-55

[Article by N. Tyurin]

[Text] The task of accelerating scientific and technical progress in the national economy holds a special place among the problems to whose solution the party draws the attention of party members and all working people on the eve of its 27th Congress. It is precisely with the sharp increase in the efficiency of all scientific activities, the radical restructuring of the application of the achievements of science and technology in production that we relate the accelerated achievement of qualitatively new levels of socioeconomic development in the country. Alongside this historical task, the agenda during the precongress accountability and election campaign in the party includes problems of perfecting management and planning, structural and investment policy, strengthening socialist discipline and order and improving the style of organizational and educational work. The solution of each one of them should directly or indirectly influence the pace of scientific and technical progress and, together, contribute to the qualitative renovation of all aspects of social life. The Leninist strategy of this renovation is substantiated in the documents currently submitted for partywide and nationwide discussion.

It is precisely within this broad context, seriously and exigently, that the party members of Sovetskiy Rayon in Novosibirsk held discussions at their 16th accountability and election party conference.

Few rayon party organizations in the country are superior to the people of Novosibirsk in terms of "compression" of scientific ideas "per unit of area," on the basis of which the universally known USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Branch, which was set up not so long ago, is firmly based today. This circumstance, which is the rayon's specific feature, largely determines the work of the rayon party organization including, above all, its leading body.

Acceleration Potential

The scope of activities of the rayon's party members is expanding with every passing year, reflecting the headlong growth of Siberian science and the scope of the industrial development of huge territories and their natural resources. At the first rayon party conference, which was held in April 1958, 301

delegates attended, representing 933 party members. Currently, the number of members of the rayon party organization is in excess of 8,000, rallied in 117 primary organizations. They work in all 29 scientific research institutes and design bureaus of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Branch and 10 institutes and design bureaus of different ministries and departments.

With what results did the party raykom and rayon party members come to the accountability conference? What had to be done to achieve a sharp growth in research efficiency and development in the most important scientific areas? What were the reasons hindering the reaching of this objective and how could existing obstacles arising on the path of scientific and technical ideas toward their practical implementation be eliminated sooner? The sharp formulation of these questions and the uncompromising and interested analysis were what determined the main content of the accountability report submitted by A.I. Zhuchkov, first secretary of the CPSU Sovetskiy Raykom, and speeches of most conference delegates. The discussion of the draft new edition of the party program and amendments in CPSU bylaws, which took place at the conference, made its proceedings even more analytical. The moral tone of the discussion held by the party members in Sovetskiy Rayon regarding their immediate concerns, closely related to the affairs of the entire country, was high and entirely consistent with the nature of present-day requirements.

It is an old and very strong tradition to enumerate, albeit briefly, at the beginning of the accountability report or speech the achieved successes and perhaps name the most outstanding areas of progressive experience. Naturally, this is done for a good reason. With an honest and principle-minded attitude toward party and official obligations, the observance of this tradition cannot hinder in any way the objective and self-critical nature of the analysis of the work done. The part which dealt with accomplishments, although bearing the imprint of pride in accomplishments, by no means held a central position in the accountability report and the discussions which followed it. Obviously, that is precisely the reason for which its task was successfully carried out: that of clearly demarcating the level and scale of current projects and concerns of Sovetskiy Rayon party members.

Yes, the Siberian scientists are making a noticeable contribution to the development of domestic and world science. Their successes in basic research are widely known. They were the foundation for major research and applied work, as a result of which basically new technologies and equipment were created and mastered within the national economy. Over the past 10 years the academic institutions have submitted to ministries and departments more than 900 developments, the practical application of which has been assessed at hundreds of millions of rubles. A characteristic fact cited in the accountability report was the following: the economic effect of the mining technology developed here by the Mining Institute, which is one of the leading subunits in the Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences, exceeds institute maintenance outlays by a factor of 4, including the financing of research. During the current 5-year plan the application of developments contributed by sectorial scientific research institutes and design bureaus earned the national economy more than 250 million rubles.

The uniqueness of the natural resources of Siberia, naturally, demand a thorough scientific formulation of the strategy for their development, consistent with regional scales and specifics. Delegates to the conference cited as an example of the proper formulation of such strategy the comprehensive "Siberia" Program drafted in 1977 on the initiative and direct participation of Akademgorod scientists. The main purpose of the program is to provide a profound scientific substantiation of efficient ways of socioeconomic development of the this huge area in the interests of advancing the progress of the entire national economy. At the present time virtually all scientific research and experimental design subdivisions of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Branch and more than 350 sectorial scientific research institutes and design bureaus and VUZs are participating in the implementation of the "Siberia" Program.

Here is yet another example which was cited at the conference, confirming the increasingly consistent orientation of Siberian science toward practical needs: presently the USSR AN SO [USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Branch] has long-term program agreements with 24 union and republic ministries. An important event which had a noticeable influence on the work of scientific collectives in the area was the all-union conference on "Development of Production Forces in Siberia and the Task of Accelerating Scientific and Technical Progress in the Region," sponsored by the USSR AN SO last July. Those attending included V. I. Vorotnikov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and RSFSR Council of Ministers chairman, A. P. Aleksandrov, USSR Academy of Sciences President, the first secretaries of party kraykoms and obkoms in Siberia, and a large group of USSR and RSFSR ministers. The results of the conference were considered by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. In accordance with the resolutions which were passed, its recommendations were used in the formulation of the draft Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the Country for the 12th Five-Year Plan and the Period Until the Year 2000. It is no secret that during the 1970s and beginning of 1980s the pace of Siberian economic development gradually declined and the growth of labor productivity slowed down. The further strengthening of the alliance of science with production is called upon to eliminate negative trends in the development of the regional economy. The delegates pointed out that this must be accomplished within the shortest possible time.

All of this raises to a new level not only the prestige but, above all, the responsibility of the scientific collectives of Akademgorodok for their assignments. The accountability report emphasized that the study of the activities of institutes and design bureaus and their party organizations holds a leading position in the daily concerns of the CPSU raykom. In the period following the 26th Party Congress the raykom buro considered the work of 15 scientific research institutes and design bureaus covering a great variety of areas of contemporary scientific and technical knowledge. What was the main conclusion? It was the same for the various scientific subdivisions for the entire 5-year period: despite individual quite substantial results, as a whole, academic science was unable to direct them completely to resolving the problems facing the national economy. As to the 11 sectorial scientific research institutes and design bureaus, which constitute the so-called area of application, their activities as well showed a certain distance from topical practical problems, understood in a broad national sense. It was presumed

that the collective of this "area" would assume all the burdens related to the practical application of academic developments and largely resolve the problem of widespread dissemination of innovations. Despite such hopes, however, sectorial scientific and design subunits are showing a tendency toward narrow specialization and work on the basis of economic contracts on topics which yield fast "reportable results" which earn ministerial bonuses. It is clear that such a trend toward narrow departmental topics and pursuit of instant benefits further reduce the already scant experimental base of academic institutions.

What is the problem? The figures and facts on the implementation of long-term comprehensive programs, cited at the conference, convincingly prove the strengthening of centralized planning in the interaction between science and production. The program-target approach to the solution of major scientific and technical problems is yielding results and, in a number of cases, contributing to mutually profitable direct relations between institutes and city and oblast enterprises. However, a single concern could be heard in the speeches by the conference delegates and in talks with scientists, party workers, economic managers and workers: no program drafted on an annual basis and no one-time cooperation contract can encompass the entire variety of scientific activities and take into consideration its inherent feature of vagueness and potential opportunities, which are difficult to assess economically in advance as long as the institute and the plant have their separate systems of management, planning and incentive.

The situation which developed literally on the eve of the rayon conference, as described to the journalists by Academician V.A. Koptyug, USSR AN SO chairman, was indicative. A shop specializing in blast strengthening of cores of railroad track switching systems was built and is functioning under the jurisdiction of the MPS [Ministry of Railways] at the Novosibirsk Switching Equipment Plant, based on the work done by the Institute of Hydrodynamics and the Siberian Design Bureau for Hydrolic Pulse Equipment. The need for such systems and the scale of their practical application are tremendous. That is why even such a shop with modest production possibilities is yielding economic benefits approximately equaling 7 million rubles. It is precisely such an "explosive" hardening of ore mining equipment (which is particularly important under Siberian conditions) could save hundreds of millions of rubles. However, this calls for combining efforts, finances and material resources of a group of ministries which, one would think, would be extremely interested in the extensive application of this innovation. Despite the obvious usefulness of such a daring idea, however, already practically tested, the coupling of departmental interests of sectorial headquarters such as the ministries of nonferrous and ferrous metallurgy, road construction machinery and transportation machinery, has not been achieved for a number of years.

"In the next few years we must resolve the application problem not in words but in action," emphasized V.Ye. Nakoryakov, deputy chairman of the USSR AN SO and USSR AN corresponding member. "In my view, the main way to achieve this is through the organizational and economic merger of scientific institutions and experimental-production facilities. An academic institute must give the country its output not as a bare idea but in its complete, "materialized" form. Unquestionably, there are areas in basic science where a "materialized"

result is sometimes impossible to obtain. In this case as well, however, one can and must find the means of determining the prospects for the utilization of even the most abstract formulas. Very promising in this respect are forms of integration between science and production, such as scientific production associations, engineering centers and scientific collectives where they develop an experimental-production base, similar to our Novosibirsk Nuclear Physics Institute. Metaphorically speaking, we see here every time a single blood circulation system, a common brain center which ensures the normal activities of such organizational structures. Under such circumstances notorious concepts such as "application" or "applied research" become automatically meaningless. For "application" involves an alien environment and only something which exists entirely separately and independently....Today we must eliminate as daringly and decisively as possible the obsolete barriers separating science from production! This must be done on a national scale, regardless of the egotistical interests of individuals and the departments they represent...."

Our time indeed demands radical changes in the sphere of relations between science and production, which is of the utmost importance to the fate of socialism and its accelerated progress. That was the reason for which the delegates heard with such great interest a detailed story, which was part of the accountability report of the party raykom, on the major action recently launched by the USSR AN SO Presidium. In formulating the plans for the 12th Five-Year Plan Period, the Siberians selected virtually 200 broad and, which is particularly important, completed scientific research and experimental design projects. Accompanied by brief technical and economic descriptions, they were sent to the USSR Gosplan, the State Committee for Science and Technology, the RSFSR Gosplan and 62 ministries and departments. The reactions of the central organizations to the material varied. However, thanks to the persistent efforts of the scientists who supported their initiative in discussions with ministry personnel and with the energetic cooperation of the USSR Gosplan and the State Committee for Science and Technology, positive results from this daring work initiative, noted by the press, were achieved. The results were the following: the USSR Gosplan passed a decree according to which 114 of the developments submitted by the Siberians would be included in the draft national economic and sectorial plans for 1986-1990 while 39 developments would become part of all-union scientific and technical programs.

This, unquestionably, was a great success! However, although being pleased, one cannot fail to consider that from the viewpoint of the search for new forms and methods of organization of the interaction between science and production this could hardly be considered a major step forward. Essentially, so far two parallel lines were merged through an energetic display of will. But how to link firmly and once and for all the interests of scientists and production workers within a common system of daily economic relations subordinated to a single end objective? It is true that the authority and energy of the party and state bodies could accomplish a great deal. However, it also still happens that, failing to find the necessary support within the existing economic structure, organizational relations among institutes and plants and the efforts of party committees or interested departments are reduced to carrying out a variety of information-propaganda steps and

promoting various types of exhibits and seminars and "science days," the effect of which is sometimes nil.

In noting the role which scientific and technical progress plays in the development of public production, V.I. Lenin wrote: "...the economist must always look ahead toward technical progress. Otherwise he will immediately find himself behind, for he who is unwilling to look ahead turns his back on history: in this case there neither is nor could there be a middle ground" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 5, pp 137-138). One of the reasons for recalling this familiar Leninist statement is the fact that, unfortunately, no single social scientist spoke out at the accountability and election conference. Yet the Novosibirsk Akademgorodok includes the Institute of Economics and Organization of Industrial Production, which enjoys the reputation of being a creative collective.

We shall not try to guess the reasons for which representatives of the social sciences, economics above all, did not participate in the discussion of a topic of great importance to the rayon party organization. However, even if had this been the result of an annoying happenstance, something more than an isolated omission of the organizations of the rayon accountability and election conference could be seen in it. Actually, it would be difficult to imagine that at such an important meeting no economic manager or progressive worker or soviet or Komsomol worker would take the floor. Yet, in this specific case, the discussion of topical problems of acceleration of scientific and scientific progress was held without the participation of representatives of the social sciences. This fact indicates, yet once again, the debt which our social scientists owe to practical workers, who are forced occasionally to apply the trial and error method, and the respect which must be shown for the social sciences and their accomplishments.

The party members, who represented Siberian economic science at the conference, could have analyzed thoroughly and specifically very promising new developments, such as intersectorial scientific and technical complexes, and the "Start" scientific and technical collective, which was set up to resolve specific problems. Whatever the case, the progressive idea of combining "under the same roof" collectives currently under different jurisdictions, for the sake of attaining large-scale national economic objectives, is alive and getting stronger and becoming "materialized" in a variety of organizational forms. Willy-nilly the accountability report mentioned briefly the extensive possibilities of such organizations, which are being created on essentially new--interdepartmental, "integral"--basis. Naturally, these possibilities will not become reality without the persistent and purposeful efforts of the party organizations, efforts aimed at the fastest possible psychological restructuring of the personnel in all areas and on all levels and the harnessing of existing reserves for the acceleration of scientific and technical progress.

From Positions of High Exigency

Internal reserves... This applies not only to obvious possibilities of labor rationalization with the help of minor mechanization facilities or organizational innovations. Both the necessary idea will come and the

necessary tools will be found providing that the main thing is there: the desire to work better, with greater initiative and make the work more interesting. The discussion of this aspect of problems of intensification and scientific research and industrial production at the accountability and election conference was extensive, principle-minded and sharp.

Yu. M. Kiselev, director of the experimental plant under the jurisdiction of the USSR AN SO Presidium, told the following story. During the present 5-year plan period, this enterprise, which was especially set up to convert "into metal" scientific ideas, became a reliable support of the scientists in their difficult searches. Here a skilled and united collective has developed, which seriously intends to apply in plant production the latest production automation facilities and operate on a total cost accounting basis. However, to do so the plant must know what to expect in the immediate future, i.e., it must have a 5-year plan. Nevertheless, the production-technical management of the USSR AN SO to which the plant is subordinated remained deaf to the plant's concern. The plant then formulated its own draft 3-year development plan and, last April, submitted it to the production-technical administration. To this day, however, it has received no answer. What are the reasons for such a stubborn silence? Could it be that the administration fears that the plan of the experimental plant would deprive it of the necessary flexibility? In its plan computations, however, the collective clearly proved its understanding of the specific nature of its enterprise and its readiness to be the experimental ground for science but only to do this better and on a broader scale than in the past. However, judging by the director's speech, it occurred to no one to study the essence of the plant's suggestions and to define more specifically its status and future development. All of this is taking place not in distant ministries but right here in Akademgorodok, in a scientific organization in which sluggishness is categorically counterindicated.

"Success is determined by the feeling, the atmosphere which the party organizations can create everywhere," delegates to the June 1985 CPSU Central Committee Conference on the Acceleration of Scientific Progress said. "It is determined by the firmness of the barrier which the party erects blocking all backwardness, departmental and parochial distortions, negligence and waste." The delegates to the conference assessed from positions of high exigency the activities of the leading body of the rayon organization and of every party member, regardless of position or job. Exigency for the party member begins with giving an extremely honest answer to a question he addresses to himself: have you done all you could to promote the success of the common project? The period experienced by the party and the country was described at the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum a time of daring decisions and energetic actions. It is the time which demands of everyone readiness to assume responsibility and to surmount the sluggish force of inertia and simple basic laziness and the custom of waiting for "orders from above," always fearing that something may go wrong as a result of making an independent decision and relying on the "protective" power of instructions.

As a rule, such habits of some managers are excessively costly.

"The importance of computers in contemporary science is universally known," said B.A. Kargin, party buro secretary of the computer center of the USSR AN

SO. "Our collective tries to satisfy as fully as possible the requirements of Akademgorodok and of Sovetskiy Rayon as a whole... Today we have come very close to the need to set up a center for mathematical modeling which will enable scientists working in all possible fields to resolve more efficiently basic scientific problems. However, the development of this and other promising trends is hindered by the lack of production area. This lack developed not as a result of the expansion of the computer center itself, for premises in our building are leased by more than 10 outside organizations. In a number of cases they occupy premises three to four times than those of the landlord. We have no right to break their lease, for such decisions are made by the departmental presidium...."

Indeed, today Akademgorodok is very short of production premises and reducing the size of the reading room of the scientific and technical library, the laboratory of the Mining Institute or a subunit of any other organization within the building of the computer center would mean vitally to harm the interests of such collectives and their management. Tactfulness inherent in academic contacts with colleagues is a splendid quality, worthy of profound respect. Be that as it may, the existing situation should be weighed on the balances of the usefulness to the government, and the efficiency needed in this case should be displayed. This was the conclusion drawn in the address by G.V. Denisenko, party committee secretary of the Sibakademstroy Construction Administration party committee. It turns out that the construction workers themselves have some demands toward the management of the USSR AN SO.

Sibakademstroy was the prime builder of the Novosibirsk Akademgorodok. It is an intrinsic part of it. Today it is a powerful construction organization with great experience, which can carry out even the most complex assignments. It is true that the realm of the current Sibakademstroy activities goes far beyond the boundaries of Sovetskiy Rayon: here the administration uses no more than some 15 percent of the annual volume of the total investments assigned to it. It is equally true that occasionally friction develops between construction workers and the USSR AN SO Presidium on the subject of projects for the construction of which Sibakademstroy lacks the necessary capacities. For the sake of fairness, however, we should point out that the construction administration tries to keep in mind the long business relations of almost 3 decades spent in a good association. But then a project becomes included in the plan and it becomes clear that in addition to bank financing and the desire of the customer to have the project completed sooner the project has no other backup. In his speech G.V. Denisenko said bluntly and clearly that "Deadlines for the submission of design documentations for USSR AN SO projects are being systematically violated." It may have been difficult for Gennadiy Vasilyevich to make such a sharp statement. However, true businesslike association always goes hand in hand with party principle-mindedness.

This is because the results of this common project shared by construction workers and scientists are not all that pleasing. For example, for the past few years the Capital Construction Administration of the USSR AN SO has been promising to submit plans for the second part of the Gidrotsvetmet Boiler Institute, which is extremely needed by the rayon as well. However, it is

either the designers who frustrate the assignments or else Stroybank experts are dissatisfied with the substantiations for the project they receive. Briefly, time is awasting and no work is being done. The lack of heat reserve is holding back the further construction of housing, kindergartens, schools and stores. Or else let us consider the numerous and just criticism by the working people of the chaotic and unfinished building of new microrayons, also mentioned by the delegates. The Sibakademstroy collective has expressed its willingness to correct this shortcoming. However, it blames the inefficiency of the UKS [Capital Construction Administration] of the USSR AN SO. The lack of cost estimate documents on the part of the customer has led to the fact that projects worth 2.5 million rubles were deleted from the plan for 1986. This includes a trade and cultural center, a nine-story residential building, a power substation and the production building of the SKB for hydrolic pulse equipment. Would such free plots be taken over by "home-built" sheds and garages for which no blueprints are necessary?

Naturally, this situation weighs on the conscience not only of the academic UKS but alsoof Sovetskiy Rayon's executive committee. The party members working for the committee were repeatedly and sharply criticized at the conference. However, it would be difficult to overestimate the role of the economic-administrative subunits of USSR AN SO in the development of the rayon's social infrastructure. This group of specialized administrations, under the direct jurisdiction of the departmental presidium is "responsible" for virtually all aspects of life in Akademgorodok and in the new microrayons. It has become increasingly clear of late that the activities of the capital construction, material and technical procurements, medical and other administrations must be radically improved. In both the accountability report and the debates the main faults of the personnel of the economic services under the USSR AN SO presidium were listed: slowness, inability to look at a problem comprehensively and a scornful attitude toward criticism shown by some party members in leading positions. The participants in the conference expressed their confidence that the rayon party members and the party organization of the USSR AN SO Presidium affairs administration will draw proper conclusions from the criticism and will fully realize the simple truth that no time to waste is left and that one must move ahead gathering speed.

This appeal was addressed from the rostrum of the accountability and election party conference also to the party members in the rayon's industrial enterprises. Although this does not apply to the industrially developed zones of Novosibirsk, each production collective should make its contribution to the struggle for economic intensification. The accountability report dealt extensively with the practical activities of enterprise party members at the end of the 5-year plan. What was the basic conclusion drawn from this study? Wherever the party organization was on the level of the requirements set to it the collective acted confidently and even under difficult circumstances achieved good end results. The accountability report named the collectives of the Novosibirsk GES and the power machinery plant. The GES workers are just about the permanent winners in the rayon's socialist competition, while the plant workers only recently were among the stragglers. However, in both places today party members are heading the most important work sectors, which has made it possible to achieve tangible results and both enterprises were able to complete their 5-year plans ahead of schedule.

Unfortunately, by no means have all labor collectives in the rayon reached the final year of the 5-year plan with overall satisfactory indicators. Enterprises, such as the bracings and posts plant and the Novosibirsk capacitors plant were unable to fulfill their 5-year assignments and have asked that their plans be lowered one quarter after another, instead of actively undertaking the use of new equipment and applying brigade forms of organization and wages. The reasons for the lagging discussed at the conference did not appear yesterday. Most of them are the result of errors made by the Ministry of Power Industry and Ministry of Electrical Industry under whose jurisdiction these plants are. Recently the Sovetskiy CPSU Raykom addressed itself to the party committees of both ministries with the request to help them streamline material and technical procurements for said enterprises, the real shortcomings of which some plant personnel cite as the reason for their own omissions in the work. Frequently references to the not quite well planned actions by the headquarters of these sectors as the reason for various types of difficulties sound unconvincing. However, some enterprises under local administration in the rayon also fall behind! Why? In order to answer the question, as the participants in the accountability and election conference justifiably emphasized, in analyzing the state of affairs in one sector or another one should not be limited to assessing figures and plan indicators. Standing behind such figures are always real people and specific collectives.

A Decisive Factor for Change

We saw in Novosibirsk's Akademgorodok that its population justifiably speaks of a special atmosphere of reciprocal relations which has developed here and for which they justifiably care. The most typical features of the moral climate in Akademgorodok are friendliness, collectivism and a strictly democratic nature of contacts between "seniors" and "juniors." These features took shape and strengthened during the 1960s, which was the starting period for Sovetskiy Rayon, when shoulder to shoulder academician and laboratory technician, plant director and janitor worked shoulder to shoulder in unloading equipment or at subbotniks in building the city. It is a familiar truth that major projects take joint efforts. Such efforts were organized and...continued, undertaking perhaps even more difficult subsequent developments, involving scientific buildings and practical human relationships. What lesson can be drawn from this experience? Naturally, above all the ability to work in a united and organized manner.

"The complex and broad tasks of the contemporary stage affecting all sides of our lives, can be resolved only by relying on the live creativity of the people and their intelligence, talent and toil," M.S. Gorbachev pointed out at the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. "We must raise for their implementation millions of working people, steadily promoting the initiative and energy of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, and putting to work the inexhaustible possibilities of the socialist society. We must more energetically support all useful initiatives." How is the rayon party committee implementing its most important mission, that of being in the vanguard of the movement of the masses?

On the day preceding the conference, V.I. Parshikov, head of the organizational party work department of Sovetskiy Raykom, quoted with visible satisfaction the following figures: at the accountability and election meetings in the primary party organizations the party members submitted 458 constructive ideas covering all possible areas of life; 545 critical remarks and suggestions were voiced at shop meetings. Approximately one-fifth of them have already been implemented and the implementation of the rest is being supervised. What do the organizational-party work department statistics show? Above all the great activeness inherent in the current accountability and election campaign and the practical and exigent mood of the party members and labor collectives. The utilization of this powerful potential fully and without losses is no simple task. However, it is also the most rewarding one in the sense of end results. The raykom, however, as one could easily notice, showed no tendency to rest on its accomplishments.

"The accomplishments of the party organization in Sovetskiy Rayon today abound in contrasting features," V. V. Kazarezov, first secretary of the Novosibirsk CPSU Gorkom, emphasized. "We have modern science, firmly established in the rayon, with a still low level of labor mechanization and automation at enterprises; most complex equipment and latest generation computers along with waste-making, idling and zero indicators in the production of goods with the State Emblem of Quality; all of this coexists literally side by side. Naturally, in this connection we must urgently raise the question of increasing the scientific assistance provided by institutes and design bureaus to the rayon's industry, transportation and consumer services. It would be just to point out, however, also that the educational and organizing work of the party committee and party buro and their aktiv has still not encompassed and imbued all collectives...."

For the sake of fairness, let us point out that the CPSU raykom can see quite clearly the possibilities of improving its activities. The accountability and election campaign helped to identify not only the positive features in the work style of the raykom and the party organizations but also things which must be firmly rejected (incidentally, the personnel of Sovetskiy Raykom has quite a volume of representative data from which to draw proper conclusions: all raykom secretaries and all heads of departments have attended five or six accountability and elections meetings in primary party organizations; as a whole, raykom personnel attendance of such meetings is on the 100 percent level).

The meetings helped to realize more clearly that the work of some party organizations is dominated by the so-called general management, which coexists with turnover, substitution and petty supervision over economic managers. Some party committees and buros clearly lack the ability to rise above ordinary fuss and engage in analysis and summations. As a result, the people are not given clear answers to their questions about what precisely they must do at a given time and in the future, and where to concentrate their main efforts. So far the procedure for the collective formulation of strategy and tactics for the implementation of scientific and technical plans has not been established. The plans themselves are frequently in the nature of outlines and isolated fragments, hardly resembling comprehensive programs. The formulation of wuch programs will will make it really possible for the party

raykom to make all of its organizational and educational activities more specific and purposeful.

The ideological work done by the CPSU raykom was covered in the accountability report in a traditional manner. This part of the report abounded with exceptionally optimistic figures. At the present time, the first secretary reported, more than 7,000 people are attending courses and seminars within the Marxist-Leninist education system; more than 900 political reporters are engaged in mass political work along with nearly 600 agitators and 1,787 lecturers of the Znaniye society rayon organization, including 46 members of the USSR Academy of Sciences and 275 doctors and 640 candidates of sciences. This is an impressive force. However, is it always as efficient as the party raykom has the right to expect by assigning to such highly skilled cadres a most important work sector--the shaping of a Marxist-Leninist outlook in the Soviet people? Judging by all available data, such is not always the case.

Also included in the report were data characterizing the level of labor and production discipline and the implementation of the rayon's antidrunkenness and alcoholism program. In particular, the following figures were cited: during the first months of 1985, after the enactment of suitable legislation, a considerably higher number of alcohol abusers were issued citations compared with the same period in 1984; the number of labor discipline violations has remained virtually the same. Other facts and figures were heard at the conference, leading to the conclusion that the CPSU raykom, the primary party organizations and the ideological aktiv must uproot more firmly chattering and formalism in their educational work and comprehensively strengthen unity between words and actions.

We believe that all the necessary prerequisites exist for the rayon's party members to make such a change. The membership of the elected aktiv in the primary party organizations was significantly strengthened in the course of the accountability and election campaign. The number of people who can skillfully combine the solution of organizational and educational problems in labor collectives is increasing. On the other hand, the exigency of party committees concerning the moral features and business qualities of party members, managers above all, has increased sharply. As always, the directing role of the party raykom and the efficient correlation of its daily activities with the political requirements of the moment remain important. Participation in the work of conferences and numerous talks with people lead to the confident conclusion that in the majority of cases the Sovetskiy CPSU Raykom is accomplishing this successfully. For example, typically, the fact that the director of one of the sectorial institutes was not voted into the party buro at the accountability and election meeting was considered by the raykom proof of maturity of the party organization. This assessment helped to strengthen the moral atmosphere in the collective.

The most topical problem of upgrading the combativeness of primary party organizations cannot be resolved simply under the specific conditions of Sovetskiy Rayon. Commissions controlling administration activities in academic and sectorial institutes can and must contribute a great deal to its solution. So far the activities of such commissions are developing sluggishly. This type of party work, repeatedly tested through practical

experience, is being applied in a number of scientific collectives with difficulty. Long tradition and the specific nature of management of scientific research make permanent and exigent control by subordinates an unusual phenomenon in the eyes of some institute directors. However, the CPSU raykom has no doubt that this very necessary form of party committee and party buro work will become mandatory in scientific and academic circles.

The speech by V. A. Mindolin, party committee secretary at Novosibirsk State University, was convincing proof of the general interest shown by the rayon communists, who are doing so much today to accelerate scientific and technical progress, and radically to improve educational activities. Actively applying progressive forms of training, increasing the amount of computer equipment and developing its branch subdivisions, in recent years the university has encountered a sharp and somewhat paradoxical problem: the computerization of training and the retraining of scientific and economic cadres are noticeably limiting educational work above all due to the scarcity of training premises. Unquestionably, familiarity with computer technology is urgently needed in training contemporary students, and Novosibirsk State University has always been and must remain a base for upgrading cadre skills in Siberia. However, V. A. Mindolin emphasized, the solution of such most important problems, created by reality itself, should in no way prevent the development of civic qualities, which are as needed by the future historian as the future mathematician. The club complex, the construction of which has now been requested by the university's management, could become a reliable base for improving educational work. Naturally, funds will be needed to complete the project. However, this is a feature of the present, which forces us to bear in mind the inseparable unity between economics and ideology. Even during the period of the greatest scientific and technical revolution man remains the yardstick for everything else.

A number of specific suggestions were formulated in the course of the discussions of the draft new edition of the party program and amendments in CPSU bylaws. The participants in the conference unanimously approved the most important precongress party documents and instructed the new raykom members to take thoroughly into consideration and to sum up the results of the discussions of these topics in all party organizations and labor collectives in the rayon.

Proceeding from the real situation, the authors of suggestions tried to include in the discussion of the party documents some of their personal experience, to sum up accomplishments and to consider how to work more successfully in the future. N. D. Dokina, head of a plasterers' brigade at the SMU-11 Construction Administration of Sibakademstroy, suggested at the conference, on behalf of her party organization, that the second part of the draft new edition of the CPSU program, i.e., the part describing the principles of ideological education work, include the demand persistently to eliminate all cases of negligence. Yu. S. Kachanov, deputy party buro secretary at the Institute of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics, was concerned by the fact that the suggested amendment in the CPSU bylaws concerning the two- and three-year holding of accountability and election conferences in primary party organizations may complicate updating and improvements in the quality of party buro members. V. A. Mindolin, party committee secretary at

Novosibirsk State University, suggested that Section V of Part Two of the draft new edition of the party program include a stipulation which would express more clearly the thought that social interests have priority over personal interests as an essential feature of the socialist way of life.

The decree adopted at the conference took particular note of the significance of the new section included in the draft bylaw amendments entitled "Party and State and Public Organizations," which refines and develops the basic principles of party leadership on all levels of the political system in our society. Under the conditions of the rayon, which includes enterprises and establishments managed by different departments, the more expanded presentation of the basic principles and forms of party leadership of state and public organizations, included in the draft CPSU bylaws (with the suggested amendments) assumes a strictly practical significance, making the coordination of their joint activities more efficient.

We can confidently say that the proceedings of the 16th Sovetskiy Rayon Party Conference were all in all successful. Perhaps the main result of the conference is that it provided clear guidelines for forthcoming activities by party members and all working people in the rayon, aimed at the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and upgrading the efficiency of scientific and ideological education work. The solution of this responsible problem, which was clearly formulated in the final document issued at the conference, urgently requires a qualitative change, radical improvements in all aspects of party work, and updating its forms and methods. But then, Siberians have always been able to carry out the most difficult and urgent projects.

5003
CSO: 1802/6

ON THE NEW EDITION OF THE CPSU PROGRAM

IN A STRICTLY SCIENTIFIC MANNER

AU031739 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) p 56

[Article by Professor V. Oligin-Nesterov, doctor of economic sciences. Uppercase passages published in italics]

[Text] Even in the first section of Part Two of the draft edition of the CPSU Program, it is clearly important to stress the SCIENTIFIC NATURE OF LEADING COMMUNIST CONSTRUCTION, BASED ON INCREASING MASTERY OF THE OPERATION OF OBJECTIVE ECONOMIC LAWS AND ON THE NECESSITY OF FURTHER COMPREHENSIVE AND PROFOUND STUDY OF THE NATURAL ECONOMIC LAWS OF PERFECTING SOCIALISM AND GRADUALLY SHIFTING TO COMMUNISM. As is known V. I. Lenin said "That we value communism only when it is economically substantiated" ("Complete Collected Works," vol 38, p 179).

In developing this thesis in the second section of Part Two, it is expedient, in connection with the acceleration of scientific-technological progress, to speak of THE GROWING ROLE OF ECONOMIC SCIENCE IN THE CONDITION OF THE CONTEMPORARY DEVELOPING SCIENTIFIC-TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION AND OF THE TRANSFORMATION OF SCIENCE INTO A DIRECT PRODUCTION FORCE OF SOCIETY.

Further, and particularly with respect to perfecting socialist production relations, the management system and methods of socialist economic operations, it is essential to reveal the MOST IMPORTANT ADVANTAGE OF SOCIALISM, WHICH IS THE ORGANIC COMBINATION OF THE CREATIVE POTENTIAL OF FREE WORKERS INTO A NEW COLLECTIVE PRODUCTION FORCE CAPABLE OF MAKING THE FULLEST AND MOST RATIONAL USE OF SOCIAL WORK AND OTHER RESOURCES AT ALL STAGES, FROM THE EXTRACTION OF RAW MATERIALS TO THEIR PROCESSING, TO THE OBTAINMENT OF COMPLETED OUTPUT AND ITS DELIVERY TO THE CONSUMER.

As long ago as 1918 (!) V. I. Lenin made it an urgent task to transform the entire state economic mechanism into an economic organism (see "Complete Collected Works," vol 36, p 7). In my view it is necessary not merely to "perfect the economic mechanism," but to move over to a qualitatively new stage in economic management operations and to find fundamentally new management decisions. It is not mechanical combination but essential transformation, integration, and synthesis which determine the formation and development of the natural laws of socialist economics.

What is involved is the development and implementation of the concept of perfecting socialism and gradually shifting to communism in economic science and economic practice, when the planned targets of socioeconomic growth should be reached not "at any price," but by the most dynamic and rational means, methods and ways.

The fruitless discussions about the assessment and stimulation of expenditure and results on the basis of the expenditure of live work alone--according to the index of "normative net production"--have also revealed a disregard for the integration processes in production and reproduction.

Criticizing Smith, K. Marx called it pure subjective "phantasmagoria" to assume the disappearance of that part of product cost which reimburses the spent past labor of society. The breakdown of product cost into wages and surplus product cost leads to a displacement of expenditure and results and to a violation of the processes of social reproduction if it disregards past labor to all intents and purposes, as both theory and economic practice show (see K. Marx and F. Engels: "Works," vol 23, 603-604; vol 50, p 105 and elsewhere).

I also consider it expedient to include in the fifth section, in connection with work education, a provision stating that it is necessary to have CORRECT ECONOMIC EDUCATION OF ALL MEMBERS OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY, AND MASTERY BY EVERYONE OF RATIONAL METHODS OF WORK ACTIVITY IN THE COLLECTIVE.

Earlier in this section it is necessary to emphasize the thesis that THE ECONOMIC TRAINING AND ECONOMIC EDUCATION OF WORKING PEOPLE ARE AN OBJECTIVE REQUIREMENT OF THE SYSTEMATIC INCREASE IN THEIR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL LEVEL UNDER SOCIALISM.

In the sphere of science, it is necessary to concretize the TASKS OF STUDYING THE NATURAL ECONOMIC LAWS OF THE CONTEMPORARY SCIENTIFIC-TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION, OF ACCELERATING SCIENTIFIC-TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS IN THE SOCIALIST NATIONAL ECONOMY, AND OF PERFECTING THE FORMS AND METHODS OF CONSCIOUS UTILIZATION OF ECONOMIC LAWS IN THE PRACTICE OF COMMUNIST CONSTRUCTION.

CSO: 1802/6-F

CATALYST OF MATURE THINKING

AU032009 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 57-58

[Article by Professor I. Suslov, doctor of economic sciences. Uppercase passages published in italics]

[Text] The effective perfecting of the mechanism of economic operations and the increasing of its influence on the intensification and effectiveness of production depend to a decisive extent on the economic literacy and the development of the economic thinking of the working people. This has been appropriately reflected in the drafts of the new edition of the CPSU Program and the Basic Guidelines of the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for the Years 1986-1990 and for the Period to 2000.

At the same time, certain provisions should be clarified. Thus, in the paragraph of the draft program which deals with the perfecting of management, it is expedient to add to "growth of educational standards, consciousness and qualifications" three more words--"ECONOMIC LITERACY AND KNOWLEDGE to continue as in the text: "of the broad mass of the working people."

In the text of the Basic Guidelines, the last paragraph in Section 14 should be strengthened in the following manner: "TO IMPROVE THE SYSTEM OF TRAINING CADRES OF ECONOMIC LEADERS IN ALL SECTORS, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE NEW REQUIREMENTS. TO TRAIN CADRES WHO, AS WELL AS POSSESSING CONTEMPORARY NATURAL SCIENCE, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC KNOWLEDGE, ALSO POSSESS ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITIES, A BROAD SCIENTIFIC OUTLOOK AND AN ABILITY TO SOLVE ECONOMIC TASKS IN AN ECONOMICALLY COMPETENT MANNER, PRIMARILY FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF STATEWIDE INTERESTS AND OF THEIR HARMONIOUS INTERACTION WITH COLLECTIVE AND PERSONAL INTERESTS, AND WITH LOCAL OR REGIONAL AND BRANCH OR DEPARTMENTAL INTERESTS."

These provisions are important for all branches and spheres of the national economy. But they are particularly significant in the agrarian sector of the economy, a fact which is conditioned by the great complexity of the interweaving and interaction of the objective laws of functioning and development, and by the multiplicity of forms of economic operations in this sphere. Three groups of natural laws operate here: socioeconomic, biological and technological. Their combination and interaction are distinguished by

great diversity not only according to zones and microzones, but also within economic units, brigades and fields within the brigades. For this reason the results of economic activity depend to a considerable extent on consideration of the concrete and specific nature and the structure of the production potential and of the mechanism of the interconnection of this potential's elements, a mechanism which, moreover, changes in different ways under the influence of weather and temporal factors. All this will be recognized to the maximum extent by a worker who is thoughtful, who thinks actively and who has accumulated experience and skillfully combines it with the new achievements of science and technology and with advanced practice.

A high standard of production is the consequence of mature thinking by a worker, of his interest in and responsibility for current promising results of economic operations. The interconnection of these can be very tangibly and clearly traced both in the example of economically strong units and in that of economic units which have lost their impulse toward development and movement by themselves. Their revival, as an indispensable condition of accelerated development, is unthinkable without economically competent running of the economy, and this in turn is incompatible with constant bureaucratic administration, with hackneyed planning, with petty overseeing and with illegal regulation.

These methods have proven to be very much alive in agriculture, first of all because of the now established extensive levers of managing kolkhoz and sovkhoz production, second, as a result of the virtual lack of punishment for unlawful economic measures and actions, and third, because of the automatic recovery of losses through low level of remuneration of agricultural workers' work until the mid-seventies, and later through bank credit in the kolkhoz sector and state budget subsidies in the sovkhoz sector.

The fundamental turn toward intensive growth factors presupposes a resolute struggle against bureaucratic administration in all of the forms in which it manifests itself. Practice shows that the greatest and most stable results are achieved in those economic units and those regions in which leaders, specialists and labor collectives implement an economically competent strategy, do no submit to excessive bureaucratic administration from above, and do not reproduce it in their subsystem.

For this reason, in the section on perfecting management of the national economy in the draft Basic Directions, it is necessary to reinforce the corresponding paragraph with the following wording: "NOT TO ALLOW BUREAUCRATIC ADMINISTRATION, PETTY OVERSEEING, AND ILLEGAL REGULATION OF THE ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF ASSOCIATIONS, ENTERPRISES, SOVKHOZES AND KOLKHOZES, THESE BEING INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE COURSE OF INTENSIFYING PRODUCTION IN EVERY POSSIBLE WAY AND OF ACCELERATING THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY."

The socioeconomic structure of the agrarian sector includes economic units functioning on the basis of three forms of ownership: all-people's, kolkhoz-cooperative, and the personal (family) ownership of rural households. The contemporary stage of development is characterized by the intensification of the interconnection and interaction of these forms. These processes are

particularly clearly manifested at the rayon level, in the territory of rural soviets, and in kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

Interaction is strengthening and developing at all stages of reproduction: from the formation of funds of production activity and institutions of the social infrastructure to the appropriation of the results of economic operations. Interaction and its consolidation are an objective requirement which is developing in a law-governed manner in the conditions of the perfecting of socialist society. Recognition of this requirement raises the maturity of economic thinking to a new level and makes new demands on the leadership of the agroindustrial complex at all its levels.

The interconnection of the forms of social ownership is reflected in a number of sections of the draft new edition of the CPSU Program. In the second part of the first section, which characterizes the economic prospects, the following wording would be more relevant and well-founded: "...DRAWING TOGETHER OF COLLECTIVE FARM AND COOPERATIVE PROPERTY AND THE PROPERTY OF THE ENTIRE PEOPLE, AND INTENSIFICATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR INTERACTION." In this case it is entirely apposite to recall the worDs of F. Engels, who said that "the entire great course of development occurs in the form of interaction (although the interacting forces are unequal: economic movement is the most powerful, initial and decisive of them)" (K. Marx and F. Engels: "Works," vol 37, pp 420-421). This provision is highly important and relevant for the agrarian sector of the economy.

And the third paragraph of the subsection on "The Refinement of Socialist Production Relations, the System of Administration and Management Methods" is proposed to have the following wording: "AN UPSURGE OF PRODUCTIVE FORCES IN THE AGROINDUSTRIAL COMPLEX AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTER-FARM COOPERATION AND OF AGROINDUSTRIAL INTEGRATION WILL HELP COLLECTIVE FARM AND COOPERATIVE PROPERTY DRAW CLOSER TO THE PROPERTY OF ALL THE PEOPLE, AND HELP TO DEVELOP AND STRENGTHEN THEIR INTERACTION IN THE INTERESTS OF EVER FULLER REALIZATION OF THE POSSIBILITIES AND ADVANTAGES OF SOCIAL PROPERTY IN AGRICULTURE."

Unfortunately, the forms, ways, conditions and, even less so, the time-spans of the fusion of kolkhoz-cooperative forms of ownership with all-people's ownership have not been theoretically developed. It would be desirable for this question to be infused with greater clarity in the CPSU PRogram.

The new edition of the CPSU Program is a fundamentally important source for the study of the Marxist-Leninist theory of social development and of CPSU economic strategy. A precise exposition of the natural laws of socioeconomic development and the "characterization of that which we have started to do and of the next steps which we want to take" (V. I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works," vol 36, p 66), represent a powerful catalyst for the formation of mature and scientific economic thinking by working people as a precondition for and important factor in the successful realization of the party's program aims.

CSO: 1802/6-F

IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PERSON

AU071316 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 58-59

[Article by V. Goylo, senior scientific worker of the International Workers Movement Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences. Passages between slant lines published in italics]

[Text] In Part Two of the new edition of the Program, the subsection on "The Refinement of Socialist Production Relations, the System of Management Administration, and Management Methods" in the section on the "Economic Strategy of the Party" sets out the position on questions of perfecting the basic economic relations in three fundamental sectors of social reproduction: Production, distribution and exchange. The general spirit and logic of the entire Program, which links the successful solution of the planned tasks to an increase in the /role of the human factor/, that is, to comprehensive and intensive development of our society's main productive force, call for the development of a similar strategy in a fourth sphere of general economic circulation, namely that of /individual consumption and consumption relations/, and for its inclusion in the draft under discussion. This must be done in order to raise the ideological-theoretical and practical significance of the given sphere of the population's and the whole society's activity.

Regardless of the social form of economy, individual consumption operates in the entire economic system as "consumer production," where the creation and perfecting of man himself largely occurs. From the point of view of the process of reproduction, individual consumption as a whole makes the producer become a producer and the final goal (depending on the social system of society) of the whole of production is achieved. It should be particularly noted that it is impossible to form and perfect capabilities for qualified and complex work in a "technological" manner without special expenditure of live work by those who will actually possess these capabilities in the future.

Perfecting the qualitative structure of consumption of articles and services by the population and improving the qualitative aspects of the entire activity of working people and their families outside work are now being advanced to the forefront of individual consumption. In this connection it is necessary to take account of and utilize the circumstance that in this sphere, and particularly in economic units within the family--an enormous mass of material and nonmaterial goods are produced or their production is finished.

It is primarily consciously established and scientifically substantiated social relation of consumption which can regulate the sphere of individual consumption in an economically rational and socially effective manner. In recent times the party and state have adopted serious measures in this area.

Proceeding from these considerations, I propose that in the given subsection, after the paragraph on the modification of the relations of exchange, a separate paragraph be included: /"The party attaches strategic significance to the progress of individual consumption and of relations concerning individual consumption. Constant attention will be paid to perfecting the qualitative structure of individual consumption and also the structure of the population's entire activity outside work time."/

In the same connection, in paragraph 5 of the subsection under analysis, which is devoted to the perfecting of the relations of distribution, it would be expedient to add /"and just"/ after the attribute "effective" in the second sentence, and thus provide a fuller characterization of the aim of socialist distribution. This sentence would then read thus: "It will be consistent policy to make the most effective /and just/ distribution of the social product and national income, ensuring that the mechanism of distribution becomes a stout barrier to unearned incomes and leveling in pay, a barrier to everything that contradicts the norms and principles of socialist society."

In the section on the "The Social Policy of the Party," the introduction (second paragraph from the end) and the second subsection on "Overcoming Class Distinctions and Forming a Socially Homogeneous Society" (Paragraph 4) set the task of effacing the "substantial distinctions between physical and mental work." This formulation requires some clarification. First, it is my conviction that it is virtually impossible to carry out this task; both mental and physical work will clearly always exist as types of human activity. What should obviously be involved is the elimination of the undesirable, negative social consequences of this division, that is, primarily of the professions to which it gives rise. For this reason it would be more correct to set the task of overcoming the substantial differences not between physical and mental work, but between the workers in these types of activities, the differences in their socioeconomic position.

In the same section, where subsection "Increasing Prosperity and Boosting the Living and Working Conditions of Soviet People" discusses intensifying care for the family, I propose that the initial phrase of this paragraph be supplemented as follows (the addition is in italics): "The CPSU attaches great significance to improving the care for the /Soviet family not only as an important economic cell of our society but also as one of the most widely spread forms of the socialist collective."/ And further as in the draft.

The relations inside and outside the family--for all their specific nature--must be constructed as in the true socialist collective, with all the rights and obligations that arise from this.

CSO: 1802/6-F

SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF YOUTH

AU071314 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 59-60

[Article by I. Ilinskiy, director of the Scientific Research Center of the Higher Komsomol School attached to the Komsomol Central Committee. Uppercase passages published in italics]

[Text] One of the most important features of the draft new edition of the CPSU Program is the fact that in its entire content it is aimed at resolving the contradictions and problems existing in our society, including the problems of young people. Let us take only demographic problems, those of the birthrate and surplus migration, or socioeconomic problems of increasing the productivity and quality of work, of the formation of new generations of the workers class, kolkhoz peasantry, and intelligentsia, and one of the growth in the social activeness and education of the masses. All of these are connected with the attitude of young men and women to the affairs of society and the state. This is natural, because young people are the product of society, its active transforming force and its future. It is for precisely this reason that questions of the policy on youth have been comprehensively reflected in the draft.

Nevertheless, in our view certain provisions could be defined more precisely and supplemented. For example, the section on "The Social Policy of the Party" notes the "need to substantially INTENSIFY ATTENTION TO THE SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF YOUTH and, above all, fuller satisfaction of its needs in the sphere of work and everyday life, education and culture, professional advancement and promotion, and rational use of free time." The importance of this provision is obvious. At the same time, it would be desirable for its formulation to be somewhat altered.

First of all, in our view the term "needs" [zapros] should be replaced by the concepts of "interests" and "requirements" [potrebnost], which have a more definite scientific content. Second, it would be preferable to talk not only about the satisfaction of the interests and requirements of young people, but also about their purposeful formation. This is prompted in particular by the growth in consumer attitudes among a proportion of young people. Third, it might be emphasized that what is involved is not just any requirements, but rational requirements which correspond to man's true nature and to the

potential of our society at this concrete historical moment. Finally it appears that in conformity with the programmatic goal of forming a comprehensively and harmoniously developed personality, our society can today set itself the task of educating a young generation which is comprehensively socially mature and which realized and asserts itself on the basis of a correct combination of group and personal interests within the interests of Soviet society. In this light, the cited provision of the draft could be presented in this more precise and supplemented form:

"The party stresses the need to substantially intensify attention to THE FORMATION OF A SOCIALLY AND COMPREHENSIVELY MATURE YOUNG GENERATION, to youth social problems and, above all, THE DEVELOPMENT AND fuller satisfaction of THE INTERESTS AND RATIONAL REQUIREMENTS OF YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN in the sphere of work and everyday life, education and culture, professional life and promotion, and correct use of free time. IT IS NECESSARY TO INCREASE THE ROLE OF YOUNG PEOPLE IN IMPLEMENTING THE ECONOMIC STRATEGY AND SOCIAL POLICY OF THE PARTY."

Further, in the new edition of the CPSU Program it is important, in our view, to point to the fact that progressive, crisis free development of Soviet society is possible only if ties of continuity with the revolutionary generations of Soviet people are fully ensured, and that it is on the correct management of the process of continuity in ideology and politics that the rates of our advance in all other spheres depend. The draft states that "the CPSU sees it as the main task of its ideological work to educate the working people in a spirit of high ideological integrity and commitment to communism..." In our view, the role of education in such an important and profound process as the continuity of the generations should be pointed out.

For this reason the second paragraph of the preamble to Section V of Part Two of the draft new edition of the CPSU Program could be formulated in this manner: "THE CPSU SEES IT AS THE MAIN TASK IN ITS IDEOLOGICAL WORK TO CORRECTLY ENSURE THE REVOLUTIONARY CONTINUITY OF THE GENERATIONS ON THE BASIS OF THE EDUCATION OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE (and not only working people--I.I.)IN THE SPIRIT OF A HIGH LEVEL OF IDEOLOGICAL AWARENESS...."

One would think that the idea of the continuity of the generations must also be reflected in the characterization of the Komsomol, which is in essence the school of revolutionary continuity. In Section IV, where the role of the Komsomol in the Soviet political system is dealt with, it is proposed that the second phrase be given the following wording: "The party will continue increasing the Komsomol's role IN THE REVOLUTIONARY CONTINUITY OF THE GENERATIONS AND PRIMARILY IN THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG PEOPLE."

In our view, the formulation of the Komsomol's role contained in the CPSU Program and Statute should be corrected. Section Eight of the draft changes to the Statute names such an important function of the Komsomol as participation in the management of state and public affairs, whereas this function is not designated in the draft new edition of the program.

Apart from this, there are other differences in readings at corresponding points in the drafts on the role of the Komsomol. For example, in one case

the tasks of the Komsomol in educating young people [molodyezh] are spoken about (in the Statute), while in another it is the "younger generation" [podrastayushchaya smena] (in the program). It is clearly preferable to speak of the education of young people, since it is precisely with this part of the younger generation that the Komsomol conducts educational work.

One more clearer definition is proposed. For example, Section Four on the "Development of the Political System of Soviet Society," states: "THE CPSU BELIEVES THAT IN THE PRESENT STAGE THE STRATEGIC AVENUE OF DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIETY'S POLITICAL SYSTEM LIES THROUGH ADVANCING SOVIET DEMOCRACY AND INCREASINGLY PROMOTING THE PEOPLE'S SELF-GOVERNMENT ON THE BASIS OF THE DAY-TO-DAY, ACTIVE AND EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION OF THE WORKING PEOPLE AND THEIR COLLECTIVES AND ORGANIZATIONS IN MAKING DECISIONS ON THE AFFAIRS OF STATE AND SOCIETY." In our view, the words "working people" could be replaced by "Soviet people." since the given provision also applies to students. To be specific, school and student self-government is a form of the people's self-government. In other cases, too, wherever it is justified, it would be better to say "Soviet people," "the population." or "the people," implying, of course, that the working people form their basis.

CSO: 1802/6-F

ON CHANGES IN THE CPSU STATUTES

AU070601 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 61-65

[Letters to KOMMUNIST from CPSU members]

[Text] The party's increasing leading role is indissolubly linked with increasing demands toward every individual communist and increasing demands concerning the level of political and organizational work of every party organization. In this connection, I propose that certain more precise definitions and supplements be introduced in the draft changes in the CPSU Statute, primarily in paragraph No 2. Thus, point "A" could begin as follows: "To precisely carry out the party's statute and spare no efforts, knowledge and labor to implement the party program." The same point could be concluded as follows: "The economic leader-communist is answerable before the party for success in the production activities and the moral-political state of the collective headed by him." It seems advisable to add the following provision in point "D" after the first phrase: "to actively participate in the political-educational work while observing the most important principle of party activity, that is, the unity of words and deeds." It would be desirable to extend point "E" by adding the following text to it: "Bureaucratism and formalism, using official position for selfish aims, embezzling social property, write-up or distortion of accounts, bribe taking and speculations, concealing output of defective products, and other actions that are contrary to Soviet laws and which discredit the honest and pure image of the party member and the authority of the CPSU in the eyes of the people are imcompatible with membership in the party." I propose that point "I" be set forth in great details; that is, in particular, the words "bureaucratism and formalism" could be added after the words "ostentation, conceit" and the word "mismanagement" after the words "Departmentalism, window dressing." I believe that point "J" should be supplemented with the following: "Cadre transfers must be always and absolutely determined by state interests, every communist is personally responsible to the party for objectivity of character reports and recommendations made by him."

I believe that the first provision of paragraph No 52 should be stated with the following formulation: "The basis of the party is its primary organizations that are called upon to further the union of the party policy with the living creativity of the masses."

I propose that the second indented paragraph of Paragraph No 53 should be formulated differently and read as follows: "In the brigades and other production teams in which there are three or more communists and where there are no internal workshop, section or other similar organizations, party groups are formed (which are either permanent or temporary for the duration of the time required for the fulfillment of joint production tasks away from the main labor collective), and where there are only one or two communists, a party organizer is appointed."

Signed: O. Vinogradov, CPSU member since 1962, engineer-designer, Moscow.

The communists of our rayon have received the published draft CPSU Statute (with proposed changes) with great interest. The discussion of this important document is in full progress. I want to stress: communists fully approve the amendments and supplements introduced by the draft. At the same time, as a communist and worker of the CPSU raykom, I consider it my party duty to make certain observations concerning the further perfecting of the party code.

Speaking about our rayon party organization, a tendency toward its "aging" has been increasingly evident in recent years. In the past 6 years, the proportion of communists above the age of 50 years has increased from 32.8 to 43.4 percent of all members of the organization. On 1 January 1985, 18.5 percent of all members of the organization were over the age of 60. It is no secret that, because of their declining years or illness, quite a considerable number of communists do not participate actively in the work of their party organization.

It would perhaps be advisable in this connection to introduce the institution of honorary CPSU members. The institution of party candidate members already exists (and it does so completely justifiably), does it not? It seems to me that a provision on the status of party veterans incorporated in the CPSU Statute would be positively assessed by communists of advanced age who--not by their will--have drawn away from active participation in the activities of party organizations. And to preclude any formalism in this complicated and--to put it directly--sensitive task, the statute should provide for and "legalize" the possibility for communists to move to the category of honorary party members (it would still be possible to think about what they should be called. This transition should be made strictly voluntarily on the basis of personal statements by the communists concerned, and should be formalized by the decision of the primary party organization concerned, a decision that would be mandatorily subject to confirmation by the CPSU raykom (gorkom) bureau. An honorary party member must retain (this is very important!) all the statutory rights enjoyed by the communists.

I would also like to introduce more precise definitions in the individual sections of the draft changes in the CPSU Statute. Thus, I propose raising the age of young people joining the party only through the Komsomol to 28 years (paragraph No 4). Otherwise it seems to me that the question inevitably arises of the moral (and I would say, even the political) right of the individual who is of Komsomol age but is not a Komsomol member, to join the party.

The statute should stipulate that the meetings, conferences and congresses are valid if they are attended by two-thirds of the members of the party organization concerned or of elected delegates, and not if they are attended by "more than half" of them, as is now stipulated (paragraph No 22). According to the system proposed by the draft, if a meeting is attended by 21 of the 40 registered communists, virtually any question of importance for the life of the organization involved can be decided by a mere 11 votes, something that naturally should not be allowed in order not to violate the principles of internal party democracy.

Furthermore, I consider it advisable to supplement paragraph No 54 with the following provision: "In sovkhozes or kolkhozes where there are more than 100 communists, general party conferences are to be held not less than once and workshop party conferences not less than twice in any 3-month period." This proposition is explained by territorial dispersal and a certain amount of separation of sections and production sectors of contemporary farms, and by the "technological" impossibility of frequently taking away from work the communists engaged in the basic branches of agricultural production operations.

A question arises in connection with the proposals included in the draft changes of the statute (paragraph No 55) on the elections of the bureaus of primary and workshop party organizations for 2- 3-year terms. In this case, what periodical principle should be applied in relation to the accountability reports and to the elections of secretaries and their deputies and of party organizers in the primary or workshop party organizations?

Signed: V. Khvan, chief of the organizational department of the Megino-Kanagalasskiy Raykom. Yakutsk ASSR.

In the first indented paragraph of the preamble, the word "people's" should be inserted before the word "intelligentsia;" and in the third indented paragraph of the preamble, the word "working" should be inserted before the word "people." It seems to me that this formulation would more precisely express the indissoluble unity of the party and the working people.

It seems advisable that in the test of the fifth indented paragraph of the preamble, where it is said that "the CPSU builds its work on the basis of strict observance of Leninist norms of party life, and the principles of democratic centralism, collectiveness of leadership" the following words be added: "and personal responsibility of communists for the assigned tasks."

I propose that the text of paragraph No 2 be prefaced by the following indented paragraph: "The communist furthers with his personal example the fulfillment of the party's vanguard role, adopting an active living position in everyday work, everyday life and communications with people."

In my opinion, it would also be useful to more precisely word the text of paragraph No 2 by rephrasing the opening phrase to read "to firmly know and unswervingly implement," and by adding after the phrase "organize the working people to implement it" the phrase "and extend to them comradely assistance in this connection."

It seems to me that more precise definitions are also needed in paragraph No 3. For instance, point "B" should appear with the following formulation: "to frankly state and defend his opinion and make proposals at party meetings, conferences, and congresses, at sessions of party organs, and in the party press, and to freely discuss questions of practical activity of the party until the party organization adopted concrete decisions on these questions."

I propose to phrase the third indented paragraph of paragraph No 24 more concretely by putting it in the following terms: "In the election of all party organs, from primary organizations to the CPSU Central Committee, the principle of the systematic ONE-THIRD [uppercase word published in italics] renewal of their composition and of continuity of leadership shall be observed." At the same time, the following additional new indented paragraph should be included in this paragraph: "The reelection of the communist to one and the same elective organ shall be allowed only for one additional successive term. In exceptional cases reelection for a third successive term shall be allowed if a special decision in this connection is adopted by at least a three-fourths majority."

Signed: Senior lecturer V. Grebenkin, CPSU member since 1968, candidate of economic sciences. Moscow.

I propose the introduction of certain more precise definitions in the draft under discussion.

It would be desirable to supplement paragraph No 1 with the following: "Workers of apparatuses of raykoms, gorkoms, okrug committees, obkoms, and kraykoms and of the republic central committees of the party are registered with the party organizations of enterprises of the given territorial rayon to which they belong." This addition does not contradict the Leninist definition of party membership. In my opinion there is no need to explain its positive aspects.

In paragraph No 9 it would be advisable to add after the words "The severest form of party punishment is expulsion from the party" the following: "This measure is the only measure of party punishment for such disgraceful occurrences as those of squandering state funds, window dressing, abuse of official position, embezzlement, bribery, and persecution for criticism, as well as for an indulgent attitude toward such occurrences." It seems that this addition will more strongly emphasize the inevitability of punishment for the grossest violations of the party statute and the Soviet laws and will thereby have a great educational effect. Furthermore, it will exclude as much as possible the "freedom to maneuver" in the examination of each concrete case of such abuses, and the possibility for the guilty individuals to escape their just punishment.

Signed: Professor O. Myazdrikov, CPSU member since 1950, doctor of technical sciences. Leningrad.

I consider it necessary to introduce in the draft statute (with proposed changes) an addition that seems essential to me. In paragraph No 2, point "G," the following should be added to the indented paragraph dealing with the

moral qualities of the communist: "to always remain irreconcilable toward the alien aspiration--unworthy of a communist--to obtain special material and other privileges." There is obviously no need to demonstrate in detail that by putting an end to the situation in which some party member, having attained any in the least high party or state position, tries to obtain--and is at times quite successful in obtaining--especially favorable everyday living and other conditions for himself and his family, it would be possible to succeed in significantly improving the internal party relations and the general moral atmosphere in the country, and in ensuring a more consistent implementation of the principle of social justice in our society.

Signed: Colonel (retired) V. Strugallo. Krasnodar.

I submit the proposal to supplement paragraph No 2, point "B" of the draft with the phrase "to strive for physical self-perfecting." Because the people's physical health represents an invaluable resource of the socialist, the communist society. In our country all the necessary conditions exist for the physical development of the individual and for strengthening his health. communists must set an example in this important task. In my opinion this is their direct obligations.

In my opinion paragraph No 58, point "E," should also state that the primary party organization also concern itself with "the protection of nature and the improvement of the environment." The preservation of nature and improvement of the environment represent one of the goals set for society by the new edition of the CPSU Program. And the primary party organization must take a most active and direct part in the efforts to achieve this important goal.

Signed: Yu. Nozdrin, CPSU member since 1962. Moscow.

It seems advisable in paragraph No 2, point "I" in the listing of the negative phenomena against which a party member must struggle, namely "ostentation, conceit, complacency, parochialism, departmentalism, window dressing," to add "overcautiousness, time-serving, servility" and leave the remaining text unchanged.

I propose the following formulation for the second sentence in point "C" of paragraph No 3: "Persons guilty of suppressing criticism and persecuting others for criticism are MANDATORILY CALLED [uppercase words published in italics] to strict party account, up to and including expulsion from the CPSU ranks.

Signed: Professor Ch. Abutalipov, CPSU member since 1956, doctor of historical sciences. Tashkent.

I propose to limit point "D" of paragraph No 2 to its first phrase and to move the second phrase to point "E," and to change and expand this phrase as follows: "To wage a resolute struggle in his collective and in society as a whole against any manifestation of bourgeois ideology and morals and private ownership mentality, and against violations of Soviet laws, against religious prejudices, and other views and customs that are alien to the socialist way of

life, to actively oppose promoters of antisocial attitudes, to promote the formation of a healthy social climate, and to assert the socialist legality."

Signed: V. Bogomolov, officer-political worker.

It seems necessary to define more precisely the rights of the general meeting or conference in paragraph No 22 of the draft which deals with the highest leading organ of the party organization. This is necessary because in the draft these rights and authorities are nowhere determined.

It is stated in the draft (paragraph No 55) that the primary and the workshop organization "elect their bureau for terms of 2 to 3 years." I think that it would be advisable to limit the term of the bureau to 1 year. If members of the party bureau or the secretary work well, they are always reelected. However, in my opinion in no way should the possibility be maintained for the bureau, in any composition, to head the party organization for 2 or 3 years regardless of the quality of its work. It is obviously necessary to include in the statute a provision on the right of the party organization to elect a new bureau if the existing bureau turns out to be incapable of work.

The draft change to the statute speak about the impermissibility of "merging the functions of the party organs and those of other organs" (paragraph No 60), but it is not clarified precisely how the party organization must exercise its control over activities of the administration.

Signed: Yu. Yeremeyev, CPSU member since 1970, journalist. Cheboksary.

Paragraph No 24 of the draft states that in the election of all party organs, the principle of systematic renewal of their composition and of continuity of leadership shall be observed. In my opinion, this formulation is incomplete because it fails to define how many members of the leading organ (in percentages) may be reelected. The failure to provide such a guideline opens up the possibility for the same persons to be elected as members of the party organs several times, even if this is not in the interests of the tasks at hand. To prevent the development of such situations, it seems advisable to renew the composition of party bureaus and party committees to a considerable extent at every election. Only the comrades that have proved themselves an absolutely devoted to the cause of the party, as skilled organizers, and as absolutely honest may be reelected.

It is also necessary to bear in mind the fact that in the elections the balloting lists usually include precisely as many candidates' names as the number to be elected. The discussion about the candidates is often merely a formality. And, as a rule, all those included in the list are elected. To a certain extent this system makes the process of improvement of the qualitative composition of the elective party aktiv more difficult. It is well known that the same persons who occupy responsible positions for a long time become accustomed to shortcomings, lose the sense of party-mindedness, or even become direct violators of Soviet laws. It must be added to the aforementioned that, even though a considerable rejuvenation of cadres of the party and state organs has taken place recently, quite a few leading workers are of quite a considerable age, something that definitely affects their ability therefore

hinders work. In the statute it is therefore desirable to "legalize" the age limit for the communists who are elected as members of the leading party organs at all levels.

Signed: V. Nikitin, CPSU member since 1931, pensioner. Moscow.

I propose that in paragraph No 14 of the draft, after the words "to familiarize themselves in greater depth with the program and statute of the CPSU," the following words be added: "its history and contemporary activity."

Since the periodical accountability reports by party candidate members on their passing the test of the candidate status have proved useful and are increasingly becoming an established practice in party life, it would be advisable, in my opinion, to legalize this practice in the statute by supplementing paragraph No 14 with the following provision: "The party candidate member renders account of his passing the test of the candidate status at the general party meeting or at the session of the party bureau."

The draft correctly proposes--in the Leninist way--that as a rule the admission to the party be made at open meetings. However, in this connection it is not quite clear what role is assigned to nonparty people. For this role should in no way amount merely to their attendance at the meeting without being able to state their attitude toward the comrade who is being admitted to the party! Therefore, I consider it important to formulate point "B" of paragraph No 4 more precisely by adding the following words to the last phrase of the second indented paragraph: "taking into account the opinion of nonparty people."

It can only be welcomed that the draft changes in the CPSU Statute include the requirement that the recommending bodies or individuals must help the recommended candidate in his ideological-political development. However, considering the CPSU's historical experience and the demands of the contemporary practice of party building, it would be necessary to formulate more definitely and, I would say, more strictly the provision on the responsibility of the recommending bodies or individuals for the behavior of the recommended candidates.

Signed: Professor V. Milovidov, CPSU member, doctor of historical sciences, Kostroma.

The individual subdivisions, enterprises and institutes of some production and scientific associations (for instance, the Ural mining machinery plant and the Ural Scientific Center of the USSR Academy of Sciences in Sverdlovsk) are situated in various oblasts of the Ural economic district. In these conditions it is impossible and it would hardly be advisable to form a unified party organization with one common party committee. Therefore, the councils of secretaries of party organization of these subdivisions have been formed here, organs that are not envisaged by the existing statute but which play quite an important role in the activities of associations.

It seems that this activity which has been confirmed in practice should also be confirmed by the statute. Therefore, I propose that the following indented

paragraph be added to paragraph No 52: "In the production and scientific association whose subdivisions are located in different oblasts, krays or autonomous republics the councils of secretaries of party organizations of these subdivisions are formed and they are invested with the appropriate rights and authority."

Signed: I. Rozenberg, CPSU member since 1943, candidate of economic sciences. Sverdlovsk.

Party organizations in place of residence have existed in housing administrations for more than a dozen years already, and within themselves they unite a considerable number of communists. These party organizations carry out their activities completely in accord with paragraph No 58 of the draft CPSU Statute (with the proposed changes). Being in the forefront of the efforts to satisfy the basic social and everyday living needs of the Soviet people, they can and must now increase their influence on improving the administration of housing and communal services. For that purpose it would be necessary to grant them the right of control over the activities of the administration, the right that paragraph No 59 of the draft provides for enterprises of communal and everyday services.

Paragraph No 52 of the draft states that in individual cases "party organizations may be formed within the framework of several enterprises that form parts of the same production association and are usually located in the territory of the same rayon or several rayons of the same city." It seems that this provision should also be extended to include the practice of work of the party organizations operating within the system of housing and communal services.

Signed: Colonel (retired) A. Gribakin, N. Proskuryakov, merit pensioner, and Major General (retired) S. Grushchenko. Moscow.

It seems to me that the question of formation of territorial primary party organizations in those places of residence of communists where registered party members are mainly pensioners and people who do not work in enterprises and institutions should be more precisely formulated. The draft changes in the CPSU Statute (paragraph No 52) say that such party organizations may be formed "if necessary." But what does this mean precisely? Who will determine this "necessity" and what criteria will he apply?

Signed: V. Zvonkov, CPSU member since 1945, engineer-economist. Leningrad.

CSO: 1802/6-F

REALITIES OF THE CONTEMPORARY EPOCH

THE YEAR 1985: THE MOST IMPORTANT TRENDS IN GLOBAL DEVELOPMENTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 66-77

[Article by Yu. Molchanov and V. Nekrasov]

[Text] The year 1985 has ended and only 15 years remain of the 20th century. With increasing persistence the people are asking: What will this new century be like, what should and could be done as of now to realize the possibilities of the qualitative enrichment of man's material and spiritual life, the objective prerequisites for which are already taking shape? The first inevitable condition, confirmed by the lesson of the past few months is the urgent requirement of safeguarding and strengthening peace and removing the threat of an all-annihilating military conflagration hanging over the peoples.

This has been a difficult and tense year in mankind's history. The international situation remained threatening and concern and alarm about the future, triggered by the threat of nuclear catastrophe, poisoned the life of people on earth. The development of the situation increasingly dictated the need for a search for solutions which could lead international relations along a new path, the path of stopping the arms race, reducing nuclear armaments and, in the final account, their elimination, the path of peaceful and mutually profitable cooperation. It demanded a new look at the situation, new approaches in many problems and decisive and daring joint actions aimed at surmounting the logic of confrontation.

This past year's celebration of the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II and the great victory over the forces of militarism and reaction gave a particular tonality to thoughts on the nature of this turning point in history. Throughout the world millions of people reinterpreted the significance and lessons of the victorious battle waged by the peoples against fascism which was threatening the very existence of European and world civilization. While expressing their respect and gratitude to the Soviet Union which, through its exploit, rescued mankind from slavery, they strengthened their faith in the possibility of efficient cooperation among peoples and states for the sake of the supreme objective of mankind: freedom and peace. Tangibly dominating the frame of mind during the year was the understanding of the peoples of the benefits of 4 decades of postwar peaceful life, and clear thoughts aimed at preserving and multiplying the priceless results of the victory.

The further strengthening of the global potential of the peace-loving forces, and rallying everyone in favor of the elimination of the threat of nuclear war was a noteworthy feature of 1985. Their activeness and the developing political dialogue among countries with different social systems were all indications of the attainability of a turn in international affairs away from confrontation and toward reliable security and cooperation and settling disputes through political means and talks, taking the legitimate interests of the other parties into consideration. New elements of confidence in the future as well as the resolve not to weaken efforts in support of the healthy principles international relations appears in the psychological outlook of millions of people.

By any scale or measure, 1985 was one of the key landmark years for the Soviet people in a long period of time and a vivid and indisputable confirmation of the inexhaustible vital force and creative energy of the socialist system. This year will enter the history of the land of the soviets as a time when new horizons were opened to our society, prospects became clear, and immediate and more distant tasks became more distinct in many of their essential details. This was a year of important decisions, intensified analysis and realistic assessment of accomplishments and formulation of major constructive tasks and identification and elimination of obstacles hindering our fast advance along the chosen path.

"The historical destinies of the country and the positions of socialism in the contemporary world greatly depend on our further actions." This conclusion, drawn at the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, expresses the party's assessment of the responsibilities of the period experienced by our homeland, revealing the essence and universal significance of the comprehensive and energetic activities of the CPSU and the main direction followed in the life of Soviet society over the past months. The circumstance that 1985 was a period of active preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress, the landmark significance of which is predetermined by the prime importance of the problems which will be discussed in it and the novelty and scale of the tasks facing society, gave that year its particular importance.

In 1985 the Communist Party did a tremendous amount of political, economic, organizational and ideological-theoretical work. The characteristic features of this work were inflexible loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, continuity in terms of basic theoretical and political concepts and principle-mindedness and consistency, to which we must add an innovative content based on the creative development and enrichment of the essential concepts in the theory of scientific communism stemming from acquired practical experience. The events of 1985 convincingly and clearly proved the great political strength contained in the ability of the CPSU to approach social problems, to awaken the energy of the masses and confidently, without ostentation or haste, to lead them toward new heights of social development.

On four different occasions in 1985--in March, April, July and October-- the party Central Committee held plenary meetings. The plenums' materials and the CPSU Central Committee June conference on problems of acceleration of scientific and technical progress were the quintessence of party activities over the past months.

A party line which called for a decisive turn of the country's economy toward intensification and general acceleration of the socioeconomic development of society and for enhacing the dynamism of political and spiritual life was formulated at the March party Central Committee plenum at which Comrade M.S. Gorbachev was unanimously elected CPSU Central Committee general secretary. At the April Central Committee plenum this line was expanded into a streamlined system of trends in the work aimed at ensuring a materially and spiritually rich and socially dynamic life for the Soviet people under conditions of peace and the fuller and clearer identification of the possibilities and advantages of the socialist system. Such is the formula expressing the trend of the party's course. In the specific terms of the April plenum, this means the following: Striving to reach the highest world standard of social labor productivity through the extensive utilization of the achievements of science and technology and making the forms of socialist economic management consistent with contemporary conditions and requirements. The plenum clearly demonstrated a feeling for the new and readiness for large-scale political decisions inherent in the CPSU, and the realistic and mobilizing nature of its Leninist policy. The plenum's documents clearly expressed the party's concern for the further enhancement of the living standard of the people and for strengthening the country's economic and defense power and international positions.

The 11-12 June 1985 CPSU Central Committee conference on problems of acceleration of scientific and technical progress, attended by noted party workers and scientists, heads of industry and agriculture and production innovators, dealt with the detailed development of the strategic tasks in the economic area, formulated at the April plenum. M.S. Gorbachev spoke on the "Radical problem of Party Economic Policy." The realistic assessment of the economic situation made at the conference and the presentation of a scientifically substantiated concept of accelerated socioeconomic development of the country and qualitative reorganization of the material and technical base of the national economy on the basis of the application of scientific and technical achievements, the reorganization of the investment and structural policy, conservation of resources and upgrading production quality and the radical restructuring of the system of planning and management of the entire economic mechanism met with the full support of the participants, all party members and the entire Soviet people. The radical broad program approved by the party immediately became the basis for extensive and comprehensive work.

The need for further improvements of the activities of the soviets of people's deputies on all levels and the efficient implementation of functions by each link in the political system was indicated at the July CPSU Central Committee plenum, which considered the problems discussed at the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 11th convocation. The course charted at the April plenum was comprehensively developed and concretized at the 15 October plenum, at which problems related to the draft new edition of the CPSU program, amendments to the party bylaws and the draft Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1986-1990 and the Period Until the Year 2000 were discussed. These documents, which are of tremendous political importance and which will be submitted to the 27th CPSU Congress, deal with the party's programmatic objectives, crucial problems of its general line and economic strategy and forms and methods of work at the present stage.

The party charted a course toward the broad accumulation of public views as the most adequate reflection of existing realities. It took into consideration the growing activeness of the masses in both formulation and execution of policy. It held with the people a thorough and frank discussion on topical economic problems and the means to resolve them, on the social problems affecting the Soviet people and the problems which are hindering our progress. In this connection the steps taken by the party's Central Committee were of great importance, such as the 8 April Central Committee meeting with heads of industrial associations, enterprises, kolkhozes, sovkhozes and production brigades and specialists and scientists, the 5 May meeting with a large group of war and labor veterans and the 20 September meeting with veterans of the Stakhanov movement and production frontrankers and innovators. M.S. Gorbachev's meetings with the working people and the party and economic aktiv of Moscow's Proletarskiy Rayon, Leningrad, Kiev, and Dnepropetrovsk, and Minsk, Tyumen and Tomsk oblasts and Tselinograd triggered a broad public response.

In 1985 the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo did a tremendous amount of work to define ways to accelerate the development of Soviet society. This made possible the formulation of a strictly scientific program of action. The program concentrates on accelerating the pace of socioeconomic development on the basis of economic intensification and faster scientific and technical progress. It is a question of ensuring within a short time the conversion of the economy to a new and higher material and technical base which will yield the highest possible production efficiency and the equipment and technological retooling of all national economic sectors, which will largely determine the course of our economic competition against capitalism. The corresponding structural reorganization of the production process, which includes the strengthening of economic levers and the organizational forms of its integration with science, will also serve the purpose of attaining these objectives. The draft new edition of the CPSU program stipulates that "The party's strategy is one of attaining a new qualitative state of society through the substantial acceleration of socioeconomic progress."

In the past months the country's governmental bodies paid prime attention to the practical implementation of the program, concentrating their efforts on the intensive development of the economy, above all that of industrial sectors ensuring the equipping of the national economy with new tools and progressive technologies. Specific steps were taken to upgrade the technological level and accelerated development of machine building, the reconstruction of ferrous metallurgy, chemization and the enhancement of all sectors acting as catalists of scientific and technical progress. Efforts were made to intensify economy and thrift in the use of material-technical, financial and manpower resources.

In resolving the problems of developing production forces, the Communist Party continues to pay close attention to problems of socialist production relations. It proceeds from the fact that their development does not take place automatically but requires major efforts and improvements in economic construction. Such improvements, based on fundamental criteria such as planned economic management, further strengthening of socialist ownership and priority of social objectives must, as was pointed out at the CPSU Central Committee plenums and addresses by party and state leaders, include the

reorganization of planning and management and improvements in the economic management system and methods consistent with contemporary conditions and requirements.

The reorganization of economic management, which was initiated in 1985, was such that, while retaining and strengthening the centralized principle, it was also aimed at broadening the rights and upgrading the responsibility of the local authorities, and of state, soviet and economic organizations, enterprises and labor collectives, giving them additional economic and organizational levers with which to display their enterprise and initiative. The economic experiment was continued with the participation of several thousand industrial enterprises and associations. Its purpose is to broaden their rights in the areas of planning and economic activities. The experiment has demonstrated the viability of suggested changes, revealed the great opportunities for upgrading production efficiency and quality and has become a major step toward the creation of an integral national economic management system during the new 5-year period, which would enhance the efficiency of economic incentives. Large-scale steps relative to the activities of the USSR Gosplan, ministries and administrations of groups of homogenous economic sectors were also formulated and implemented.

During the year publicity in the work of party, state and soviet bodies was increased. The role of criticism and self-criticism was enhanced and the social and political rights of the working person became more substantial. Particular attention was paid to energizing the participation of the soviets of people's deputies in the management of the state, society and industry and to upgrading initiative in the work of the trade unions, the Komsomol and all state and public organizations and labor collectives.

Immediately available opportunities, such as upgrading organization and order, strengthening the discipline and comprehensively developing the creative initiative of the working people, were used ever more extensively. Problems of work with cadres and upgrading their responsibility and exigency concerning the professional, ideological and moral features of managers and their readiness to learn how adopts a new work style were assigned a major role.

The party inseparably links successful implementation of tasks with upgrading the role of the human factor, i.e., with intensifying the influence of social processes on material production. The measures it implements and drafts are oriented toward the live creativity of the people, their intelligence and talent and the labor initiative and political activeness of the masses, above all the country's working class, the main creator of socialism. This is also a question of a social policy as an important element of social unity and political stability and the assertion of a socialist way of life. This is closely related to the task of achieving the full and comprehensive assertion of the social justice which is inherent in our system.

The experience acquired in 1985 confirms the efficiency of properly set political, organizational and ideological work among the masses. The party's ideas and the specific steps taken for their implementation, actively approved and totally supported by the people's masses yielded noticeable economic as well as ideological and moral results. They generated in the society an

atmosphere of moral-political and labor upsurge, optimism and faith in one's own strength and in the inexhaustible creative possibilities of socialism. Labor, planning and state discipline were strengthened, the interest of the working people in all matters increased, and the feeling of civic responsibility was enhanced. The decisive steps taken to promote greater order and to purge life from alien phenomena and any encroachments on the interests of the society and its citizens, as well as actions to strengthen socialist legality, met with nationwide approval. The Soviet people unreservedly supported the offensive mounted against irresponsibility, bureaucratism, eyewashing, communist boastfulness and all kinds of abuses. The steps taken in the struggle against alcoholism and drunkenness were given a high rating as being timely and proper.

The comprehensive and energetic steps taken to implement everything planned by the CPSU Central Committee and Central Committee Politburo have already begun to yield tangible results. They have already triggered positive changes in the economy, in cadre mentality and in the feelings of the masses. Their material expression is found in the economic results of the year. According to preliminary estimates, in 12 months the country's national income increased by 3.5 percent and the volume of industrial output by 3.9 percent. Social labor productivity increased by 3.7 percent. Therefore, in terms of basic economic indicators the 1985 state plan was fulfilled. The positive changes in the economy of the agroindustrial complex are confirmed by the volume of gross agricultural output, which was the highest for the 5-year plan period.

The CPSU and the Soviet people consider with full justification such accomplishments as a basis for a good start of the new 5-year plan period, which must become a crucial period for the acceleration of social development and the start of the huge volumr of complex and responsible work to be done in the forthcoming years. The pace gathered over the past months and the currently identified development opportunities convincingly prove the realistic attainability of the planned upsurge of the economy and rapid social progress.

The great constructive plans for the implementation of which the Soviet people are dedicatedly working clearly prove the peaceful orientation of domestic policy which, as M.S. Gorbachev stressed at the fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, on 27 November, "is closely related to our foreign policy aspirations and the international policy of the Soviet state."

The celebration of the 40th anniversary of the great victory won by the Soviet Union and its valorous armed forces in the Great Patriotic War was a noteworthy event in the life of our people in 1985. The Soviet people expressed their feelings of sacred memory and deep respect for those who defeated the German-fascist aggressors in the heroic battles for the freedom and independence of the socialist fatherland, for those who, sparing no efforts, worked in the rear for the triumph of the just cause. The 50th anniversary of the Stakhanov movement, which clearly embodied the tremendous constructive potential of socialism and the revolutionary and innovative spirit of the working class, was widely noted. The CPSU and the Soviet people noted the 80th anniversary of the 1905-1907 revolution in Russia, the first

people's revolution in the epoch of imperialism, led by the working class headed by the Leninist Bolshevik Party.

These days, during the final stage of preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress, a discussion of the precongress party documents--the draft new edition of the CPSU program, the proposed amendments to the CPSU bylaws and the Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1986-1990 and the Period Until the Year 2000--is taking place throughout the country. A specific and highly interested discussion on the most vital and crucial problems of economic policy, the social and spiritual development of society and the new and higher requirements concerning party work and the further strengthening of the ties between the party and the masses is taking place.

The Communist Party organizations on all levels, which have accepted the creative spirit of recent steps with great upsurge, are paying prime attention to perfecting the means and methods of the party's leadership in the economic and all other areas of social life. Their ability to lead the people, to develop labor initiative and use available reserves economically are manifested in their activities in mobilizing the masses for the fulfillment and overfulfillment of state plans and radically restructuring their work style. In the course of the accountability and election campaign which developed within the CPSU in recent weeks and months the party members are analyzing their accomplishments, interpreting acquired experience and earmarking ways to upgrade the combativeness of the party organizations, with a feeling of great responsibility to the people.

Through all of its 1985 activities, again and again the CPSU has proved that it exists for the people and that it is always concerned with their vital interests. In turn, the Soviet people trust the party implicitly, adopting its Leninist course as their own. They continue actively to support the domestic and foreign policy of the Communist Party and its innovative approach to the radical problems of our time and are preparing to welcome the party congress with new labor successes. The CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo and the Soviet government highly value the trust of the people and are doing everything possible to justify it.

The year 1985 was another period of great and fruitful toil for the fraternal socialist countries, aimed at solving the vital problems of building the new society and seeking and finding answers to the questions triggered both by the needs of development itself and the consequences of the worsened political and economic situation in the world and the increased manifestations of hostility on the part of the capitalist political leadership. Particularly noteworthy among other distinguishing features characteristic of events and trends in the life of these countries have been the steps they have taken to strengthen their unity even further. This refers to the qualitative growth of their political, economic, ideological and defense interaction and cooperation, organically combining the national and the international interests of all the members of the community.

Concern for strengthening universal security and their own defense power, and the responsibility of the members of the socialist community for the fate of socialism clearly raised the question of strengthening their cohesion as

allies and ensuring the increasing coordination of their actions. The energizing of political cooperation within the Warsaw Pact, which is a military and political alliance, has been the answer to the requirements of the present. This has been manifested, above all, in the meetings of heads of Warsaw Pact member countries in Moscow (13 March), Warsaw (26 April), Sofia (22-23 October) and Prague (21 November). The heads of the fraternal parties and states noted at these meetings that the socialist community has the necessary potential for strengthening the positions of socialism in the world arena even further and for intensifying efforts aimed at preventing a nuclear war, strengthening universal peace and security and ensuring the constructive interaction among all countries regardless of their social system.

At their meeting in the Polish capital, the senior party and state leaders of the Warsaw Pact members considered the extension of the 1955 Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Aid Treaty and initialed a protocol extending it for the next 20 and, subsequently, another 10 years. The participants in the meeting unanimously concluded that as long as NATO, the aggressive bloc of Western countries, exists, the Warsaw Pact will continue to play an important role in defending the socialist positions in Europe and throughout the world and serveing as a reliable instrument for the prevention of nuclear war and strengthening international security.

The declaration "On the Lifting of the Nuclear Menace and a Turn for the Better in European and World Affairs" was adopted at the 23 October Sofia conference of members of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact, in which their views on the existing world situation, new ideas and approaches to the solution of complex international problems and an extensive program suggested by the pact members to normalize the situation were expressed. In the opinion of the CPSU and the other fraternal parties, the most important results of the conference included the further strengthening of the unity and cohesion among the allied socialist countries in the present responsible moment of international development, perfecting the mechanism of their political and defense cooperation and a further manifestation of the inflexible resolve of the fraternal countries to continue their fruitful struggle for the peaceful future of the planet.

In domestic policy, the efforts of the communist and worker parties and working people in the fraternal countries were directed at the successful implementation of the tasks of the now ending 5-year period and the creation of conditions for good work during the new 5-year plan period. The certain slow-down in the pace of economic growth, which had taken place at the turn of the 1980s, was surmounted and a sharp turn toward intensive methods economic management methods was made.

The political and social life of the members of the community was characterized by the active search for new forms of development of socialist democracy and steps to intensify the socialist nature of social relations as a whole. The process of internal consolidation based on cooperation among toiling classes, with the working class in the leading role, continued. In Poland, for instance, internal political life continued to stabilize despite the intrigues of its enemies. This was convincingly confirmed by the results of the elections for the Sejm, the supreme legislative body of the republic,

which were held in October, and in the course of which the absolute majority of the population expressed its support of the program for socioeconomic development being implemented in the country.

The ruling parties in the countries in the socialist community entered a crucial period of preparations for and holding of their regular congresses. The MSZMP held its 13th congress (March 1985). In the course of comprehensive and extensive precongress work, the communists in the socialist countries are summing up their accomplishments, earmarking the levels of socioeconomic development to be reached over the next 5 years and on a longer-range basis, analyze existing problems and earmark the means and methods for their solution.

The common interests of the community demanded paying tireless attention to the systematic implementation of the resolutions of the summit economic conference of CEMA members, which was held in Moscow (June 1984), and to attaining the collectively earmarked levels of integration. In the course of formulating the prospects for the further comprehensive development of socialist society, direct relations were increased between related enterprises and sectors in the fraternal countries. Scientific achievements and progressive experience were exchanged. Plans for the next 5-year period were coordinated and bilateral programs for economic and scientific and technical cooperation were formulated and adopted. The drafting of a comprehensive program for scientific and technical cooperation among CEMA members until the year 2000 was completed.

A conference of secretaries of central committees of fraternal countries on economic programs--the first of its kind--was held in Moscow in May 1985. The decision was made to hold such conferences on an annual basis. The results of the implementation of the decisions of the summit economic conference were summed up at the 40th CEMA session held in Warsaw on 25-27 June, attended by the heads of governments, and a general agreement on multilateral cooperation in the development and organization of specialized and cooperated production of flexible production systems for machine building was initialed, and a program for cooperation among fraternal countries in the economical and efficient utilization of material resources until the end of this century was adopted.

One of the main lessons learned in 1985 was that the destinies of peace and social progress depend to a decisive extent on the strength of the socialist community, the successes achieved by each fraternal country in its constructive activities and the coordination of their activities in the international arena.

One of the features of international life in 1985, on both the political and psychological levels, was that along with the sharp confrontation between two diametrically opposite trends in the development of events in the world arena, positive aspects began gradually to increase, particularly toward the year's end. It was as though a fresh wind had blown over the heated international atmosphere. Gradually, the view that despite all difficulties and dangers prerequisites for the better were appearing and a mood of optimism, expectations and hopes was developing in the broad political and social

circles in various countries throughout the world. This mood, the appearance of which was predetermined by the active foreign policy activities of the USSR and the other socialist states, along with their constructive and initiative-minded approach to the solution of the burning problems of our time, were a manifestation of the natural aspiration of millions of people, who were tired of living in the oppressive atmosphere of international tension and under the sword of Damocles of the nuclear threat, to lead a normal and peaceful life with confidence in a peaceful future and the hope that political forces capable of preventing a global catastrophe existed in the world.

The immediate reason for such optimistic feelings was provided by the resumption of foreign policy contacts and talks between socialist and capitalist countries, between the Soviet Union and the United States above all. The tension of the confrontation was lowered somewhat. However, as a whole the international situation remained alarming and frought with difficulties, for the main forces which generate increased concern through the world remain active. An extremely dangerous tendency remained in the policies of the largest capitalist countries: seeking social revenge on the basis of attaining military superiority over socialism, the forceful suppression of progressive liberation movements, maintaining international tension on a level which would justify the creation of ever new types of mass destruction weapons and militarization of outer space. As a result, mankind experienced an exceptionally crucial, perhaps even a critical period in its history.

All imperialist countries bear the guilt for this situation to a greater or lesser extent. The main responsibility, however, remains with the United States, whose ruling circles continued to pursue their imperial-hegemonistic course in international affairs, relying on breaking up the existing military-strategic parity with with USSR and gaining radical advantages.

The American military ceaselessly carried out large-scale militaristic preparations in some essential areas. It tried, above all, to stockpile first-strike nuclear weapons, deploying them as close as possible to the borders of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and increasing the direct threat to their security. This was the purpose for increasing the quantity of American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe (FRG, Italy, Great Britain and Belgium). By the autumn of 1985, 128 cruise missiles (out of 464 planned) and 81 Pershing 2 ballistic missiles (out of 108 planned) had already been deployed. The American military potential (nuclear essentially) was increased even further in Japan, which is accelerating its own military preparations.

The armament fly-wheel gathered further momentum in the United States itself. Intensive efforts were made to implement the vast programs for rearming the branches of the armed forces, at the cost of huge material funds. The Pentagon's allocations for the 1985 fiscal year totaled $292.6 billion and a military budget of $302.5 billion was approved by the congress for 1986.

The main attention was focused on the growth of strategic armaments. The creation [sozdaniye] of new MX intercontinental ballistic missiles proceeded in full swing. One such missile has the destructive power equal to the combined power of all of explosives used in World War II. For the first time

MX missiles were launched from underground silos under conditions maximally simulating actual combat. In June an official ceremony marked the delivery of the B-1B strategic bomber, capable of carrying up to 30 nuclear cruise missiles, to the U.S. Air Force. The construction of the latest Trident nuclear submarines (Ohio class) was continued. Six such submarines are operational, to be followed [na ocheredi] by another 13.

The plans and practical actions of the Washington administration, related to the use of near space for military purposes and for deployment of qualitatively new types of weapons, which could be used both against space and ground targets, created, and are continuing to create, increasingly obvious threats to security. Throughout 1985 a most sharp political and ideological struggle was waged on the subject of American plans for the militarization of outer space. In its effort to pursue the creation [sozdaniye] of antisatellite systems and offensive space weapons, the U.S. administration justified them with a variety of arguments," shamelessly resorting to obvious deception and juggling and distortion of facts.

Overseas, these plans for the militarization of outer space, frought with dangerous consequences, were described as no other than being a "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), claiming that this was exclusively a question of a "highly humane objective," aimed at saving mankind from the nuclear missile threat and that it was no more than innocent "scientific research." Notoriously slanderous statements were made to the effect that the Soviet Union already had its own military space program and had created an antisatellite system, whereas the United States was merely trying to catch up. Official White House spokesmen even went so far as to try to misrepresent the content of the 1972 Soviet-American treaty on limiting ABM systems, claiming that it allowed new ABM research, including outer space.

Ignoring the serious warnings and constructive proposals of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries and of noted scientists and the protests of broad public circles, step by step the United States continued to extend the arms race to outer space. The Pentagon has already signed contracts with 800 companies on the creation [sozdaniye] of space weapons, while big business has eagerly joined in this profitable venture for which Washington intends to allocate the huge sum of $70 billion over the next few years. On 13 September, for the first time the United States destroyed an artificial earth satellite with weapons, ignoring the unilateral Soviet moratorium on introducing any kind of antisatellite weapons in outer space as long as other countries, including the United States, would follow suit. Intensive efforts were made to create [sozdaniye] a variety of so-called "exotic weapons," to be used precisely in outer space conditions, including laser, ray and electromagnetic guns, and others. The first experimental prototypes have already been created [sozdaniye].

All such activities concealed the irrepressible aspiration of U.S. imperialist circles to achieve the impossible: by gaining military superiority to secure world hegemony for itself. "If we succeed in obtaining an effective system which could make their (i.e., the Soviet--editor) weapons helpless," Caspar Weinberger said candidly, "we would return to the situation which existed when the United States was the only country possessing nuclear weapons."

In his answers to the American journal TIME, M. S. Gorbachev quite convincingly indicated the total unattainability of such hopes: "Clearly, someone in the United States thought that the opportunity had appeared to outstrip us, to bring pressure to bear on the Soviet Union. This, however, is an illusion. It failed in the past and will not succeed now. We shall find an answer, a totally adequate answer to that."

The question which naturally arises is the following: How are Washington's intensive militaristic preparations combined with declarations on the desire for peace and with talks between the USSR and the United States? As the Indian newspaper FREE PRESS JOURNAL pointed out, "the United States intends to pursue a policy of double reaction toward the USSR." Such a policy "means conducting talks with the USSR on easing tension while, at the same time, taking all possible--military, political and economic--measures to attain superiority over the Soviet Union."

The past year provided new confirmation of the reactionary and aggressive nature of the course pursued by world imperialism, American above all, which, violating the norms of international law and morality, continued to rely on power pressure, diktat and the imposition of its will upon other countries and peoples. Yet another foreign policy "doctrine" was made public overseas, essentially amounting to the fact that henceforth open intervention into the internal affairs of other countries is elevated to the rank of long-term U.S. state policy, aimed at counteracting all liberation movements in the world. As James Reston, the noted American commentator, wrote in connection with the new "doctrine," "The United States will support any country or group fighting communism anywhere on earth."

The United States continued to wage undeclared wars and to engage in covert and overt activities against peoples taking the path of progressive change. The maximally heated atmosphere around Nicaragua was maintained throughout the year. Blocking the constructive efforts of the Contadora group, aimed at a political settlement of the situation in Central America, the American administration intensified its interference with the life of this sovereign country in its effort to strangle the Sandinista revolution. Washington proclaimed the economic and trade blockade of Nicaragua and appropriated more millions of dollars to finance the Nicaraguan "contras." Endless bloody raids were conducted from the territories of neighboring countries and the threat of direct American military intervention continued to increase.

Tension in the Middle East did not abate. Here American imperialism provided comprehensive support to Israel, its "strategic ally," in its aspiration to perpetuate the occupation of Arab lands, to impose crushing accords on the Arabs, to block the exercise of legitimate national rights of the Palestinians and to prevent a durable and comprehensive Middle East settlement. The tragedy of long-suffering Lebanon continued. Armed clashes among hostile groups continued unabated on its soil. At the same time, uninterrupted attempts at gross interference in its domestic affairs from the outside went on. Elevating state terrorism to the rank of governmental policy, the Pentagon repeatedly brought closer to the shores of Lebanon its naval armada, including the aircraft carrier "Nimitz." In turn, Tel Aviv was doing everything possible to destabilize the situation in that country and to seize

Dits southern regions. The bombing by the Israeli air force of PLO headquarters in the suburb of the Tunisian capital and the interception of an Egyptian civilian aircraft by the American military were scandalous acts of international banditry.

In setting the tone of the increasingly expanding scale of the undeclared war waged by international imperialism and reaction against the people's regime in Afghanistan, the United States appropriated for such purposes $470 million for this fiscal year. Extensive support and generous aid were also provided to the antipeople's forces operating against Cambodia and Angola, the Indian separatists and the South African racist regime.

At the same time, the CIA energized its activities in promoting the international "unification" of ill-assorted counterrevolutionary groups and elements. A meeting of the heads of the Nicaraguan "contras," African hostiles, Cuban "gusanos" and other varieties of reactionary riff-raff, was held last summer in the part of Angola controlled by the subversive UNITA organization, and the creation of some sort of "democratic international" was proclaimed at this assembly of killers for pay.

Despite all efforts, however, imperialism was unable to crush the aspiration of the peoples for independence, freedom and social progress. On the contrary, an important trend appeared in international affair, a trend which had been intensifying in recent years, characterized by the growing opposition of the people's masses in different countries and areas under imperialist diktat to efforts to interfere in their domestic affairs. This was convincingly confirmed by the firmness and courage of the peoples of Nicaragua, Lebanon and other Arab countries, Afghanistan, Angola and Namibia, and the persistence and dedication to the struggle for its legitimate rights of the African population in South Africa.

At the same time, the overall political picture of 1985 events impressively reflected the dynamic development of positive processes in international affairs and the increased beneficial impact which forces actively and firmly trying to safeguard peace and protect mankind from sliding into the abyss of a nuclear missile apocalypse had on the global political atmosphere and the situation in the world arena. As the declaration adopted at the Sofia conference of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact members noted, the fraternal socialist countries, aware of their responsibility to their own peoples and to mankind, and guided by the aspiration to achieve a change for the better in the current alarming development of international affairs, are firmly calling for a new approach to them, consistent with the realities of the contemporary world, for mutual restraint and for taking urgent practical steps aimed at halting the arms race and preventing its spreading into outer space. "The main objective of their foreign policy," the document emphasizes, "was and remains lifting the threat of war, reducing the level of military confrontation and developing international relations in a spirit of peaceful coexistence and detente."

The stipulations of the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum were a specific manifestation of the Leninist foreign policy course at the present stage. The need for comprehensive energizing of Soviet peaceful policy and for doing

everything possible to prevent the forces of militarism and aggression from prevailing were emphasized at the plenum which called for the development of correct and civilized relations among countries and for maintaining comprehensive contacts among them.

Displaying high responsibility for the preservation and strengthening of peace and the fate of human civilization, last year the Soviet Union mounted a broad diplomatic offensive aimed at improving the international situation and taking a decisive turn from confrontation to detente, curbing the arms race, nuclear above all, on earth, and preventing its extension to outer space, strengthening the security of the peoples and establishing extensive and mutually profitable intergovernmental cooperation.

M.S. Gorbachev's speeches, which appealed to the minds and hearts of millions of people were political actions of great mobilizing power. They not only contained an objective, realistic and accurate assessment of the dangerous situation existing in the world but also earmarked the way to resolve it, formulating specific practical suggestions aimed at improving the international climate. The CPSU Central Committee general secretary called upon the political leaders of all countries, the great powers above all, to become fully aware of the fact that the present situation has reached a stage in its development which requires responsible solutions and actions and the need to display a new type of political thinking consistent with the realities of the nuclear age and to do everything necessary to protect mankind from catastrophe.

In demanding that the vicious circle of the arms race be broken and that the threat of nuclear catastrophe be lifted, the Soviet Union is acting boldly and decisively for the implementation of these objectives. It tirelessly offers important constructive suggestions and is doing everything pssible to create peaceful conditions for life and work by people on earth. Such was precisely the approach taken by Soviet diplomacy at the talks which were held with the Western powers. This applies above all to the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments which began in Geneva in March 1985, in which, strictly observing the preliminary agreement reached on the subject and the purposes of the political dialogue, our delegation persistently called for banning the use of outer space for military purposes and for a significant reduction in strategic nuclear armaments. U.S. diplomacy held a different view. It not only failed to submit any somewhat serious suggestions on limiting the arms race but also stubbornly sabotaged the very discussion of problems related to the nonmilitarization of outer space, clearly trying to use the Geneva talks as a cover for accelerated military preparations on land, at sea and, particularly, in space.

A sharp political struggle was waged at the Stockholm conference on building confidence, security and disarmament measures in Europe. It was above all thanks to the activeness, persistence and good will of the diplomats from the USSR and the other socialist countries that the obstructions and hindrances created by the representatives of a number of NATO countries were surmounted and prerequisites were gradually established for the formulation of future mutually acceptable agreements, which included both concretizing and ensuring

the maximum effectiveness of the principle of nonuse of force and taking specific confidence-building steps in the military area.

Many initiatives of essential importance formulated by the Soviet Union in the area of reducing armaments, including a number of unilateral steps taken as a good example in the expectation that similar steps would be taken by the other side, marked the year 1985, particularly the months after the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum. In particular, a moratorium was proclaimed on the deployment of medium-range missiles and other corresponding steps in Europe (from 7 April until November) and on nuclear explosions (from 6 August to 1 January 1986 and beyond, providing that the United States would in turn abstain from nuclear explosions). The Soviet Union submitted for consideration by the 40th UN General Assembly the question of international cooperation in the development of outer space under conditions of its nonmilitarization and the establishment of a universal space organization to this purpose.

The daring constructive steps taken by the Soviet Union earned it the warm support of broad political and social circles in various countries, which urgently called upon the American government to take corresponding positive actions. The reaction overseas, however, was different. The Soviet moratorium on the deployment of missiles was countered with the accelerated increase in the number of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Western Europe and the cessation of nuclear explosions with new underground nuclear blasts. The proposal on the nonmilitarization of space was countered by the testing of the ASAT antisatellite system, shooting at an actual target in space.

Such U.S. reaction did not defeat the persistence of the Soviet Union and its resolve to curb the arms race and the forces of war and militarism. During his visit to France, M.S. Gorbachev formulated a broad program for improving the explosive situation in Europe and the world at large. First of all, the Soviet Union turned to the U.S. government with the proposal to reach an agreement on imposing a total ban on offensive space weapons and to reduce nuclear armaments which could reach the other side's territory by a truly radical 50 percent.

The second Soviet proposal was aimed at facilitating the reaching of an agreement on reciprocal reduction of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. To this effect, the USSR deems it possible to reach a separate agreement on this matter, unrelated to the problem of strategic and space armaments. The USSR also expressed readiness to initiate an exchange of view on medium-range nuclear weapons with France and Great Britain, taking into consideration their growing nuclear potential in the European balance of power.

The third important step taken by the Soviet Union was aimed at limiting the number of medium-range nuclear missiles on the European continent. It withdrew the SS-20 missiles deployed in answer to the American medium-range missiles deployed in Western Europe. The number of Soviet SS-20 missiles deployed in the European zone was reduced to their exact number of June 1984, when U.S. actions had forced us to take additional security measures.

The implementation of this set of realistic and constructive steps would have enabled mankind to make substantial progress toward the desired coal of banning and totally eliminating nuclear weapons. It would have constituted a major step in the area of real disarmament and ensured a sharp turn in international politics.

Similar objectives were pursued with the plan for peace and security in Europe, proposed by the Soviet Union and the other members of the Warsaw Pact, aimed at achieving peace and security in Europe, based on a clear understanding of the newly existing situation according to which today European security cannot be ensure by military means and military power, for due to its geographic density and oversaturation with weapons, this continent is particularly vulnerable to the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear conflict.

While taking active steps to improve the situation in Europe, the Soviet Union also paid tireless attention to the situation developing in Asia, fully sharing the growing aspiration of the Asian peoples to turn this continent into a zone of peace and security and equal and mutually profitable international cooperation. In 1985 the USSR formulated the important idea of combining the efforts of the Asian countries for the purpose of jointly formulating a comprehensive common approach to problems of security in Asia and holding in the future an all-Asian meeting for the purpose of exchanging views and seeking constructive solutions.

The final months of 1985 were marked by major international events. M.S. Gorbachev visited France in October. The Paris talks and discussions and the agreements which were reached laid a good foundation for the further development of friendly relations between the USSR and France and contributed to strengthening European security, broadening European cooperation and improving the international situation.

The results of the Geneva meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President Reagan, impatiently awaited by the people throughout the world, provided convincing confirmation of the correctness of the recent initiatives and actions of the CPSU and the Soviet state, aimed at resolving key problems of international security and ensuring a turn for the better in relations among governments.

Although the specific problems of limiting and reducing armaments were not resolved in Geneva, above all because of the major differences on essential matters, it was particularly important that the heads of the biggest powers stated in a joint document that a nuclear war was inadmissible and that the prevention of a nuclear conflict between the USSR and the United States was necessary. They pledged not to aspire to gaining military superiority. The great significance of the Geneva meeting was also due to the fact that it marked the beginning of a dialogue aimed at making a change for the better in Soviet-American and worldwide relations. As was noted by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, as a whole the results of the meeting could have a positive impact on changing the political and psychological climate in contemporary international relations, improve them and reduce the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war. The long-term significance of the Geneva meeting

will be manifested through specific practical actions and will depend on the willingness of both sides to act on the basis of the jointly adopted declaration.

Unquestionably, the forces of political reaction and the military-industrial complex in the United States and the other imperialist states will try to hinder the implementation of the Geneva agreements, the curbing of the arms race and the improvement of Soviet-American relations. A lengthy and stubborn struggle lies ahead. As to the Soviet Union, as was emphasized in the USSR Supreme Soviet decree, it "will do everything within its power for the practical implementation of these agreements."

The work done by M.S. Gorbachev in Geneva was rated as an exceptionally important contribution to the advancement of the joint peace-loving positions of the socialist community at the 21 November Prague summit meeting of heads of Warsaw Pact members. The results of the Soviet-American summit triggered the broadest possible response and most lively approval throughout the world, for they were consistent with the profound interest shown by all countries and people in the successful solution of the most crucial problems of our time: the problems of war and peace.

The past year provided abundant confirmation of the fact that an understanding of the need for immediate and decisive steps to correct the international situation is becoming increasingly widespread in ranks of the progressive peace-loving public and among political and state personalities in different countries, manifested in mass meetings, protest demonstrations, official declarations and important political decisions and documents.

Despite the efforts of the representatives of the United States and the other imperialist states to draw the attention of the members of the world community away from the most burning and urgent contemporary problems, it was precisely such problems--war and peace, curbing the arms race and survival of human civilization--that remained in the center of the political debate which took place during the 40th anniversary session of the UN General Assembly, attended by envoys of 159 countries. Many of the delegates, noting with concern the increased arms race, sharply criticized Washington's foreign policy course and its plans for preparing a laser-missile war in outer space, frought with a growing threat to all mankind. At the same time, both during the general debates and in informal UN meetings, the significance of the new Soviet initiatives and of the Soviet program for improving the explosive international situation was broadly noted.

The voice of the liberated countries and the members of the nonaligned movement, which includes some 100 countries with a total population of about half a billion, was heard increasingly loudly in favor of the elimination of the threat of world war and for disarmament and safeguarding universal peace. As the final declaration of the conference of ministers of foreign affairs of the nonaligned countries, which was held in Luanda in September, emphasized, the struggle for preventing a nuclear war which threaten the very existence of mankind is the main problem of our time. Lasting peace and security on earth, the document pointed out, can be achieved only by ending the arms race and taking effective steps leading to universal and total disarmament.

A new declaration was issued by the heads of states of six countries (Mexico, Sweden, Tanzania, Greece, Argentina and India), calling upon the nuclear powers and the peoples, parliaments and governments the world over to do everything possible to eliminate the threat of nuclear catastrophe, prevent an arms race in space and terminate it on earth without delay, for this was threatening the future of all nations.

More sober moods and healthy judgments could be noted on the part of many U.S. allies as well. Thus, France, Norway, Denmark, Canada. Greece, The Netherlands and Australia formally refused to take part in the implementation of the American "star wars" program. The governments of Spain and Iceland opposed the Pentagon's plans to deploy nuclear weapons on their soil. Washington was irritated and angry at the decision of the government of New Zealand, a U.S. ally in the ANZUS bloc, to ban access of its ports to American ships powered by nuclear engines or armed with nuclear weapons. The White House reaction to this was gross pressure, blackmail and threats. This, however, did not overcome the New Zealanders or prevent the government of Australia, another ANZUS member, from forbidding the Pentagon to use Australian airfields for testing MX missiles. The decision of 13 countries in the South Pacific, including Australia and New Zealand, to proclaim the area a nuclear-free zone was another confirmation of the growth of antinuclear moods.

In 1985 the political parties and social organizations affiliated with the Socialist International energized their activities even further in favor of disarmament and lifting the threat of nuclear war. This was convincingly confirmed at the conference on disarmament held by the Socialist International in Vienna last October and attended by representatives of socialist and social democratic parties of some 50 countries. The results of the conference and the documents it adopted indicated, yet once again, that under the current circumstances differences in ideological views are no obstacle for all detachments of the working and democratic movements to wage a joint struggle for rescuing humanity from the peril of nuclear destruction.

The 12th World Youth Festival, which was held in Moscow and was attended by more than 20,000 foreign delegates from more than 150 countries, was an outstanding politicalevent which reflected the expectations of the young generation on the planet. The festival was held under the slogan "For Anti-Imperialist Solidarity, Peace and Friendship!"

In the life of the mass antiwar movement in the capitalist countries 1985 was characterized by the fact that despite subversive activities and cruel repressions mounted by the authorities the movement grew in depth and width. On the one hand, powerful and large protest demonstrations were held against U.S. policy and plans for "star wars" in Western European countries, Japan, Canada, Australia and other countries. Millions of signatures were collected under appeals calling for ending the arms race and preserving life on earth. On the other, the political weight, prestige and influence of antiwar and antinuclear movements increased and, one way or another, their views had to be taken into consideration by the political leaderships in the capitalist countries.

The fact that the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to the "Physicians of the World for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement for its activities for the good of mankind and, particularly, its considerable contribution to the dissemination of reliable information on the catastrophic consequences of nuclear war and making the people aware of them, triggered a broad international response. The movement gained numerous followers among scientists in the FRG, France, Italy, the United States and other countries. A scientists' movement to boycott "star wars" plans appeared.

All of these facts are a confirmation that an exceptionally important and promising process not only of awakening the social consciousness of people belonging to all sorts of different social and political circles, but also of their aspiration to make a direct personal contribution to preventing the irreparable and their readiness to support new constructive initiatives in resolving problems of limiting the arms race, safeguarding peace and strengthening the security of all countries and peoples is gathering strength in the capitalist world.

The most important political conclusion which can be drawn from the numerous events of 1985, rich in history and saturated with major accomplishments and stubborn struggle is the following: however strong and dangerous international imperialism may still be and whatever desperate attempts it may be making to stop historical progress and take its social revenge, and however refined the means it may be resorting to, the main forces of social development--world socialism, the worker and communist movements, the peoples of the liberated countries and the mass democratic movements--are in a state of historical advance. The social progress of mankind cannot be defeated despite its overall complex and conflicting nature.

The CPSU proceeds for the fact that despite the grave threat to peace created by the policy of aggressive imperialist circles a world war is not fatally inevitable. War can be prevented and mankind saved from catastrophe. This is the historical vocation of socialism and of all progressive and peace-loving forces on earth.

The Soviet people, who are currently undergoing an exceptionally meaningful and responsible period in the development of socialist society, are entering the new year 1986 fully confident in their strength and firmly convinced that the set tasks will be implemented through their dedicated work for the good of the homeland and that the planned landmarks will be reached. Such is the inflexible will of the Communist Party and the Soviet people.

5003
CSO: 1802/6

DEFEAT OF FASCISM AND GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 78-88

[Article by John Pittman, U.S. Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member]

[Text] The defeat of fascism and the victorious end of World War II, 40 years ago, had a tremendous impact on the destiny of all peoples on our planet, including the people of the United States.

World War II began as a conflict between two groups of imperialist states which were pursuing a common anti-Soviet and antisocialist policy but which, at the same time, were fiercely competing against each other in the struggle for the redistribution of global resources and asserting their hegemony in the world. It broke out when one of the groups--the capitalist countries of the West, headed by the United States, Great Britain and France--proved unable to resolve interimperialist contradictions with another group of capitalist countries, which included fascist Germany and Italy and militaristic Japan.

During the 2 decades between the world wars the ruling circles in the Western imperialist countries spared no financial-economic or political-diplomatic means in preparing their aggression against the first state of workers and peasants in history, with a view to eliminating this bulwark of the forces of peace, democracy and socialism on earth. They linked special hopes for the destruction of the Soviet Union to the policy of the fascist-militaristic countries. Thanks to the tireless efforts of Soviet diplomacy, struggling for the prevention of war, for a while the land of the soviets was able to remove the threat at its borders. Relying on the possibility of an easy conquest, greatly assisted by the complicity of local anticommunists in Western countries, the fascist countries struck first at the weakest European countries.

The Hitlerite forces invaded Poland on 1 September 1939. Two days later, on 3 September, Great Britain and France declared war on Germany. In April-May 1940 Norway, Denmark, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg became victims of fascist aggression. France surrendered to Hitlerite Germany in June.

The fact that the U. S. monopoly circles played one of the main roles in preparation for World War II is historically irrefutable. Aspiring to

establish their domination over the world, together with the British imperialists they financed and inspired great conspiracies, thus hoping simultaneously to get rid of dangerous rivals in their own countries and deal with an enemy which they feared and hated the most--the international working class and its highest accomplishment--the socialist Soviet Union.

The indications of the leading role which U. S. imperialist circles played in the organization of such sinister conspiracies appeared as early as the start of the 1920s, when American imperialists extracted a number of concessions from their British, French and Japanese rivals at the 1921-1922 Washington Conference. One of them was the conclusion of agreements which, by imposing certain limitations on Japanese power, also directed its expansion mainly against the Soviet state and the national liberation movements in the colonial and dependent countries of East Asia and the Pacific.

The Dowes Plan, which was enacted in August 1924, laid the beginning of the rebirth of Germany monopolies with the help of the United States which granted huge loans for such purposes. Having refused to help Germany at the start of the 1930s to regain its great power status, the U. S. imperialists contributed to the regrouping of forces in the capitalist world and laid the foundations for the open restoration of German military potential.

The growth of German industrial and military power, ensured with active U. S. support, and the strengthening of the economic and political positions of the monopolies within the country inevitably led to the fact that German imperialism once again raised the question of a redistribution of world markets and sources of raw materials and areas of capital investments in its favor. The German imperialists were relying in their efforts to achieve world domination on the Nazi Party which assumed power in the country in 1933. The feverish haste with which the fascists regime armed Germany, Hitler's impudent threats against neighboring countries and progressive forces in the world and the intensified stupefication of the German people with racist and chauvinistic sermons drastically increased the threat of a new war.

Consequently, when Hitlerite Germany and its satellites, taking the path of aggression, unleashed World War II, the people of the world were faced with the threat of a most terrible reaction ever to exist in recent history. This was a threat to the freedom, independence and sovereignty of national states, a threat which fascism enacted through the system of state terrorism and barbaric excesses committed against the peoples of occupied and enslaved countries.

Even during the early stages of the war the active resistance of the peoples of countries captured by the Nazis had introduced and anti-fascist content in its nature. This content became predominant after the treacherous attack by fascist Germany on the Soviet Union and the blows which the Hitlerites inflicted on the Soviet people and their armed forces. This transformation of the conflict, which initially did not go beyond the limits of an interimperialist clash, into a war against fascism and for the liberation of the peoples, and its victorious completion by the anti-Hitlerite coalition, within which the Soviet armed forces made the main contribution, cleared the grounds for the development of the great revolutionary processes which shaped

the face of the postwar world and are continuing to influence the situation on earth to this day.

This truly scientific and objective interpretation of the history of World War II is of tremendous importance to the people of the United States, for its origins and lessons are constantly and most shamelessly being distorted by the ideologues of imperialism. Americans may be proud of the fact that the United States took part in the anti-Hitlerite coalition and that they made a contribution to the routing of the criminal fascist-militaristic bloc. They are fully justified in being proud of the actions of the U.S. armed forces in North Africa, the Mediterranean, Italy and the Pacific and the landing of Anglo-American forces in Normandy, on 4 June 1944, which opened the second front in the struggle against the Hitlerites. They can also be proud of many foreign policy activities of the United States at that time, the most outstanding examples of which are the agreements reached with the Soviet Union and Great Britain on the basis of the continuation of the war until full victory had been won and laying the foundations for post war cooperation among the victors in maintaining peace and assisting in the development of democracy and progress and the punishment of Nazi war criminals.

However, the truth of the history of World War II is drastically different from its misrepresentations promoted by American bourgeois historiography and propaganda. For example, the significance of the Anglo-American landing, the 40th anniversary of which was solemnly celebrated a year ago on the Normandy beaches, was substantially limited by the obstructionist maneuverings of American and British imperialists.

It is a fact that this landing took place not sooner than 3 years after the Nazis had invaded Soviet territory and more than 2 year after the Soviet-American and Soviet-British agreement, which was concluded May-June 1942, on the soonest possible opening of a second front in the part of Western Europe which would be the shortest way into fascist Germany. The time of landing in Western Europe was established after the course of events on the Soviet-German front had most clearly indicated that the outcome of the war was already predetermined and the USSR had acquired the ability to defeat the fascists by itself. This fact, to which a great deal of other proof could be added, shows that the United States and Great Britain deliberately postponed the opening of the second front, dragging out the war and trying to exhaust both Germany and the Soviet Union, thus deliberately creating a situation which cost the lives of a few more million military servicemen and civilians.

The credit for the fact that, in the final account, the United States made a contribution to the victory over fascism belongs entirely to the American working people. Along with some members of the ruling class, whose interests were expressed by President F.D. Roosevelt, workers and the other democratic forces in the country struggled throughout the entire war against obstructionist actions and sabotage by powerful monopoly capital groups. During the war these reactionary groups fiercely opposed any measures aimed at strengthening allied unity and achieving the fastest possible defeat of the enemy. Their obstructionism was manifested in a variety of forms: slowing down the pace of armament and military ordnance production and undermining the unity of effort of antifascist masses by attacking the working class, the

trade unions and national and racial minorities and other population strata and groups opposing fascism. The reactionary groups in the ruling class stubbornly opposed the opening of a second front in Western Europe. Enjoying an influence in the Congress and controlling a significant share of the mass information media, they engaged in anti-Soviet and anticommunist tirades while millions of Red Army troops and commanders were fighting a battle to death against fascism. The reactionaries included both people who secretly sympathized with the Nazis and profascists who made no effort to conceal their views.

The dedicated struggle by a coalition of democratic forces headed by the working class, which included the American communists, and which involved sacrifices, was required in order to preserve the unity and political power needed to pursue the U. S. military effort. Such struggle was waged in plants, mines and offices and during electoral campaigns when it was necessary to support candidates for governmental positions, who pledged to struggle against fascism.

Such an assessment of the U. S. contribution to the defeat of the criminal bloc of the "Axis" powers has a specific place in fundamental works on the history of World War II. However, the ideologues of American imperialism and the bourgeois mass information media are interpreting the history of the war in such a way as to make it consistent with the current policies and objectives of the ruling U. S. class. The origins and reasons of the war, its development and its main events and results are misrepresented. The authors of a variety of interpretations try to belittle the role of the Soviet Union and proclaim insubstantial the contribution which the resistance movement of peoples of countries occupied by the fascist powers made to victory. They try to conceal the true history of the war by resorting to all sorts of distortions and anti-Soviet and anticommunist conjectures.

It is important to resurrect the truth of World War II and bring it to the awareness of the broad masses under the contemporary conditions of aggravated ideological struggle between the two systems, when the most reactionary and aggressive circles of American imperialism are using such forgeries for securing social support for their policy of urging on the arms race and preparations for nuclear "star" and other wars.

For several decades the imperialist ideologues have been trying to instill in world public opinion the stupidity that the war was the consequence of the 23 August 1939 Soviet-German nonaggression pact. Without any substantiation whatsoever, this was stated as early as 1948 at the peak of the "cold war" by the U.S. Department of State and is still tirelessly being claimed by the learned supporters of anti-Sovietism. The truth of history, however, is that the ruling circles in the Western capitalist countries stubbornly rejected repeated Soviet initiatives and suggestions aimed at preventing the war. Again and again they refused to assume strictly defined obligations on ensuring collective security against fascist aggression. In the final account, in 1938, in Munich, they assured Hitler of the fact that they would remain neutral in the case of a Nazi aggression in the East. It was precisely under these circumstances that the Soviet leadership was forced to sign a nonaggression pact, thus gaining time to strengthen Soviet defense capability.

The outcome of the lengthy and growing hatred of socialism and of conspiracies and combative feelings displayed by Western imperialist circles is a lesson which must be seriously considered to this day. None other than the anticommunist retention of power by the rich in the capitalist world defeated all serious efforts at safeguarding peace. It blinded the Western statesmen and prevented them from seeing and realizing the true danger which threatened, among others, the independence and the very existence of their own countries. The silent agreement with which the Western imperialists leaders reacted to all acts of aggression committed by the "Axis" powers on the eve of World War II was symptomatic of this anti-Soviet and anticommunist blindness.

The war itself, which began with the Nazi invasion of Poland, led to a series of events which exhaustingly proved the intention of Western imperialist circles to incite the "Axis" powers to launch the long planned attack on the Soviet Union. These events, which were typically described as the "funny war," indicated with extreme accuracy the class similarity and anti-Soviet cohesion between the Western imperialist capitalist countries and the fascist-militaristic powers. The ruling circles of the Western capitalist countries displayed staggering passiveness and indifference while the Nazis were capturing, one after another, the European countries and while Japan, encouraged by Hitlerite successes, occupied Vietnam.

As a whole, it is inherent in Western historiography to distort or ignore the significance of these and other events which convincingly revealed the true reasons for the war and the fact that the fault for its outbreak is not exclusively that of German fascism and its allies but also of their imperialist accomplices and benefactors in the Western capitalist countries. Bourgeois historians even belittle the role of the USSR in the defeat of the "Axis" powers. Such precisely is the purpose of the insulting and unfair comparisons among the contributions which the individual participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition made to the common cause.

Yet, without in the least belittling the contribution of the Western countries in the North African, Mediterranean and Pacific theaters of military operations, a just and balanced assessment cannot fail to recognize the decisive importance of the Soviet-German front, which determined the outcome of the entire war. This exclusively accurate assessment should include, among the decisive battles of the war, the unprecedented gigantic battles in which, as George Marshall, the chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the American Armed Forces, was forced to report to the U.S. President and the secretary of defense in 1945, "The Russian army is engaging two-thirds of the land and one-third of the air forces of Germany in mortal and exhaustive battles...."

The great victory of the Soviet forces at Stalingrad led American General Douglas MacArthur to exclaim the following on 23 February 1943: "The fate of mankind rests on the noble flags of the Red Army!...The scale and greatness of this effort make it the greatest military accomplishment in history." In a message addressed at that time to J.V. Stalin, using similar expressions President Roosevelt congratulated the Red Army for its "splendid victories unsurpassed in history."

While making a decisive contribution to the destruction of the Nazi military machine, the Soviet Union kept significant Red Army forces in the Far East, thus blocking the main land forces of Japan with which the USSR had a neutrality pact. At the Crimean Conference, the USSR denounced this pact and, on 9 August 1945, joined the war against Japan. Together with the forces of the Mongolian People's Republic, the Soviet Armed Forces mounted combat operations against a large group of Japanese land forces (more than 1 million men), the bulk of which was the Kwantung army, deployed in Manchuria.

These activities resulted in the liberation of an area of 1.5 million square kilometers with a population of over 70 million people. This alone refutes the stubbornly widespread view in the West, in the United States in particular, according to which the Soviet Union made no contribution whatsoever to the victory over Japan. In the version of the history of World War II aimed at simple Americans, the imperialist ideologues explain the victory over Japan with the atomic bombing of Hiroshima on 6 August and Nagasaki on 9 August 1945. However, any reasonably unprejudiced researcher would consider the atomic bombing nothing but purely political in essence, undertaken mainly as a result of the increased hostility of the United States toward the USSR but unnecessary and of no decisive significance from the military viewpoint. Nevertheless, a number of Western works contain reluctant admissions to the effect that entering the war in the Far East by the USSR had an unquestionable impact on the surrender of militaristic Japan.

The official surrender of Japan on 2 September 1945 marked the end of World War II, the biggest and fiercest war in history, which took the lives of more than 50 million people and doomed to suffering and privations an incalculable number.

The defeat of the criminal Aaxis" bloc marked the second failure of the assault forces of imperialism in the efforts to turn back the movement of the nations toward a system free from exploitation and the oppression of man by man. The first failure was the defeat suffered in 1918-1922 by the participants in the imperialist aggression against the young Soviet Republic.

Therefore, in a period of no more than 25 years, the peoples which had founded the first socialist state in the world were forced twice to assume the burden of the armed struggle against imperialist aggression and twice came out winners from this struggle. The victories won in 1941-1945 extended and broadened those of 1918-1922. After withstanding most severe trials, the ideas and objectives of the Great October Revolution triumphed once again.

Today this fact is of tremendous importance to those who have not lost their ability to draw lessons from history. The two defeats with which the imperialist "crusades" against the forces of social progress ended were nothing but the defeat of the socioeconomic system of monopoly capital. At the same time, they were also the defeat of the ideological-political superstructure erected to support and expand said system. Both defeats were a manifestation of the condemnation and active rejection by mankind of ideas and ideals embodied in this superstructure, such as hatred of man, predatoriness, chauvinism and racism and, above all, antisocialism in its demonological variety, anti-Sovietism. Thus, there were two outstanding victories of the

ideas of the socialist revolution in Russia, the ideas and objectives developed and brought to the masses by Marx, Engels and Lenin, on the one hand; on the other, there were two defeats of imperialist ideas and objectives, two defeats expressed in the catastrophic routing of imperialist military assault detachments. Such is the irrefutable verdict of history, which has had a transforming influence on the state of affairs in the world.

The decisive role played by the Soviet Union in defeating the bloc of fascist and militaristic powers proved to the entire world the tremendous reserves of power and truly boundless possibilities of socialism. The estimates and hopes of the imperialists that prolonging the war would weaken and exhaust the USSR proved unjustified.

By the time of the battle for Kursk, despite tremendous dislocations and temporary occupation of part of Soviet territory by the Hitlerites, Soviet industry was producing significantly more ordnance than the economy of fascist Germany, which was exploiting the material and human resources of all of Europe captured by the Nazis.

Furthermore, for the information of those who still claim that it was deliveries of weapons and military materiel from the capitalist Western countries that allowed the USSR to repel the fascist invasion: although the aid given by the United States based on lend-lease was tangible and important in a number of areas, throughout the entire war the Soviet Union was able to supply by itself its own armed forces with most of the armaments they needed. Shipments by the allies of the USSR accounted for no more than 2 percent of artillery weapons, about 12 percent of airplanes and 10 percent of the tanks in the overall amount of armaments and military equipment which the Red Army obtained during the war.

After the defeat of fascism and the end of the war socialism immediately proved its efficiency under peaceful conditions. The Soviet people, who had lost 20 million people and some 30 percent of the country's national resources, faced the tremendous tasks of restoration and reconstruction. The devastation and wreckage were so immense that some Western experts predicted that the Soviet Union would need several decades, if not longer, to rebuild its national economy.

The fact that the Soviet people implemented these assignments within the shortest possible historical time proved once again the advantage of the socialist socioeconomic system and, particularly, the socialist organization of economic planning. As early as 1950 gross Soviet industrial output had exceeded the 1940 level by 73 rather than 48 percent as planned; thousands of major industrial enterprises had been built or reconstructed.

Headlong progress in building socialism, science and culture, a successful pursuit of national policy, the aid which the USSR is giving developing countries in Africa, Asia, the Arab East, and Latin America, successes in perfecting socialist democracy in the direction of social self-management and the stubborn and decisive struggle for peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems are all significantly intensifying the prestige and influence of the Soviet Union in the eyes of the peoples on the planet.

In the postwar world the Soviet Union is a powerful defender of the peoples from the sneaking ambitions of imperialism and the counterrevolution. As a model and example of a socialist alternative to capitalist social relations based on cruel exploitation, the USSR inspires the struggle of the peoples for peace, freedom and the revolutionary renovation of the planet.

The victory over fascism and the new deployment of forces in the world objectively contributed to the successes of democratic and revolutionary forces throughout the globe. After the war, the peoples of a number of Eastern European countries, followed by the peoples of Korea, China, Vietnam and Laos, took the path of building a socialist society. The revolution won in Cuba in 1959. It is thus that socialism was established on three continents, drastically changing the sociopolitical aspect of our planet and becoming a decisive factor in international politics.

The world socialist system is the bulwark and one of the motive forces of the global revolutionary process. It is the most dynamic economic force with a decisive influence on the entire course of global developments. The persistence and insistence with which the socialist countries formulate peace initiatives and are waging the struggle for peace strengthen the hope of the peoples that wars and threats of wars can be avoided.

The restoration of the national economy and the striking increase in the power and influence of the USSR in the postwar years and the appearance and expansion of the world socialist system dealt heavy blows to the plans of American imperialism, which nurtured the hope of global hegemony. The changes which took place in the world narrowed the realm of imperialist domination and further intensified the general crisis of capitalism. Furthermore, the decisive determinants of progressive historical trends are closely interacting with powerful processes the incentive for the development of which was the defeat of fascism.

Proletarization processes contributed to the increased number of members of the global labor movement and the spreading of this movement among ever new countries. The new detachments of the world proletariat made a clear choice in favor of the socialist alternative to capitalism and created communist and worker parties.

The process of organization and cohesion of the international working class gathered strength as well. A shift to the left has taken place in the developed capitalist countries in the postwar years. Its most important aspect was the growth of the world communist movement, man fested, among others, by the fact that in 1946 communist parties existed in 78 countries, compared to only 69 on the eve of World War II. Today communist parties exist in 95 countries. In the period which directly followed World War II communists were members of the government in 10 capitalist countries.

In the postwar years the worker and trade union movements which faced the intensified class antagonisms and efforts to mount a counteroffensive by the monopolies, assumed more combative positions and resorted to more efficient tactics. The number of strikes increased. In answer to the offensive mounted by the corporations, the most powerful wave of strikes in the country's

history swelled in the United States. However, the monopolies and the government were able to break down this wave of strikes by passing laws which drastically restricted the freedom of action of trade unions and by unleashing an anticommunist campaign. Nevertheless, repressive measures were unable to prevent retaliatory worker actions. Changes in the structure of the working class are increasing the number of energetic and aggressive actions which are becoming increasingly political in nature and showing a tendency to developing into large scale nationwide actions.

The powerful liberation processes, the impetus for which was the victory over the fascist-militaristic bloc led to results justifiably considered second in importance to the change which followed the establishment of the world socialist system. Such a change was the explosive upsurge of national liberation movements which affected hundreds of millions of people in Asia, Africa and Latin America, who were kept in a state of colonial or semicolonial slavery and had been alienated from participation in determining the course of global events for a long time. This global upsurge of liberation movements radically destroyed the imperialist colonial system, which was replaced by a system of national states. More than 100 new independent states joined the "family of nations."

With the advent of the 1970s the liberated countries began to play an increasingly more active role in the formulation of political measures determining the course of world events. On the other hand, the development of these countries is characterized by increasing unevenness and sociopolitical differentiation. Some of them took the path of capitalist development while others chose the revolutionary-democratic way. A significant group of Asian and African countries made a choice in favor of socialism and by the start of the 1980s already had or were in the process of founding Marxist-Leninist parties.

Since imperialism is blocking the path of the liberated countries to real freedom and independence, the social problems in these countries are assuming increasing importance. The new colonialist policy pursued by the multinational corporations prevents such countries from attaining full independence and surmounting backwardness. A tremendous effort must be made to throw off the legacy of colonialism--to surmount the crying poverty to which more than one-half of the population of the liberated countries is doomed, where every year millions of people die of hunger, and to cope with the tremendous difficulties in developing public education, providing the masses with housing and medical services, eliminating illiteracy and wiping out chronic diseases. The efforts to resolve such problems which brook no postponement aggravate the confrontation between imperialist and liberated countries which are increasingly acting as a dynamic component of the global revolutionary process.

The creation and development of international institutions, which embody the principles and the proclaimed objectives of the participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition, may be considered as yet another durable result of the victory of antifascist, antimilitarist and prodemocratic forces. The influence of the Soviet Union was of exceptional significance in the formulation and definition of these principles and objectives.

The principle of peaceful coexistence and cooperation among countries belonging to different sociopolitical systems, which was formulated by Lenin immediately after the victory of the October Revolution, plays a particular role among them. More than ever before this principle has become essential and vitally important in resolving basic global problems and is assuming a mandatory, a necessary nature. Tempered in the flames of the great battles of World War II, this principle was acknowledged and institutionalized with the establishment of the United Nations organization at the 1945 San Francisco conference.

Subsequently, the effectiveness and viability of the principle of peaceful coexistence were reasserted and were able to neutralize the obstructionist and regressive trends of the cold war period. The Soviet and American leaders who met is Moscow in May 1972 coordinated and adopted the basic principles governing reciprocal relations. The first among them proclaimed that the United States and the USSR "will proceed from the common conviction that in the nuclear century no foundation for relations between them other than peaceful coexistence exists."

As a whole, the victory over the fascist-militaristic bloc, which was won 40 years ago, brought into action processes which changed the correlation among class forces on a global scale and in individual countries and opened to the nations a path to lasting peace, democracy and social progress. The active participation in this victorious strugle of the working class and the toiling masses in many countries, headed and guided by Marxist-Leninist parties, convincingly proved the growing significance of the subjective factor in charting the course of history. Postwar development, stimulated by the victory of the national liberation process, provided further proof of the growing significance of Marxist-Leninist ideology in the struggle for upgrading the revolutionary awareness of the masses and strengthening the combativeness and combat capability of revolutionary parties.

In the struggle against fascist aggression the peoples of the world achieved a victory which should ensure their lives without fear of the future and prospects for free and democratic development. The defeat of Hitlerite Germany and militaristic Japan helped to awaken in the peoples of the world hopes for a bright future. However, these hopes were dashed by the activities of Western imperialist circles, of U.S. imperialists above all, even before the guns had become silent.

The learned men serving the ruling U. S. class claim that the clouds which are darkening the hopes of the peoples were the result of Soviet "intransigence" and some kind of Soviet "expansionism." These people slanderously accuse the Soviet Union of having unleashed the cold war. However, more objective observers in the capitalist countries are forced to acknowledge that the real reason for the cold war was the activities of Western imperialist circles, the United States above all.

Various dates are cited as marking the beginning of the cold war, such as 6 and 9 August 1945, when the United States destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the first and only time in history that nuclear weapons were used only for the sake of frightening the world, the USSR above all. The date 5 March 1946 is

also mentioned, when Churchill, one of the main builders of anti-Soviet conspiracies by British imperialism, proclaimed the beginning of the cold war in Fulton (Missouri), calling upon the Anglo-Saxon countries to join in opposing the Soviet Union with nuclear weapons, for which he was applauded by President Truman. Finally, the date 12 March 1947 is also cited, when the U.S. President repeated the proclamation of the cold war by proclaiming the "Truman Doctrine," with which American imperialism declared its aspirations to the exclusive right to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries with a view to supporting reactionary regimes rejected by the peoples.

In his book "The Cold War and Its Origins," American historian D.F. Fleming indicates that the deep-rooted and insurmountable hatred and irreconcilable hostility shown by the ruling circles of the capitalist West towaer the Soviet Union appeared as early as October 1917, when Russian workers and peasants rang the bells which capitalism took as its funeral toll, and which intensified, after the efforts to destroy the young Soviet republic with the help of the intervention had failed. There is extensive information to the effect that during World War II this hatred and hostility, initially suppressed by the need for military cooperation, increased among the most reactionary U.S. circles, becoming increasingly apparent as the war was drawing to an end.

For example, the British Marxist R. Palm Datt tells of Churchil's admission made by the end of 1954, that as early as the spring of 1945, when Soviet troops were approaching Berlin, he had ordered Field Marshal Montgomery to assemble and keep the weapons of surrendering fascist armies for possibly returning them to the Germans should it become necessary to enlist their help for taking action against the USSR.

In turn, President Truman gained notoriety when while still a Senator he called upon the United States to make it possible for Germans and Russians to kill each other as much as possible, until both sides became materially exhausted and drained of their blood, which would allow American imperialism to achieve desired global hegemony. Holding on to such views, after becoming U.S. president with Roosevelt's death, Truman quickly changed the course of his predecessor who had tried to establish relations of cooperation with the Soviet Union, adopting an exactly opposite policy with the approval of the most reactionary imperialist circles and their profascist accomplices. It was with the help of these elements that Truman launched the cold war, initiating the protracted campaign of surrounding the socialist countries with military bases and creating aggressive military blocs aimed at the Soviet Union and the movement of peoples fighting for national liberation and independence.

The U. S. ruling circles motivated such a headlong conversion to the positions of hostility toward the socialist countries with considerations of both foreign and domestic policy nature. The Soviet Union came out of the war as the militarily most powerful state, enjoying the honor and respect of the nations for the leading and dedicated role it had played in rescuing them from fascism. A world socialist system appeared, rallying the liberators and the liberated peoples of Eastern Europe and Asia. These consequences of the defeat of fascism blocked the path to the establishment of the "American century" of global hegemony, of which American imperialists had dreamed for

decades, and the plans for which they had formulated during the war. Furthermore, the ordinary Americans and the working people in other countries had developed a sympathetic attitude the USSR and a feeling of admiration for this country. The democratic ideals and objectives of the anti-Hitlerite coalition rapidly spread among the American masses as well.

Throughout the entire postwar period, with the exception of a regrettably all too short a period, when detente revealed its inherent possibility of promoting social progress and benefiting all countries, U.S. imperialism has made efforts to eliminate the consequences of the defeat of fascism, which have blocked its path to world domination. The Truman administration and all subsequent presidents have contributed to elevating anticommunism and anti-Sovietism to the rank of state policy.

The intensification of the general crisis of capitalism and the series of cyclical crises, which adversely affected the situation of the toiling masses, reduced the maneuvering possibilities of the ruling circles in countries with state-monopoly capitalism. The growing activeness of the young states struggling for true independence curtailed even further the reserves of imperialism in former colonies and dependent countries. With each passing year the previously unchallenged leadership of American imperialism in the capitalist world is weakening under the blows of the imperialist rivals of the United States. These processes intensify the orientation of scientific and technical achievements toward military objectives while, at the same time, they contribute to the concentration and centralization of production in state-monopoly armament conglomerates which are the material foundations for the increasing influence and power of the military-industrial complex.

Furthermore, as militarization and the entire cold war atmosphere turned into permanent features of the American way of life, yet another motif in the policy of imperialism appeared and began to play an increasingly tangible role: support of revanchism. It was impudently proclaimed for the first time in the Truman Doctrine, on 12 March 1947, and clearly reformulated by the leaders of the present administration, who dare to contest the inviolability of the borders which were set in Europe after World War II and to question the decisions of the Crimean and Potsdam Conferences as well as other accords concluded during the war among the United States, Great Britain and the USSR.

Such is the course which U. S. imperialism has been following for the 4 decades after the defeat of fascism by the anti-Hitlerite coalition. The promoters of this course are constantly relying on the use of naked force to "contain" and "throw back" communism. These are precisely the terms with which experts in the service of American imperialism define U.S. intervention in the Korean War in 1950-1953, the aggressive actions against Cuba, the protracted and costly aggression against the peoples of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, the invasion of the Dominican Republic, the organization and implementation of a military-fascist coup d'etat in Chile, the intervention in Grenada, the participation in punitive operations against the patriots in El Salvador, and the waging of undeclared war in Nicaragua.

The chronological enumeration of these criminal actions alone proves the catastrophic consequences threatening international security as a result of

the paranoid anticommunism and anti-Sovietism displayed by American imperialism. The course it has charted in the nuclear century has brought the world to the brink of catastrophe, threatening the elimination of all life on earth. With its intention of deploying along the perimeter of the socialist community first-strike missiles with nuclear warheads, the flight time of which reduces to a minimum the time for warning of a nuclear attack, and by accelerating the development of space weapons, the current U.S. administration is actively engaged in military preparations aimed at eliminating all obstacles on the way to global domination.

It would be pertinent to recall in this connection the fate of the German fascists and Japanese militarists, who hoped to attain those same objectives through lightening attacks without a warning. Nor should we forget the decisions of the Nuremberg and Tokyo military tribunals and the sentences they passed. Today there are forces on earth capable of preventing the outbreak of a new war. The imperialist threat of nuclear missile catastrophe is countered by the forces of peace which have energized their activities worldwide.

The most important fact is that the imperialist circles have been forced, one way or another, to take into consideration the military-strategic parity achieved by the socialist community, headed by the Soviet Union. By preventing U.S. imperialism from achieving military-strategic superiority, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are thus guaranteeing mankind its most precious right--the right to life.

The major peace initiatives formulated by the Soviet Union are particularly important under the present tense international situation. They are not only a vivid confirmation of the peaceful course of the first socialist country in history but also a real foundation for reaching agreements which could put an end to the arms race unleashed by imperialism, strengthen peace on earth and prevent the militarization of outer space. The Soviet proposals are consistent with the hopes and expectations of the peoples on the planet and closely agree with the requirements formulated by the fighters for peace in the United States and other countries.

The recent Soviet-American summit meeting was a major event. It marked the victory of the forces of reason, cracked the ice of the cold war and marked a shift toward normalizing relations between the United States and the USSR. The agreements reached in the course of this meeting proved that the cause of peace can gain the upper hand and that the possibilities which were opened as a result of the Geneva dialogue could turn into specific agreements.

Based on the changes which have taken place in the world, thanks to the great victory over fascism, won 40 years ago, the peoples on earth can lift the threat of nuclear war and continue the progress of mankind toward the triumph of democracy and socialism. As always, everywhere, the communists will be in the vanguard of the forces participating in this noble and humane act.

5003
CSO: 1802/6

ARGENTINE COMMUNISTS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 89-98

[Article by Athos Fava, secretary general of the Communist Party of Argentina]

[Text] Argentina is experiencing a difficult transitional stage after almost 8 years of military dictatorship, which was imposed upon our people in 1976, to bourgeois democracy with all the positive and negative features implied in such a transition.

The legacy which the dictatorship left was a difficult one. It included the results of state terrorism, such as the tens of thousands of people who "disappeared," were killed, sent to jail and tortured, the still retained old repressive apparatus and the heavy burden of the consequences of a merciless antipeople's economic policy and drastically increased foreign indebtedness. This list could be extended on and on.

Such are, very briefly, the results of a policy pursued for the sake of models imposed from the outside of a country classified as a trading station and a pasture ground, a humiliated and dependent country, tied to the militaristic chariot of American imperialism.

The country entered a new period in its history in December 1983. It began with the resumption of constitutional institutions and the access to power of a democratically elected civilian government, headed by Raul Alfonsin, characterized at that time by our party's Central Committee plenum as a "bourgeois-democratic reformist type government, a heterogenous government in which representatives of progressive circles and of conciliationist positions coexist." It was also stated at the plenum that the communists will act constructively, firmly supporting and rallying the patriotic forces for the implementation of measures consistent with the democratic aspirations of the Argentine people in the interests of accomplishing progressive changes, safeguarding peace while, at the same time, rejecting anything which could oppose such aims.

As practical experience indicated, the current government has no support among the working class. By virtue of its class nature it aspires toward "social accord," which would enable it to act without disturbing the status quo. It

is for the sake of this status quo that it tries to rely on various forces, something which cannot fail to influence its actions and decisions.

Let us emphasize that the government is subject to pressure from two sides: The open and very strong pressure exerted by the oligarchy, foreign monopolies and big groups of local capitalists, linked with imperialism, American above all, and the pressure, sometimes open, exerted by the United States--the Pentagon, the Department of State and the embassy. All of them are trying to eliminate the most positive aspects of the government's efforts to strengthen democratic institutions and civil freedoms and in the area of foreign policy.

Domestic and foreign reaction is thrown in a state of frenzy by the freedom of speech existing in the country and, particularly, the trial of the members of the military juntas, responsible for the crimes of the dictatorship. This trial, unprecedented in Latin American history, has become a vivid exposure of state terrorism. At the same time, the reaction is trying to abolish trends in foreign policy, such as defending the principle of nonintervention in the affairs of Nicaragua and Central America, support of the Contadora group, and condemnation of the criminal embargo instituted by Reagan.

The reactionaries oppose the foreign policy course aimed at terminating the arms race and the condemnation voiced by Argentina, together with many other nonaligned countries, of the U.S. "star wars" program. They are worried by the expansion of trade and cultural relations with members of the socialist community, the USSR in particular.

On the other hand, the government is being pressured by democratic, progressive and popular forces. As their structural component, the Argentine communists are not behaving like marginal observers. They are acting. We believe that if we can unite and mobilize the workers and the broad popular masses and positive elements within the government and outside it, we would be able to insist on the adoption of the type of program demanded by our people and eliminate the destabilizing plans of the reaction within and outside the country.

The past 2 years have indicated that the nature of governmental activities are clearly dependent on the precise nature of the forces which have had the greatest influence, which most clearly indicates that two different ways of development are possible. The class nature and heterogeneity of the government explain its tendency to "extemporize," and the conflicting and complex nature of its actions. This also confirms the accuracy of Lenin's thesis to the effect that it is precisely the pressure and struggle of the broad popular masses that can and must predetermine the development of events in a positive direction.

A characteristic feature of the democratization process in our country at the present time is its mass nature, combined with high level population activeness, in which the working class plays a central role. Starting with a period of militant activities in the 1960s, opposing the dictatorship of General Juan Carlos Ongania, the center of the struggle has always remained in areas of large proletarian associations in both the private and governmental

sectors. This enabled us to gain rich experience in class battles and increased the combativeness and consciousness of the working people.

That is why now, when the government and the power of the rich, including the big entrepreneurs and a number of trade union bosses are striving toward "accord" for the sake of attaining a so-called "social peace," day after day the working class is intensifying its striking movement, demanding higher wages and improved working conditions and trying to prevent the burden of the crisis from being shifted to the working people.

It would be pertinent to emphasize at this point that the class nature of the oscillations and conciliatory concessions granted by the government are most clearly manifested in the worsened economic and social situation in the country. Thus, by the middle of June 1985 the government adopted a program for anti-inflationary measures, consistent with the universally known prescriptions of the International Monetary Fund. Its implementation entails a significant reduction in real wages, a drastic increase in unemployment, curtailed budget allocations for education, health care and housing, reduced state-financed construction and transfer of some state enterprises to private ownership. With all of this, however, it will not affect the punctual payment of interest on foreign loans.

Our party's July 1985 Central Committee plenum qualified these steps as governmental remedies. However, it also reasserted its basic evaluation, formulated at the December 1983 plenum we mentioned.

Newspaper articles and statements by a number of leading political figures emphasize, as a rule, that strikes and other actions taken by the working people are allegedly not contributory to strengthening democracy.

To this we always answer that our party supports the opposite viewpoint and, naturally, we point out the most important role which the working class can and must play in the struggle for stabilizing the situation in the country. The working class, which is heading the struggle of the entire people, rallied within the trade unions and on the political level, is the best guarantee for victory in the battles for stable democratic institutions, social justice and national liberation.

The energetic actions of the working class and the broad popular masses in support of their demand are not "destabilizing" in the least. The main destabilizing forces are big capital, the monopolies and the oligarchy in particular. No true democracy is possible without social justice. This is our position and we shall act in that direction regardless of plans drawn up in a spirit of "social conciliation," promoted by a certain segment of the bourgeois parties within the government.

We, Argentine communists, are convinced that if the powerful stream of the struggle waged by workers and popular masses would merge with the great common stream and if general objectives, such as democracy and stability of constitutional institutions, defense of national sovereignty and peaceful coexistence are added to the specific demands of the masses, there is hope that the expectations of our people will not be lost.

As the experience of our country proves, in the majority of cases coups d'etat have been inspired by imperialism more for the sake of blocking the movement of the masses aspiring toward national and social liberation than for replacing constitutional governments weakened by their own shortcomings, hesitations and concessions to other such governments.

The study of the past and present situation justifies the claim that the most aggressive and militaristic imperialist circles, which are stubbornly following the policies of the Reagan administration, will not tolerate any, even a most "modest" reformist government should it harm their interests or oppose Washington's global strategy aimed at a military confrontation with the USSR and the other members of the socialist community.

Today many social and political forces in Argentina, regardless of differences among them, have set themselves a single objective: to attain constitutional stability, thus putting an end to a series of coups d'etat. To us, communists, who also favor this, it is a question of achieving better conditions for the development of the struggle waged by the masses for political and trade union unity and for the organization of the working class, thus gaining strength within the revolutionary camp.

The document entitled "Let us Defend Democracy," which was signed last April in the presidential palace, was a major accomplishment in reaching this objective. It was initialed by the leaders of the country's 13 leading political parties, including the Communist Party of Argentina, the ruling Civil Radical Union Party and the main opposition parties--the Justicialista Party and the Irreconcilable Party.

The document emphasized the resolve through joint efforts, despite existing differences, to support the democratic process in the country and to firmly rebuff all manifestations of subversive activities. The difficulties facing Argentina, the document stipulates, which are numerous, are of a protracted and profound nature and surmounting them will require great efforts. They cannot be resolved by coup d'etat and dictatorships which betray the sovereignty of the people...."National unity is needed in order to eliminate dependence and the consequences of the tremendous foreign indebtedness which is adversely affecting the situation of the people and hindering our development. National unity must be built on social justice and freedom."

In considering the accomplishments as a result of the conclusion of this document a necessary base in the struggle for constitutional stability and effective democracy and social justice, we, communists, suggest further progress in the area of structural changes, characteristic of a democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution. In other words, we proceed from the concept of the united front--anti-oligarchic and anti-imperialist--aimed at unifying left wing forces accepting this program and becoming the center of attraction for the broad toiling masses, the members of other parties and the independents, who strive for radical change.

Before undertaking to explain our viewpoint on such a front, we must properly assess the type of democracy we have attained. Essentially, it is formal

bourgeois democracy. However, it has made it possible to shift the struggle to a new level and enabled the working class and the entire people to act.

Victorio Codovilla, the founder of our party, frequently cited Lenin's words to the effect that acquiring democracy is of tremendous importance in the struggle waged by the working class, and that one of the basic tasks in the struggle for a social revolution is to seek and find the ways which would make bringing this struggle to its proper end possible.

To bring it to its end, Codovilla said, means to resolve the problems of the democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution and thus to open to our working class, our people and country, the bright path to socialism.

The purposeful activities of the masses are a vitally important, active, unifying and organizing aspect of our concept of democracy. That is why the mobilization of the popular masses is necessary above all in defending and consolidating the constitutional regime.

To the Argentine communists the struggle for democracy today is a struggle against the forces of a conciliationist or openly reactionary nature, who are trying to exert pressure on the government. It is a struggle in defense of measures which ensure civil freedoms and constitutional guarantees. It is a struggle for the true participation of the people in the making of important decisions concerning specific matters aimed at satisfying the simplest yet profound and patriotic expectations, such as the right to work and adequate wages, education for the children, access to culture, decent housing, health care for the working people and a secure old age.

To the communists democracy consists above all of ensuring the self-determination of the people and guaranteeing their right to choose the type of government and sociopolitical system which can meet their vital demands.

Political instability in Argentina has always been the result of contradictions inherent in a society which has become ripe for progressive change, with a developed working class and broad yet dispersed democratic movement. This instability plays in the hands of the landed oligarchy and the big bourgeoisie, who are increasingly linking their domination with the interests of financial capital and the multinational monopolies, and are using all available means of state power to strengthen their alliance with these forces and safeguard their positions and privileges.

We are firmly confident that today, when a profoundly negative attitude toward coups d'etat has developed among the people, the parties and the public organizations, an end could be put to them. Experience indicates that the weak points of the mass movement in our country have been the insufficient unity of democratic forces and the false belief that the essential problems of the country can be resolved by a given bourgeois party or single social force.

Another contributory fact to coups d'etat has been the fact that the governments which came to power made no changes in our backward and dependent socioeconomic structure. The constitutional governments, which made one concession after another to the forces of oligarchy and reaction, themselves

fell, in the final account, victim to a coup d'etat. As past experience indicates, even through scandalous capitulations the governments themselves have been unable to prevent the next coup d'etat, for in all cases it was aimed mainly against the people, the working class above all.

That is why one of the primary tasks is to achieve a situation in which the democratic forces and their leaders would act in a spirit of unity, dedication and patriotism. The scattering, dispersal, division and discord in the ranks of democratic forces have always been the result of arrogance and sectarianism.

Should the democratic movement today fail to surmount these weaknesses, it risks to lose the most favorable opportunity in our country for putting an end to the cycle of coups d'etat. We consider that the time has come for all progressive forces to act together and most resolutely.

We must point out that on the basic level--in plants, enterprises and at home--major steps are being taken in this direction. Here the struggle for demands blends with defense of democracy and lays the foundations for a national and social liberation front.

Putting an end to the sinister cycle of coups d'etat is not a self-seeking aim but a platform for the implementation of the plan for the creation of such a front, formulated by the communists, under more favorable conditions. In this connection, it is necessary to surmount certain shortcomings, schematism, for instance. Even the most correct line, if schematically implemented, becomes distorted or fails to be understood by the masses in the final account.

In particular, if we were today to absolutize the struggle against coups d'etat and make it the pivot of our actions, we risk to lose sight of the basic, the necessary features in defending democracy and promoting radical changes in our country. The most important feature is a national and social liberation front headed by the working class.

Coups d'etat and destabilization are one of the means to which imperialism and reaction resort. At the present time they are playing a double game: on the one hand, they are pressuring the government; on the other, they are trying to frighten the popular masses and to reduce and even paralyze their activeness.

The Communist Party of Argentina has never erred by underestimating circumstantial measures or reforms. With every passing day, however, it is becoming increasingly obvious that our country requires decisive "surgical" measures and antioligarchic and anti-imperialist changes, for the effect of "current" reforms is rapidly lost.

As Marx wrote, revolutions are the locomotives of history. They move social development ahead. That is why we must distinguish among the nature and meaning of reforms. There is a difference between reforms made by any type of bourgeois government and reforms carried out by a revolutionary power.

The reforms demanded by the masses are progressive and enable us to gather strength. True change, however, can take place only under the leadership of

the working class, providing that it is united from the political and trade union viewpoints, and can rally around itself the absolute majority, whose interests clash with those of the main enemy--imperialism and the oligarchy--and the financial magnates linked with them.

Therefore, this is a political question, the base of which is the question of power; in other words, it is a question of the class or classes and social strata which will head the process of transformation in the country.

The aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism and the efforts of the United States to shift its burdens and the fabulous cost of the arms race to the peoples of Latin America and the rest of the world have intensified our contradictions with imperialism.

Consequently, whatever problems we may try to resolve, we shall always be forced actively to oppose imperialism's policy and aggressive aspirations and its intention to use foreign indebtedness to increase our dependence. This problem is greatly influencing and leaving its mark on any strategy of action in defense of independence. This was confirmed also at the conference of communist parties of Latin America, which took place last year in Buenos Aires.

Between 1976 and 1983 not only did production decline in Argentina, as a result of which more than 500,000 industrial workers lost their jobs; we also noted, on the one hand, the concentration of economic power in the hands of an increasingly narrow circle of landed and financial oligarchy and multinational corporations and the further impoverishment of the people's masses.

The antinational economic policy, foreign indebtedness, drain of capital and emigration from a country which has traditionally absorbed extensive immigration, inflation and a protracted economic decline, unemployment and the steady worsening of the living conditions of the popular masses created an atmosphere of anarchy the solution to which would be difficult, even more so in the case of a reformist bourgeois government subjected to the strangulating pressure on the part of imperialism and hesitant by its very nature.

It is only the implementation of a bold and decisive policy that can correct this critical situation. This task can be accomplished only by a united and cohesive antioligarchic and anti-imperialist front.

At this point we come across the problem of how more accurately to formulate the revolutionary task of the communists while not ignoring the struggle for reform and partial gains within the framework of formal bourgeois democracy and without interrupting even for a moment the struggle for stability.

In other words, it is a question of how under the given specific situation and moment to put to practical use the advice given by Marx, Engels and Lenin, who criticized those who tried to advance by skipping the necessary intermediary stages and alliances as well as those who, absolutizing compromises, remained trampling on the same spot.

We are confident that revolutionary anti-imperialist change is the only proper way. However, we do not exclude honest tactical compromises even with temporary, inconsistent, fluctuating or conditional allies.

The question of the composition of a front which should act under the leadership of the working class under the country's complex political and social situation was discussed at the Communist Party of Argentina Central Committee plenum, last May. The plenum's resolution stipulates that "the front must rally within its ranks the broad toiling masses, particularly the Peronistas, citizens and young people belonging to other parties or who are independent and those who are dissatisfied or disappointed by the results of the endless defeats of succeeding governments. They should constitute the foundations of a government of unity, a government of a united front, a government of national and social liberation." The resolution stipulated that "the national and social liberation front could and should include all parties and political trends, social forces and strata which accept its program, methods of action and objectives."

Both the struggle for the defense and strengthening of democracy and the creation of the front presume the implementation of a proper policy toward the armed forces for unless there is a sufficiently strong contingent loyal to the constitution within the army, fully resolved not to allow a coup d'etat or to suppress it, it would be difficult to deal with the putschists. The isolation of the armed forces as a result of vulgar antimilitarism would not help to resolve the crisis or make it possible to put them within a constitutional and democratic framework, not to mention involving them in the process of profound change.

The fact that the most reactionary circles have mounted an offensive does not mean that everyone supports their line. After the bitter experience with the Malvinas, which exposed the true face of American and English imperialism, the feelings of positive anticolonialist and pro-Latin American nationalism increased among those members of the military who are realizing with increasing clarity that national problems are caused by dependence on imperialism and are a consequence of the implementation of the "national security" doctrine preached by the Pentagon. For the first time in our country's history some military circles opposing coups d'etat and supporting democracy, have publicly assumed corresponding obligations, as confirmed by the statute and declaration of the Center of Argentine Democratic Military.

We support a policy toward the military which will enable us to achieve democratic stability and advance toward national and social liberation. The purpose of alliances between civilian democratic circles and the armed forces is to involve the military on the side of the people and to surmount the ideology of the oligarchy and imperialism imposed upon it as a result of reactionary policy.

The creation of the front suggested by the communists cannot be accomplished without a broad and open debate. The lack of a clear program which would rally the popular forces in the struggle against imperialism is the main shortcoming of all the plans formulated by other organizations and parties.

The crisis in Peronista ranks is intensifying as a result of their defeat in the 1983 elections.

By virtue of their heterogenous nature, the radicals are seeking a solution in the so-called "Third Historical Movement," which could bring nothing but new failures.

There also are variants formulated by the right wing parties and their new organizations which appeared as a result of a regrouping. Supporters of the two-party system may be found both in the government and among the opposition.

Various social organizations are also trying to impose their individual choices; the church has its own strategy; various suggestions are being formulated by the armed forces; trade unions, industrialists, bankers and the agrarian sector are announcing their positions virtually every day and the same is occurring in university circles. All of this is reflected in the regrouping of forces in the political arena.

This situation forces us, again and again, to return to the question of the structure and content of the activities of the front, which should take the country out of the crisis and enable us to start making revolutionary changes.

Essentially, two way of development are becoming apparent as a result of all of these discussions: the people's, the democratic one, or the one suitable to American imperialism and its local allies. That is why more than ever before today the future of our country, revolutionary change and the situation of the working class and the entire people depend on the creation of such a front, which is precisely what we, communists, are presently engaged in.

Naturally, we are aware of the difference between a sociopolitical front and blocs which are formed at electoral times. However, the latter can and should bring us closer to the national and social liberation front. That is why today our party is actually already engaged in the creation of the front and is concluding agreements for the defense of democracy. So far, this has taken place on the primary level, involving efforts organizationally to join anyone who is ready to act boldly and daringly, without waiting for conditions to become ideal. The communists are calling upon large and small parties and political trends, the public and noted personalities in the struggle for democracy and against imperialism to undertake the implementation of this task immediately.

The nature and content of the extensive activities of the popular masses, which accelerated the defeat of the dictatorship, and the struggle which developed during the rule of the constitutional government, as well as the progressive formulations included in the programs and statements of leaders of people's political parties confirm that tremendous social conditions have already matured in the country for the establishment of the front although, unfortunately, so far the idea of "acting alone" frequently prevails.

As a whole, the supporters of such actions gratify themselves with the idea that if no such front is created the Communist Party will remain isolated and will be forced to rely only on its own forces; a parallel alternative is

presented for the left-of-center forces in which the petite bourgeoisie, with its typical ideological looseness, will play the main role. This is a cynical policy which has already led to severe consequences in a number of capitalist countries.

That is why the starting point of our plan for such a front also includes the strengthening of our own forces. A large communist party is a prerequisite for the efficiency of our policy of unity and cooperation. The working class must lead with a party of its own class, the communist party, rather than under the aegis of a party belonging to the bourgeoisie or the petite bourgeoisie.

However, this does not mean that we underestimate or neglect relations with other social strata. It is a question exclusively of choosing the proper path and having a firm leadership, which could ensure the successful outcome of the struggle. In itself, the working class, particularly as it is now--splintered down trade union and political lines and without any consistent leadership--cannot withstand the pressure of the reaction. In order to initiate revolutionary change it needs its own allies. At the same time, the middle classes must realize, as theory and practical experience teaches, that they can play an important role only by becoming the loyal allies of the working class and the other detachments of working people.

Therefore, the communists face a historical task of changing the correlation of forces in the labor movement, which must become the support of the front, and develop the broadest possible initiatives and actions aimed at ensuring mass unity and the creative daily constructive activities of the front.

In order to strengthen our party quantitatively, organizationally and ideologically, we must do a great deal, for it is a question of a specific but also broad objective. There has never been a front in Argentina in which the working class has played the central role. Such a front must be created now.

The situation and the vital problems demand of us drastically to intensify ideological and political work. We are planning to discuss our project for the front with working people and different population strata. We shall sponsor talks, conferences and debates at enterprises and creatively cover the project in QUE PASA and other party publications. Our propaganda and all other specific sectors of ideological work must make others familiar with our plan for the front and explain its stipulations both within the party and among the masses.

The political and ideological upbringing of new trade union cadres, promoted by the masses, has assumed an important role in such ideological activities. They include both members and nonmembers of our party. In the majority of cases, however, they lack adequate experience needed to resolve difficult problems.

Difficult work awaits us, for bourgeois-nationalist concepts of a social democratic nature remain strong. There also exist harmful elements of petit bourgeois revolutionism. All of this motivates us to focus our struggle on proletarian ideology and our revolutionary plan for the creation of the front.

We must struggle against anticommunist prejudices and the sectarian and vainglorious concepts to the effect that any separate social sector could win in the struggle for national and social liberation. This also presumes a struggle against petit bourgeois views within our own ranks and against those who believe that we, communists, can resolve by ourselves the main problems of the working class.

At the same time, we must develop even more extensively the polemics with our possible allies in the struggle for anti-imperialist changes, who ignore the fact that the proper path involves unity within the ranks of the anti-oligarchic and anti-imperialist front with the prospect of building socialism.

Unless we firmly assume such a position, the possibilities which are opening could drown in a sea of loose formulations and unspecific actions. A good plan is not everything. It must be implemented and its success ensured in practical terms.

This is particularly important in the daily struggle waged at plants, residential districts, the countryside, and the schools, where a mass struggle for vital requirements and democracy is underway.

The Communist Party of Argentina is trying to rebuild its trade union cadres, which severely suffered during the dictatorship. We are promoting the concentration of our cadres in the big trade unions and enterprises and we have essentially been able not only to fulfill but even overfulfill our initial plans. More of our comrades now hold trade union positions. Nevertheless, without belittling the results, we realize that a great deal remains to be done in this area.

As stipulated in the resolution of the party's Central Committee plenum, one of the most important aspects in this entire struggle should be the maximal concentration of party work at enterprises where manpower is most heavily concentrated.

In the final account, it is a question of strengthening the party within the core of the proletariat. This is necessary if the working class is to be able to play a leading role in the national and social liberation front we are creating.

The working class, headed by its party can and must guide the middle urban and rural classes, for it is the only truly revolutionary and totally consistent fighter against exploitation and for national and social liberation.

The other classes and different social strata, whose interest diverge from those who are trying to preserve dependence and backwardness, could and should participate in joint actions. However, a prerequisite for their success is to act under the leadership of the working class.

The Argentine working class has sufficient maturity, consciousness and militant spirit. It can establish its leading role and lead the Argentine people and all physical and intellectual workers to victory.

Our country is experiencing a deep crisis and has suffered severe defeats in the past. The revolutionary solution to the crisis is not a matter of accident. It depends on the role which the working people will be able to play in the struggle for democracy and against the oligarchy and imperialism.

Our vital task is to strengthen the Communist Party as the instrument of the working class in its unification struggle for the creation of the national and social liberation front which will open to our homeland a path to a bright socialist future.

5003
CSO: 1802/6

TO UPHOLD AND STRENGTHEN UNESCO'S EFFECTIVE ROLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 99-107

[Article by G. Uranov]

[Text] UNESCO--the United Nations Education, Science and Culture Organization--is approaching the 40th anniversary of its founding. This is an important unit within the UN system and its largest specialized institution. UNESCO numbers 160 member countries and more than 500 international nongovernmental organizations, and a number of national liberation movements are participating in its activities. UNESCO today is the largest intergovernmental world organization, whose activities specifically embody one of the cornerstone principles of the United Nations system--universality.

In recent years, however, UNESCO has become a target of persecution on the part of the most aggressive imperialist circles. Bourgeois propaganda stubbornly claims that UNESCO is increasingly turning (allegedly by the fault of the socialist and developing countries) from a forum for cooperation into an arena of acute confrontation, for which reason, allegedly, it is currently in a state of crisis and on the verge of breakdown.

It is common knowledge that it was the American administration which inspired and orchestrated the attack on UNESCO. Using the methods of disinformation and gross pressure, it decided that the United States will pull out of UNESCO as of 31 December 1984. Actively resorting to the services of imperialist propaganda and means of political, economic and financial diktat, of late the United States has applied heavy pressure on its Western partners and on the developing countries, urging them to oppose the participation of the organization in the efforts to resolve crucial problems of our time, such as safeguarding peace and cooperation on earth, preventing a nuclear catastrophe and radically improving the international situation in the interest of human progress.

Two other countries-- Great Britain and Singapore--announced their intention to leave UNESCO as of 31 December 1985, under U.S. pressure. Great Britain is currently asserting its decision to leave the organization, thus damaging its universal nature. Threats directed at UNESCO are being heard also on the part of governments of some other countries. Meanwhile, the global public favors

the further development of UNESCO activities. Committees in defense of this organization have been created in a number of countries, including the United States and Great Britain. At the beginning of December 1985 the Special Political Committee of the UN General Assembly passed a resolution in support of UNESCO.

What are the objectives of the Western pressure exerted on UNESCO and what is the actual role of this organization in contemporary international life?

UNESCO's political and legal base of activities is its charter, which was adopted at its constituent conference in London on 16 November 1945. Subsequent to its ratification by the first 20 countries, it was enacted on 4 November 1946, which day is considered the date UNESCO was founded. The organization appeared virtually without the participation of the socialist countries. However, its charter was drafted under the direct influence of the results of World War II and the Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco Conferences, where the foundations of the United Nations were laid. That is why UNESCO's statutory objectives and tasks were formulated in accordance with United Nations ideals. Thus, the UNESCO charter directly stipulates that "the organization sets itself the task of contributing to strengthening peace and security by expanding cooperation among nations in education, science and culture in the interest of ensuring a universal respect for justice, legality and human rights and the basic freedoms proclaimed in the UN Charter, for all nations regardless of race, sex, language or religion." The same thought is emphasized in the preamble to the charter, which stipulates that UNESCO was created "with a view to gradually attaining through cooperation among the peoples the world over in the fields of education, science and culture, international peace and the universal prosperity of mankind, for which purpose the United Nations organization as well was established, as stipulated in its charter."

Initially, by virtue of its membership at that time, UNESCO found itself totally dependent on the United States, which tried to use it essentially in the interest of its political objectives. At that time the organization was mainly a channel for Western, American above all, influence, an instrument for providing very one-sided philanthropic aid in terms of its objectives, aimed at drawing the attention of the peoples away from the struggle for political and economic liberation as the foundation for their truly independent development.

The admission of the USSR into UNESCO in 1954 and the increased influence of the socialist countries in the organization dealt a tangible blow at the unchallenged domination of the West. The breakdown of the colonial system and the joining of UNESCO by virtually all young countries which had gained their independence in the 1960s and 1970s also contributed to its positive development.

In addition to a great number of specific actions accomplished in resolving a number of topical problems of cooperation among countries in education, science, culture and information (communications), by the 1980s UNESCO had acquired rich experience in participation in important meetings such as the special sessions of the UN General Assembly on disarmament, the conference on

security and cooperation in Europe and, subsequently, the meetings in Belgrade and Madrid. Therefore, an increasingly noticeable turn toward the gravest problems of our time, the solution of which determines the scientific and cultural progress of mankind, the fate of civilization and the very existence of mankind, took place in the activities of the organization by the turn of the 1980s.

Bearing in mind that UNESCO activities are inseparably related to the overall situation in the world, by the turn of the 1980s the overwhelming majority of organization members asked that in the 1980s its work be based on the scientific study of global problems and, on the basis of urgent tasks, to ensure the effective contribution of the organization to their solution taking, naturally, into consideration its real possibilities and areas of competence. It was precisely this approach, based on the decision adopted at the 21st session of the general conference (Belgrade, 1980) that was taken as a foundation in the formulation of the draft second medium-term UNESCO plan for 1984-1989, which was approved at the fourth extraordinary session of UNESCO's general conference (Paris, 1982). The plan called for a certain restructuring of UNESCO activities, taking into consideration the direct dependence of human progress in education, science, culture and communications on resolving the basic problems of our time. As a whole, the plan was based on the concepts of the need to ensure peace on earth and expand and intensify international cooperation on a multilateral, regional and global basis.

Such a position held by UNESCO was obviously not to the liking of imperialist circles, headed by reactionary U.S. forces, which actively began to oppose detente starting with the 1980s and preventing the United Nations and its specialized institutions, UNESCO is particular, to work with total dedication for the good of peace and broad international cooperation. In considering the current course taken by UNESCO as one of the obstacles on the way their imperial plans, the United States and its allies are trying either to change its course to their advantage or, should this fail, to undermine the organization as a whole. Efforts are being made to prove that UNESCO has allegedly "degenerated," that from a forum of practical cooperation it has turned into an arena of political confrontation between East and West and into just about the notorious "hand of Moscow," and that it has far exceeded its range of competence.

By disseminating such fabrications about UNESCO, imperialists propaganda hopes that the broad world public strata are poorly familiar with the activities of the organization and that under these circumstances an erroneous idea of its true features and of the actual share which its various components contribute to UNESCO work could be instilled in them.

Let us note in this connection that UNESCO has a very broad range of competence, in accordance with its charter, and corresponding UN assignments. The organization deals with problems of cooperation among countries in the field of education in all its aspects and all levels, from preschool to adult education, and with problems of the links between education and human production activities. Its range of competence also includes a number of problems of international scientific cooperation which covers a broad spectrum of the natural and social sciences. UNESCO plays a leading role in the

organization of international cooperation in the field of culture on a multilateral, regional and worldwide basis. Finally, problems of restructuring of contemporary international information relations and the formulation of the principles of a new international order in mass information (communication) play an important role in its activities. This most general enumeration alone indicates that the realm of UNESCO activities is quite broad and that, in this respect, it is a unique organization among the many other specialized institutions within the United Nations system. The truly universal, worldwide nature of UNESCO and its cooperation with governments and men of science and culture in virtually all countries on earth enables it to engage in extensive studies and, on their basis, to provide a profound analysis of the problems and formulate efficient recommendations, plans and programs.

Another circumstance worth emphasizing is the following: education, science, culture and mass information are areas of human activities most closely related to national and international politics and to the ideological atmosphere on the planet, and largely depend on the condition of national and world economies. This specific area of UNESCO competence leads to the fact that the organization cannot fail to feel the strong impact of the political situation in the world, the more so since some of its members include countries belonging to the opposite sociopolitical systems and since the majority of UNESCO members are countries which gained political independence only recently but which, in many other respects, are still continuing to experience the consequences of the period of colonial dependence. By virtue of these circumstances, as an organization for cooperation among countries on the planet, UNESCO is also an arena of occasionally rather sharp clashes and struggle both in terms of specific aspects of its activities as well as overall orientation problems.

It is important to note, however, that UNESCO's contribution to postwar international cooperation and, particularly, its activities in the 1960s-1970s, became an increasingly noticeable and substantial component in mankind's efforts to resolve crucial global problems and that despite the great difficulties it has faced, UNESCO in the mid 1980s is an instrument for joint action among countries and peoples in the interests of promoting cooperation among them and enhancing the progress of civilization on earth.

Another characteristic feature in the activities of the organization is the fact that predominant mostly here are precisely the trends and accomplishments which contribute to strengthening reciprocal understanding and friendship among peoples and which, as a whole, are consistent with the urgent needs of their social and cultural development.

Even a brief familiarization with UNESCO's programs and measures would indicate that they are of a nature which is tangible and comprehensive and which, above all, by no means exceeds the framework of its competence. The experience gained in UNESCO work, particularly during the period of international detente, indicated that the organization was able successfully to fulfill its role as a forum for cooperation, reaching a high level of reciprocal understanding and interaction among member countries. This was also expressed, for example, in the fact that virtually all basic documents

and resolutions passed by the organization in the 1970s and at the turn of the 1980s were based on consensus, i.e., without a vote but with a general agreement on the problems considered, although occasionally such agreement was reached as a result of rather lengthy and sharp debates. Until the advent to power of the present U. S. administration, the American side had accepted the practice of UNESCO consensus.

The medium-term UNESCO plan for 1984-1989, which determines both the general guidelines governing the activities of the organization and its objectives and tasks almost to the end of the current decade, as well as the structure of its program and mechanism for its implementation, adopted by consensus, with U.S. participation, was another very important document. Three two-year programs and a UNESCO budget, respectively for 1984-1985, 1986-1987 and 1988-1989, are being drafted on the basis of the medium-term plan.

The United States and its closest allies are now trying to revise this plan and thus to eliminate from UNESCO's practical activities measures proceeding from important parts of its work, such as the major programs "Study of World Problems and Research Prospects," "Communications in the Service of Man," "Uprooting Prejudices, Intolerance, Racism and Apartheid," and "Peace, Mutual Understanding, Human Rights and the Rights of Nations." The international imperialist circles have organized powerful anti-UNESCO campaigns with a view to emasculating the progressive content of such programs, for they contribute to concretizing the contribution made by the organization to the cause of peace and security on earth. Western attacks on UNESCO's current course have been garbed, as a rule, in the clothing of various types of demagogic suggestions aimed at upgrading the efficiency and rationalizing its measures, and the more economical utilization of its budget. Those who are orchestrating these attacks on UNESCO are trying to make active use of the narrow national interests and needs of the leading circles of some liberated countries. Efforts are being made to instill in them the false thesis that UNESCO has allegedly abandoned its charter objectives, is exceeding its range of competence and is almost trying to take over from the United Nations. This is being said, for example, in connection with the fact that UNESCO is dealing with global problems, including problems of molding public opinion in favor of peace, disarmament and mutual understanding among nations. Openly ignored in this case are the stipulations of the UNESCO Charter we mentioned and resolutions of the first and second special sessions and 38th session of the United Nations General Assembly, which gave specific assignments to UNESCO. Furthermore, UNESCO has never discussed specific aspects of disarmament, which is the work of the United Nations and other pertinent international fora. However, it continues to make important studies on the adverse effect of the arms race on resolving problems of social development, education, science and culture. The organization can and must make a substantial contribution to the establishment of moral and political guarantees for disarmament and the security of the peoples, using its specific methods and within the framework of its charter obligations. However, all of this irritates the enemies of detente.

A similar situation prevails in the case of other UNESCO programs of broad socio-political significance. The reason for which the West would like to scratch them from the organization's plans is that they offer the peoples an

effective channel for exposing "information imperialism," neocolonialism, racism and apartheid as well as other instruments in the struggle against these shameful phenomena of our age. Characteristically, no more than 4 to 5 percent of UNESCO's budget is allocated for such problems. Nevertheless, under the banner of upgrading the efficiency of the organization, the West would like to curtail even these small amounts. Talk by specific Western circles on the need to "rationalize" UNESCO efficiency, avoid it "excessive politization," and upgrade the efficiency in the implementation of specific or strictly technical measures are aimed at returning UNESCO to the parameters of the 1950s, when the West enjoyed total control over the organization. The West has stubbornly tried to impose this line in particular in the formulation of UNESCO's programs and budget for 1986-1987. Actually, the class lining of such efforts is clearly manifested through the official condemnation voiced by the United States concerning UNESCO in connection with the fact that it is allegedly encroaching on the foundations and moral values of the Western world.

The pressure applied on UNESCO has been accompanied by ever new slanderous propaganda campaigns in the course of which its extensive practical activities in the areas of education, science, culture and information have been deliberately ignored.

UNESCO's activities have immeasurable increased in the last 40 years. It has become an efficient channel for cooperation among liberated countries in their struggle for surmounting the backwardness inherited from colonialism. The organization also plays the role of the broadest possible platform for the exchange of progressive experience within the areas of its competence, which is consistent with the interests of literally every single country, including the culturally and scientifically most advanced states.

As an intergovernmental organization, UNESCO relies of the cooperation of governments and their bodies but also on the help of very broad strata of the intelligentsia on earth--men of education, science and culture--on informations bodies and on hundreds of national and international nongovernmental organizations. UNESCO's universal nature allows it to be simultaneously an organizer of extensive work on the gathering of data, study, summation and scientific analysis of a number of problems which determine the current status and future development of cooperation among countries and peoples.

This aspect of UNESCO activities is usually described as its "intellectual function," while the organization itself is frequently referred to as a "laboratory" or "generator" of ideas. UNESCO's research and innovation role has been broadly acknowledged. X. Peres de Cuellar, the UN secretary general, has described UNESCO as the "thinking head" of the United Nations system.

Let us note that during the 1980s a view on problems in which the search for solutions is based on the profound and comprehensive study of the reasons for the existing situation, has become particularly tangible in UNESCO activities. For example, UNESCO did extensive studies of the situation in the area of international information relations (the McBride Commission and its report). On the basis of this analysis, it clearly showed to the peoples how and in

what specific manner is the domination of imperialism manifested here in the nonsocialist part of the world and formulated a strategy for its activities in this area supporting, in particular, the idea of a new international order in the field of information and taking specific steps in this direction.

In 1977 UNESCO adopted the widely known declaration of basic principles relative to the contribution of mass information media to strengthening peace and international understanding and progress in human rights and in the struggle against racism, apartheid and instigation to war. This was the first United Nations document essentially applicable to mass information media and to the content and trend of information standards in contemporary international relations and international law. In this sense UNESCO activities, to which the United Nations has assigned the "central role" in the realm of communications, is assisting in the establishment of a direct correlation between information and the struggle for peace and strengthening international mutual understanding and cooperation among nations. In 1980 an international program for the development of communications was instituted under UNESCO's auspices, the purpose of which was to help the developing countries in establishing and developing their national and regional communication systems and eliminating the vestiges of colonialism in that area.

The characteristic features of UNESCO are not only a wide range of problems it studies and resolves but also a great variety of functions and forms and methods of day-to-day activities. We already mentioned its intellectual-analytical function. Using the results of its analytical summations, the organization drafts and promotes the subsequent adoption of various international-legal acts by its member states, in which it codifies positive experience and norms of cooperation among countries, within the areas of UNESCO competence. This applies to various conventions, agreements, declarations, recommendations and other documents which have become important instruments in strengthening equal international cooperation and reciprocal understanding among nations. Such documents have been developed by UNESCO for virtually all basic areas of its activities and number into the dozens. An example of that is the Universal Copyright Convention (1952), the Declaration of Principles of International Cultural Cooperation (1966), the Convention on the Protection of the Universal, Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972), the Recommendation on Education in a Spirit of International Reciprocal Understanding, Cooperation and Peace and Respect for the Rights of Man and Basic Freedoms (1974) and the already mentioned Declaration on Mass Information Media (1978) and the Declaration and Recommendation of the World Conference on Politics in the Field of Culture (Mexico, 1982).

UNESCO's analytical activities and the documents of international legal nature which it drafts and adopts and its extensive activities are closely interwoven with an organically lead to the formulation and subsequent implementation of a large number of extensive scientific programs, projects and specific measures in the implementation of which, thanks to the efforts of many countries, UNESCO frequently plays the role of initiator, organizer, coordinator and direct executor.

Let us take as an example cultural cooperation within UNESCO's frameworks. The efforts of the organization to preserve the cultural legacy of mankind and the cultural originality of nations and to develop active international cultural exchanges and offer people access to the values of culture have earned it broad international recognition. The current major "Culture and the Future" program includes an entire set of measures aimed at expanding specific and purposeful multilateral cooperation among countries in the realm of culture. UNESCO promotes the fact that cultural cooperation must contribute to the cause of peace, friendship and reciprocal understanding among nations. The international campaigns for saving and preserving outstanding cultural monuments, sponsored by UNESCO at different times, have become vivid manifestations of cohesion among nations. This includes Venice, the Borobudur Temple in Indonesia, Katmandu Valley in Nepal, Carthage, the Acropolis in Athens, the monuments of ancient Egypt and Nubia, and a number of other world-famous landmarks. UNESCO has drafted a number of projects and conducted many studies enabling the peoples of different areas and continents to become better acquainted with each other. This includes "Slavic Cultures" and "Arctic Cultures," and the multiple-volume works "History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind," "General History of Africa," and "History of Civilizations in Central Asia." UNESCO sponsors many meeting among men of culture and scientific symposia and conferences, the purpose of which is to ensure the efficient international preservation of cultural values and assistance so that the culture of each nation may become part of the common legacy of mankind. That is why, while actively opposing, in particular, the threat of the destruction of cultural values as a result of military actions or military occupation, UNESCO has frequently objected to the Israeli aggressors who are shamelessly destroying or irreparably spoiling the monuments of ancient culture in the Arab lands they have seized, thus harming the cultural legacy of all mankind.

In the area of scientific cooperation, UNESCO contributes to the acceleration of scientific progress. Characteristically, in this case increasing attention is being paid to the latest branches of contemporary science (such as microbiology and others) both in basic and applied research and in the practical utilization of accomplishments in these sciences. UNESCO operates a worldwide system of scientific and technical information--UNISYST--which is becoming an important sector in organizing cooperation among countries in the area of information. A number of international scientific and technical programs are being implemented, which are of global significance for they contribute to the solution of global environmental protection problems, the study and development of resources of oceans and dry land, recoverable energy sources, etc.

Thus, an Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (MOK) was set up by UNESCO in 1960 for the purpose of assisting scientific studies of the world's oceans through the joint efforts of the international community.

The intergovernmental program "Man and Biosphere" (MAB) has been implemented since 1971 under UNESCO's auspices. Its purpose is to conduct comprehensive long-term studies in various parts of the world of the influence of man on natural processes in the biosphere and on its basic components, and to study the influence which changes in such processes has on man himself. The First

International Congress on Biosphere Preserves, which was held along the UNESCO line in Minsk in September-October 1983, was an acknowledgment of the successes achieved by Soviet scientists in that area.

An International Geological Correlation Program was adopted in 1972. Its purpose is the comprehensive study of geological phenomena and processes on the planet and to determine the laws governing the formation of mineral deposits depending on other geological processes. This program involves the participation of scientists from more than 100 UNESCO-member countries and covers more than 50 different projects.

An International Hydrological Program has been unde implementation since 1975 with a view to developing international cooperation in the world hydrology. Soviet scientists were at the origins of this program and their suggestions largely determined its content.

In recent years an increasing number of studies have been conducted in the social and humanitarian sciences, which are becoming a methodological foundation for long-term UNESCO plans and programs and which play an important role in the formulation of the general approaches of the organization to the activities of the international community for the sake of further economic, social and cultural progress on earth.

The special role which the social sciences play in UNESCO activities was strengthened and developed in the organization's medium-range plan for 1984-1989. The plan includes as its prime task cooperation in the further study of problems of the contemporary world in order to develop awareness of the common future. This task is part of UNESCO's direct obligations in the field of intellectual activities. The basic methods through which UNESCO's objective is being pursued are the conferences, symposia and extensive studies it sponsors, which emphasize the study of the social aspects of urgent contemporary problems, such as war and peace, struggle against racism and apartheid, improving the situation of young people and women in contemporary society and some others.

UNESCO has gained extensive experience in promoting cooperation among scientists from different countries in the social sciences and the study of world problems. The journals IMPACT and INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES have become effective organs for such cooperation. Scientists from our country are active contributors to them. The studies conducted by UNESCO's social science sector frequently become the theoretical foundations for the formulation of practical programs, projects and measures in all areas of competence and a base for the drafting of a number of legal acts. Such studies are becoming increasingly important, for their purpose is to expose the hindering negative effect on the development of civilization of the aggravation of the international situation, the intensification of international tension, the nuclear arms race and the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe. In this area UNESCO's work could make a substantial contribution to the formulation and strengthening of moral and political guarantees for peace and security on earth.

Problems of international cooperation in the area of education account for a significant part--approximately 40 percent--of UNESCO's activities. The organization is engaged in an extensive struggle against illiteracy (to this day more than 800 million people throughout the world are illiterate, the overwhelming majority of whom live in the former colonies); in this connection, its N. K. Krupskaya Award for successes in the struggle against illiteracy, awarded annually, plays an important positive role. Within the framework of its programs, UNESCO contributes to the creation and development of national education systems, the democratization of education and scientific planning and strengthening ties with production, as well as maximally broadening of access to knowledge. UNESCO's documents and studies on problems of education and the international legal documents it has drafted in this area (such as regional conventions on reciprocal recognition of education diplomas), and its numerous works and basic periodical publications on school, university and pedagogical problems are all the results of the purposeful and successful activities of the organization, enjoying great recognition throughout the planet.

The contribution of the Soviet Union to UNESCO activities has been substantial and tangible. Soviet delegations and representatives actively participate in the work of all sessions of UNESCO's General Conference, which is the supreme authority of this organization, and its Executive Council, which guides the activities of the organization between general conference sessions. The Soviet Union is represented in all main working bodies and intergovernmental UNESCO committees. Soviet specialists are participating in virtually all measures organized under the auspices of or directly along UNESCO's channels. By actively contributing to the formulation of the basic UNESCO areas of activity and specific programs and projects, the Soviet Union invariably struggles for this organization to implement with maximal efficiency the principles of equal and mutually profitable cooperation.

In encouraging the further successful implementation of UNESCO's role as one of the largest centers of contemporary international cooperation, the Soviet Union supports whatever contributes to perfecting the activities of this organization and increasing its contribution to the solution of the problems facing mankind. During his recent trip to France, Comrade M. S. Gorbachev, who highly rated UNESCO's contribution to contemporary international cooperation, said: "This organization justifiably enjoys great prestige in the international arena thanks to its tireless activities for good reciprocal understanding and cooperation among nations, thus contributing to the spreading of the ideas of humanism and peace in the world." Like the other socialist and the overwhelming majority of developing countries, the Soviet Union is showing a businesslike and constructive approach to UNESCO's problems, invariably speaking out in favor of the formulation of mutually acceptable decisions within the organization on all essential aspects of its work and functioning. It condemns the methods of blackmail and diktat toward the organization, displayed by the U. S. administration and Western circles supporting it. The enemies of UNESCO are also aiming at the United Nations, dreaming of undermining the entire system of postwar cooperation and its principles, which appeared as a result of the victory over such ugly forces of reaction as Hitlerite Fascism and Japanese militarism, achieved in World War II.

The peoples on earth are struggling with UNESCO's support for the victory of peace, reason and progress on earth and for UNESCO as well to be able to make its major contribution to this struggle.

This line was embodied also in the course of the 23rd session of UNESCO's General Conference, which was held in Sofia in October-November 1985. Despite the efforts of a number of Western delegations to reduce UNESCO's contribution to the solution of global contemporary problems and curtail its research and analytical activities, thus weakening the organization's intellectual role and reducing it to the status of an ordinary agency providing technical aid, the General Conference confirmed the loyalty of the organization to its current positive course. The session approved a program acceptable to all its participants and its budget for 1986-1987. Thus UNESCO proved once again its viability, humaneness and aspiration to the future.

5003
CSO: 1802/6

BOOK REVIEWS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE ART OF BEING A TEACHER, GUIDE AND LEADER OF THE MASSES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 108-112

[Review by Prof P. Andreyev and Prof P. Snurnikov of the book "V.I. Lenin, KPSS ob Organizatsionno-Partiynoy Rabote" [V.I. Lenin and the CPSU on Party Organization Work]. In four volumes. Vol 4. "Strengthening Ties Between the CPSU and the Masses and Guidance of State and Public Organizations." Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 608 pp]

[Text] The party is the nucleus of the political system of Soviet society. "All other links within it--the Soviet state, trade unions, the Komsomol, and cooperative and other organizations which reflect the unity and specifics of interests of all population strata and national and ethnic groups in the country--operate under its guidance. Acting within the framework of the constitution, the CPSU directs and coordinates the work of state and social organizations and sees to it that each one of them fully implements its specific functions. Through its entire activities the party sets the example of serving the interests of the people and observing the principles of socialist democracy," the draft new edition of the CPSU Program reads.

The recently published fourth volume of the work under review discusses basic problems of CPSU policy, such as strengthening the unity between party and people, perfecting and developing socialist democracy and energizing the entire system of political and social institutions. In chronological sequence, the book cites the full text or excerpts of Lenin's works and party documents which show the comprehensive activities of the CPSU as the political vanguard of the Soviet people, the principles governing its work among the masses and the means and methods of party guidance of state and public organizations.

Lenin ascribed prime significance to strengthening the ties between the party and the masses, considering it the main prerequisite for making a socialist revolution and building a new society. The idea that the revolutionary reorganization of the country can be successful only if the party is unbreakably linked with the working class and the toiling people runs throughout all the works included in the collection. To believe that the new society can be built by the communists alone, Lenin said, means to regress

into childhood. Socialism, he emphasized, can win only "when masses, ten or a hundred times bigger than in the past, will begin themselves to build the state and a new economic life" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 37, pp 425-426).

History itself called upon the working class to reorganize society on a communist basis. However, it will be able to reach this great objective only with high consciousness and organization and only under the leadership of the Marxist party. "By raising a workers party," Lenin wrote, "Marxism is raising the vanguard of the proletariat, able to seize the power and lead the entire people to socialism, to guide and organize the new system and to be the teacher, guide and leader of all working and exploited people in organizing their social life without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie" (Op. Cit., vol 33, p 26). He considered the danger of the alienation of the party from the masses one of the greatest difficulties which could defeat the cause of the revolution and the building of socialism (see Op. Cit., vol 44, p 348).

Lenin was also involved in formulating the basic principles of leading the masses. The main content of these principles is the following: live in the thick of the people, know their moods, be familiar with everything about the people, understand them, gain their absolute trust and prevent the alienation of leaders from the masses they lead and the vanguard from the entire army of working people. Avoid entanglements with backward moods. Educate the masses politically and lead them.

Lenin's works and CPSU documents included in the volume describe the specific forms of ties between the party and the masses under different historical conditions. During the prewar years priority was given to the task of winning over on the side of the party the working class and the nonproletarian toiling strata and rallying the masses around the proletariat to overthrow the bourgeois rule. This objective was attained thanks to the systematic implementation of revolutionary strategy and skillful and flexible tactics and painstaking work done by the Bolsheviks among the mass organizations, waging irreconcilable struggle against petit bourgeois oscillations, opportunism and revisionism of all hues, and displaying the ability "to be linked with, to come closer to and, to a certain extent, if you wish, to blend with the broadest possible mass of the toiling people" (Op. Cit., vol 41, p 7).

After the victory of the socialist revolution, the Bolshevik Party, now ruling, began to implement its leading role through the system of proletarian dictatorship. The readers can learn a great deal of interesting and instructive details on the way in which the ties between the party and the masses increased and strengthened and the way its leading role in society in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism increased, by studying the resolutions of congresses, party conferences and decrees of the Central Committee and other documents included in the volume. Documents from that period cover the most essential aspects of the Soviet political system at the time of its establishment and most clearly prove the insurmountable truth that the revolutionary creativity of the peoples masses is the very essence of socialism and a determining factor of its appearance and development. At the same time, the broadest possible opportunities provided by the new social system for the involvement of the masses in conscious historical creativity

were implemented not automatically or spontaneously but thanks to the tireless organizational work of the Communist Party.

As a result of the full and definitive victory of socialism in our country and the growth of the proletarian state into the state of the whole people, while remaining by virtue of its class nature and ideology the party of the working class, the CPSU became the party of the entire people. This broadened and strengthened even further its ties with the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry and the people's intelligentsia. In resolving today the difficult and broad tasks of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development and achieving on this basis, a qualitative renovation of all sides of life, the CPSU is persistently promoting the mastery of the Leninist work style. This style is distinguished by its democratic nature, trust in the people and high responsibility to them, comprehensive assistance in developing the creative activeness of the working people and a sensitive attitude toward their material and spiritual demands.

The party, which is increasingly mastering the Leninist work style, is making extensive use of a channel of communications with the people, such as personal contacts maintained by leading party, soviet and economic workers with the working people. "Personal influence and addressing meetings," Lenin taught, "is terribly important in politics. No political activity is possible without them...." (Op. Cit., vol 47, p 54). An example in this connection is given by the Central Committee and its Politburo. The party and state leaders periodically visit various parts of the country and meet with workers, kolkhoz members and members of the intelligentsia. Politburo members and candidate members, CPSU Central Committee secretaries, senior personnel of the Central Committee apparatus and secretaries and buro members of central committees of communist parties of union republics, party kraykoms and obkoms and heads of ministries and departments take part in the accountability and election conferences and meetings.

However, some managers continue to avoid contacts with the masses. The party is firmly struggling against such mores. The draft of the new edition of the CPSU program includes the stipulation that managers on all levels must always meet with people, study their moods and be familiar with their requests and wishes. This must be determined on-site in the labor collectives and primary cells, such as sections, brigades, livestock farms and laboratories, i.e., where the problems of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development are being directly resolved.

Today the primary party organizations, which function in virtually all labor collectives and are their political nucleus, are called upon to play a most important role in further strengthening the ties between the party and the masses. The readers will find in the collection under review rich documentary data characterizing the role and place of party cells in life and the party's organizational structure. For example, an excerpt from the "Regulation on the Work of VKP(b) Cells," adopted by the Central Committee in 1927, applies directly to the present: "The constant ties with the nonparty mass and the promotion of party influence within it is the most important and basic task of the cell" (p 317).

Much of the material in the collection describes the development of the outstanding Leninist tradition of constantly seeking the advice of the people on major problems of social life by the party. In drafting document of great importance, the party submits them to nationwide discussion in order maximally to take into consideration the opinions of party members and all working people. Thus, more than 140 million people took part in the discussion of the draft constitution of the USSR; more than 110 million participated in discussions pertaining to the Law on Labor Collectives (see p 548). By decision of the October 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum the draft new edition of the party program, changes in its bylaws and the Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1986-1990 and the Period Until the Year 2000 were submitted to all-party and nationwide discussion.

Letters and oral appeals by the working people are one of the permanently open channels of communications between the party and the people. The letters are not only a clear confirmation of the high political activeness and consciousness of the Soviet people and the manifestation of their profound interest in the further progress of the socialist homeland but also one of the means of direct participation of the masses in the administration of social affairs and a form of direct democracy inherent in our system.

The collection cites data showing that between the 25th and 26th party congresses alone, the CPSU Central Committee received more than 3 million letters and that nearly 100,000 people visited the Central Committee. During that time the local party organizations considered 15 million written and oral statements by citizens.

The party's Central Committee displays a Leninist attitude in work with letters. CPSU Central Committee secretaries and senior personnel of the Central Committee departments actively participate in their study. The most important letters are considered in the course of on-site visits. The CPSU Politburo and Secretariat are always interested in the questions, critical remarks, wishes and reactions of the working people, contained in their letters. The Central Committee has repeatedly passed resolutions on work with letters sent by the working people. This question was the subject of a special decree at the 26th CPSU Congress. After the congress, work with letters sent by the working people has been repeatedly considered by the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo.

The party pays great attention to improving the organization of reception of the working people. In particular, the collection cites the 6 March 1979 CPSU Central Committee decree "On Further Improving the Reception of Citizens by Party, Soviet and Other Organization." It was recommended to party and soviet bodies, ministries and departments to establish the type of procedure which would ensure the possibility of receiving citizens at times convenient to them. The Central Committee also pointed out the need to practice more extensively the method of seeing working people directly at enterprises, construction sites, kolkhozes, sovkhozes and places of residence (see p 526).

Problems of intensification of the ties between the party and the masses were discussed at the April and October 1985 CPSU Central Committee plenums. Thus, it was pointed out at the April plenum that the party committees must be

concerned with "ensuring the work of all channels of communications with the masses and investigating the attention which is being paid to public opinion and to the critical remarks, statements and letters of citizens." Today the party considers as the most important prerequisite for upgrading its leading role in society and for success in its entire work to perfect socialism strengthening and expanding ties with the masses and relying on their experience and creative initiative.

The role and significance of state and social organizations in the establishment and development of the new system are identified profoundly and comprehensively in Lenin's works and CPSU documents included in the collection. Soviets--"A power open which is accessible to all, which does everything in the eyes of the masses, which is accessible to the masses and proceeds directly from the masses and is the direct and immediate organ of the people's mass and its will" are the political foundations of our state of the whole people (V.I. Lenin, Op. Cit., vol 12, p 319). The collection's documents provide a clear idea of the establishment and development of the soviets, which are the main link in socialist self-management by the people and perfecting their activities, and steadily enhancing their role in our social life.

The trade unions, which Lenin described as a school of administration, a school of economic management and a school of communism, are the most widespread organization of the working people. The volume under review includes documents which give a clear idea of the increased complexity and scale of the problems resolved by the trade unions. Today the trade unions must considerably expand and energize their participation in production management, in leading the socialist competition and in the struggle for the comprehensive strengthening of discipline and organization.

The materials contained in the volume also prove the great attention which our party pays to the activities of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth Union and to the organizational and political strengthening of its ranks and the solution of youth problems. The 1984 CPSU Central Committee decree "On Further Improving the Party's Guidance of the Komsomol and Upgrading its Role in the Communist Upbringing of the Youth" offers clear guidelines for Komsomol activities under contemporary conditions (see p 566).

Lenin's works and CPSU documents included in Volume 4 of the collection provide an expanded characterization of relations between the party and all types of social organizationswith membership in the millions.

The basic principles of such relations were developed by Lenin within the framework of his theory of a proletarian party of a new type.

In his work "The Infantile Disease of 'Leftism' in Communism," Lenin wrote that the RKP(b) implements its leading role within the system of proletarian dictatorship through the state and public organizations of the working people, which are the "transmission belts from the party to the masses. Through the trade unions the party is linked with the working class and the other detachments of working people in production; through the soviets it is linked

with the toiling people in town and country via the government; through cooperatives it is linked with the peasants, particularly in the farming area.

The practice of building socialism has considerably enriched the Leninist ideas of the party's leading role in the life of society. This role legitimately increases in the activities of the state of the whole people, which is the historical heir to the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Relying on Marxist-Leninist theory and a profound knowledge of the life and experience of the masses and expressing their radical interests, the CPSU defines the general prospects for the development of the Soviet state, providesa scientific guidance for the constructive activities of the people and gives communist construction its organized, planned and purposeful nature. State and public organizations resolve problems within their field of competence independently and democratically. However, they resolve them in accordance with the party's policy and the directives of its leading bodies.

The CPSU proceeds from the fact that its increased leading role and the enhanced significance of mass organizations are an interrelated and interdependent process. By expanding and intensifying its influence on all aspects of the political system, the party contributes to the strengthening of state and public organizations, to enhancing their prestige and increasing their activeness in resolving problems raised by reality and in developing socialist democracy.

The basic principles of the party's leadership of state and public organizations and the means and methods of this leadership have withstood the test of time. At the same time, however, as the documents in the collection confirm, they were steadily developed and perfected. This is natural, for conditions, situations and tasks facing the party and the country change. Therefore, the specific needs and methods of the party's guidance of the soviets, trade unions, the Komsomol and other organizations must correspondingly change as well.

Under all circumstances, however, the party's leadership must ensure the coordination of activities of state and public organizations and the efficient demarcation among the functions they perform. The party conducts its political guidance of their work without interfering in the areas of competence of state and public organizations. The reader will find in the collection a number of important publications on this account. Thus, during the very first years of the Soviet system, Lenin called for "distinguishing much more precisely between the functions of the party (and its Central Committee) and the Soviet system; upgrading the responsibility and autonomy of soviet personnel and soviet institutions, leaving to the party the general leadership of all state organs combined" (Op. Cit., vol 45, p 61). The resolution adopted by the 8th Congress of the RKP (b) "On the Organizational Problem" stipulated that "in no case should the functions of party collectives be confused with the functions of state organs, such as the soviets....The party must implement its decisions through the soviet bodies within the frame of the Soviet constitution. The party tries to lead the activities of the soviets but not to replace them" (pp 201-202). The resolution adopted at the 10th RKP(b) Congress "On the Role and Tasks of the Trade Unions" noted that the Congress "persistently and categorically cautions all party organizations

and individual comrades against any kind of petty supervision and excessive interference in the day-to-day work of the trade unions" (p 217).

These basic Leninist stipulations remain entirely valid to this day. The draft CPSU bylaws (with suggested amendments) now includes a separate section on "The Party and State and Public Organizations," which formulates the basic principles of party leadership of state and public organizations within the framework of the USSR Constitution. The need for the strict observance of these principles is brought to our attention by the still existing practice of some party committees to duplicate the functions of state and public bodies.

Periodical discussion of basic problems of the work of such organizations by party bodies is a major form of their guidance by the party. A procedure has been comprehensively established according to which the lower party bodies report to the superior ones on the leadership they provide in the work of one mass organization or another. In the course of such reports positive experience is summed up, shortcomings are exposed and specific measures for their elimination are earmarked. In this connection, the readers' attention will be unquestionably drawn to the decrees of the CPSU Central Committee included in the volume, aimed at improving the party's guidance of the activities of mass organizations of working people under contemporary conditions (see pp 457, 463, 508, 527 and 534).

The party ascribes prime significance to the selection, placement and upbringing of leading cadres of mass organizations. Not only party members should hold elective positions in the soviets, trade unions or the Komsomol. Furthermore, the documents in the collection remind us, it is necessary to promote nonparty members to leading positions of mass organizations, by choosing experienced, reputable and initiative-minded workers.

Control over the work and verification of execution of decisions are effective means of upgrading the level of party leadership of the mass organizations. "Check the people and check the actual implementation of projects," Lenin taught. "Again and again, today this is the entire crux of all work, all policy" (Op. Cit., vol 45, p 16). A number of documents in the collection deal with perfecting this important form of organizational-party work which contributes to the prevention of errors and the efficient elimination of shortcomings and improving all activities of mass organizations.

The attention of the readers will be drawn to yet another form of party leadership of state and social organizations, described as follows in the resolution adopted at the 14th RKP(b) Conference "On Party Construction:" "With a view to making more flexible and systematic the party's guidance of soviet bodies, it is necessary to acknowledge the need (with a proper application of the eligibility principle) of strengthening personal ties between leading party and soviet bodies, such as, making the secretary and some members of the gubkom buro members of the presidium of the GIK (guberniya executive committee--editor); making the chairman of the GIK member of the gubkom buro; apply the same on the level of uyezds, etc." (p 281).

Currently, as a rule, the first secretaries of the corresponding local party bodies are elected members of executive committees of local soviets of

people's deputies; in turn, chairmen of executive committees of soviets of people's deputies are made members of the buros of local party committees. This strengthens the interrelationship among party, soviet and public bodies, making their work more efficient and upgrading the party's influence on the work of the mass organizations.

The CPSU guides the state and public organizations through the party members who work in them. In accordance with the CPSU bylaws, party groups are set up in all nonparty organizations which include no less than three party members. Such groups are set up at congresses, conferences and within the elective bodies of soviet, trade union, cooperative and other organizations.

A number of documents in the volume remind us that Lenin and the party have always paid great attention to the creation of party groups (until 1934 they were known as party factions) in nonparty organizations and in organizing their activities. Lenin pointed out the need for such groups as early as 1906 in the draft resolution for the RSDWP Unification Congress. "...the RSDWP must participate in the nonparty soviets of workers deputies," the draft noted, "by forming as strong groups of party members as possible within each soviet and by guiding the activities of such groups strictly in connection with overall party activities" (Op. Cit., vol 12, p 231). To this day the party committees direct the work of party groups relying on them in all of their activities in guiding state and public organizations. The resolutions of the April and October CPSU Central Committee plenums and the draft new edition of the party program and CPSU bylaws (with suggested amendments) are the further development and enrichment of the Leninist principles of party guidance of state and public organizations.

The fourth volume completes the project of the four-volume publication of "V.I. Lenin, KPSS ob Organizatsionno-Partiynoy Rabote," prepared by the CPSU Central Committee Department of Organizational-Party Work. This publication is, unquestionably, a noteworthy event in intraparty life. Its completion coincides with the accountability and election campaign, the preparations for the 27th Party Congress and the party- and nationwide discussion of the most important documents approved by the October CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

For the first time, such a complete systematization of Lenin's statements and thoughts and party documents on problems of party organizational work will enable the party members and the nonparty aktiv to understand more profoundly the objective nature of the growth of the leading role of the CPSU under the conditions of the planned and comprehensive advancement of socialism and the laws governing the further progress of Soviet society toward communism on the basis of the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development. The publication of this four-volume work will unquestionably be of great help to party, soviet and public organizations in their work related to preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress and the subsequent implementation of its resolutions.

5003
CSO: 1802/6

DOCUMENTS OF HISTORICAL TRUTH

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 112-116

[Review by A. Grishchenko and A. Stepanov of the book "Za Mir i Bezopasnost Narodov. Dokumenty Vneshney Politiki SSSR" [For Peace and Security of the Peoples. Documents of USSR Foreign Policy]; 1966 (Book I, 318 pp; Book II, 334 pp), Moscow, 1983; 1967 (Book I, 335 pp; Book II, 413 pp), Moscow, 1984; 1968 (Book I, 333 pp; Book II, 429 pp). Moscow, 1985]

[Text] The publication of the most important foreign policy documents is a long and strong tradition in Soviet sociopolitical life. It stems from the first years of the existence of the land of the soviets, during which, guided by Lenin's instructions on the need "to help the people to interfere in problems of war and peace" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch" [Complete Collected Works], vol 35, p 16), the Soviet government published secret imperialist treaties concluded by the ruling circles of prerevolutionary Russia. As stated in the 9 (22) November 1917 declaration of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs, "the Russian people and, with them, the peoples of Europe and the entire world, should find out the documentary truth of the plans which were secretly hammered out by financiers and industrialists together with their parliamentary and diplomatic agents."

Firmly rejecting secret diplomacy, our country based its international activities on an essentially new, a truly people's honest and open policy, which it has invariably maintained for nearly 70 years. The most important stages and trends in the foreign policy activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state have always found documentary interpretation and confirmation in numerous publications of a current as well as fundamental nature. Such prime sources are priceless materials for the profound study and extensive summation of the rich experience acquired by Soviet diplomacy, which is doing everything dependent on it to ensure favorable international conditions for the peaceful and constructive toil of the Soviet people and for a lasting peace on earth. By bringing the words of historical truth, Soviet foreign policy documents trigger a most lively interest throughout the world and are highly valued by political and social circles abroad.

Considering the importance of such publications, the Commission on the Publication of Diplomatic Documents of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs

undertook the publication of a new multi-volume work under the overall title of "Za Mir i Bezopasnost Narodov." This most complete and systematized collection of foreign policy materials, both party and state, many of which have been extracted from the archives and are published for the first time, trace, starting with 1966, the course pursued by the USSR in the world arena. The first three already published volumes offer a clear and specific idea of the nature, distinguishing features and merits of this publication. The work is significantly superior to any previous Soviet publications of its kind. It is distinguished by its high scientific level and thoroughly planned structure. Each volume has comments and notes and topic, name and geographic indices.

The study of the documents enables the reader to trace, step by step, the activities of Soviet diplomacy against the background of the development of international life, to recreate the view of events of the period and to see the individual, occasionally disparate phenomena through the lens of the basic trends of global politics and the leading forces and factors of our time. As a result, it is as though a tangible string links the past with the present, enabling us to determine the true underlining of historical events, see the dramatic turns in the destinies of countries and peoples and scientifically to forecast the development of leading processes and trends. This new work is noteworthy not only because of the topical nature of the problems and the considerable factual data it contains but, above all, because of its important sociopolitical content which becomes particularly relevant under the contemporary situation in the world, characterized by the intensification of the tension by the fault of American imperialism and its allies and the aggravated political and ideological struggle. The merit of this publication consists, above all, in the fact that it thoroughly reflects the tireless and comprehensive international activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state, convincingly indicating their major contribution to the enrichment of the ideological-theoretical arsenal of socialist foreign policy and the implementation of the principle-minded, class-oriented internationalist Leninist course.

The compilers of the collection have chosen the year 1966, the year of the 23rd CPSU Congress, as their starting point in time. The meaning of this choice is profound. The second half of the 1960s played a special role in the history of international relations. It was packed with events of major historical meaning and significance, events which had a substantial impact of subsequent developments. Those were years when the peaceful offensive of socialism was mounted extensively and energetically, demonstrating its tremendous constructive role in the defense of the peace and security of the peoples with increasingly clarity. This was the period of the birth of detente, which gathered strength thanks to the tireless struggle waged by socialist diplomacy, with the support of all peace-loving mankind. It was a time of stubborn clash in the international arena and intensified counterattacks mounted by imperialism and the reaction, who were trying to take their social revenge, weaken world socialism and defeat the national liberation movement.

The content of the volumes already published shows that strengthening fraternal relations with the other members of the socialist community was and

remains the main, the pivotal trend of Soviet foreign policy. The CPSU and the Soviet state paid prime attention to strengthening the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries, the further development of their friendship and comprehensive cooperation on the firm foundations of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism, and firm rebuff through joint efforts of the aggressive aspirations of imperialism, particularly in connection with Cuba and Vietnam.

The 1960s witnessed the further enhancement of the international role and influence of the socialist community on the deployment of class forces on a global scale and on the course of the global revolutionary process. The class conflict between the two socioeconomic systems and two foreign policy courses entered a stage distinguished by qualitatively new features. The military and strategic balance which was attained between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, thanks to the long and tireless efforts of the CPSU and our people, was of tremendous historical significance. New realistic prerequisites for blocking the aggressive militaristic course pursued by the United States and NATO and for asserting the principle of peaceful coexistence in the practice of relations between countries with different social systems developed.

The trend toward detente became increasingly apparent in the course of the sharp ideological-political struggle. Whereas at the start of the 1960s the situation in the world was characterized by extreme tension, during the second half of the decade features of positive changes in international relations became clearly apparent. This process has been quite comprehensively reflected in the volumes under review.

Creatively developing Lenin's theoretical legacy in terms of the objective requirements and realities of the new stage in international relations, based on the extremely rich experience which had been acquired and, on this basis, earmarking the immediate guidelines and long-term prospects of its foreign policy course, the CPSU offered at its 23rd Congress a set of specific broad scale suggestions and initiatives covering basic and most topical international problems. Their target was the prevention of nuclear war and the preservation and consolidation of universal peace. It is indicative that for the first time the concept of the "struggle for detente" was codified, under the sign of which the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries were to pursue their policies (see 1966, Book I, p 32). The 23rd CPSU Congress, which was a significant landmark in the implementation of the Leninist foreign policy course, proved that defending and strengthening peace were and remain the prime concern of our party and Soviet state, as convincingly shown in the documents included in the book.

Materials which describe the struggle for peace in Europe waged by the members of the socialist community are extensively discussed in the publications. These countries, having profoundly and comprehensively assessed the international situation of the time, reached the important conclusion of the need for, real possibilities and timeliness of the solution of problems of European security and submitted important programmatic suggestions and initiatives. It was precisely on the basis of such a constructive foundation

that the political dialogue between East and West, which brought beneficial changes in the situation in Europe and the rest of the world was initiated.

The published materials reproduces with extreme accuracy the dialogue which began when the 23rd Party Congress called for initiating talks "to discuss existing suggestions submitted by socialist and other countries in Europe relative to military detente and reducing armaments in Europe and developing peaceful and mutually profitable relations among all European countries. To this effect a corresponding international conference should be held" (Ibid., p 39). The Warsaw Pact members called for concentrating joint efforts on "turning Europe, one of the most important centers of global civilization, into a continent of comprehensive and fruitful cooperation among equal nations and a powerful factor in the stability of peace and reciprocal understanding throughout the world" (Ibid., p 252).

Observing the conditions which would exclude forever any repetition of the German aggression, stipulated in the agreements concluded by the allied powers at Yalta and Potsdam, is one of the most important components of European security. This problem assumed a particular nature in connection with the fact that the ruling circles in Bonn, encouraged by the United States and other NATO countries, were promoting the undermining of the territorial-political results of World War II and postwar developments, increasing to this effect the military potential of the FRG and demanding access to nuclear weapons. The Soviet declarations, notes and representations addressed to Bonn and the governments of the Western powers, included in the collection, emphasized that the growth of neo-Nazi and militaristic forces in the FRG and the course charted by its ruling circles are threatening peace in Europe and throughout the world (see 1967, Book I, reports 16, 26, 98; Book II, reports 138, 145, 201, 218, 245 and 246; 1968, Book I, reports 32, 66, 139, 156 and 157). Increasingly, the political course charted by the FRG clashed with the realities of international life.

The published materials show the development of the dialogue between Moscow and Bonn on the question of normalizing relations between the two countries. Let us note that the Soviet draft documents submitted to the West German side on 21 November 1967 subsequently became the foundations for the 12 August 1970 Moscow Treaty (see 1967, Book II, reports 201, 218, 219, 220; 1968, Book I, report 32; Book II, reports 173 and 184).

In the language of convincing facts, the documents included in the collection reveal the way political realism began to make its way increasingly obviously in the policies of the majority of European countries. The organization of fruitful Soviet-French cooperation became a major factor in the development of detente. Positive changes in the same area occurred, above all, as the result of the exchange of visits by Charles de Gaulle, the French president, to the USSR and A. N. Kosygin, USSR Council of Ministers chairman, to France and the joint documents which were signed as a result of their discussions, in 1966. During that same period relations between the USSR, on the one hand, and Great Britain and Italy, on the other, improved; cooperation was broadened with Finland, Sweden, Austria and other countries. It was precisely during that period that thanks to the purposeful efforts of the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist states, foundations were laid for a turn for the better in

relations between East and West and for the development of the European process, completed with the historical Helsinki Final Act of 1 August 1975.

Naturally, the compilers of the collection have paid the closest possible attention to problems related to the fate of countries liberated from colonial domination. The intensive process of breakdown of the imperialist colonial system, which continued in the 1960s, led to the establishment of tens of young countries, the role of which in international relations began to increase with every passing year. The nonalignment movement, which is today an influential force in the struggle for peace, gathered strength. The steady and ever increasing aid and support provided by the USSR and the other socialist countries was of progressive significance in terms of the noteworthy changes occurring in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The revolutionary and combat alliance between world socialism and the national liberation movement of the peoples rose to a higher level in terms of content and forms of interaction and cooperation.

The collections cover extensively and thoroughly the policy of international solidarity pursued by the Soviet Union, embodied in the comprehensive and effective support given to the forces of national liberation in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Events in the Middle East, related to the Israeli aggressions against freedom loving Arab countries, became particularly heated in the second half of the 1960s. In this connection, the readers can see for themselves, with the help of a clear documentary basis, the consistent course pursued by our country which, firmly taking the side of the Arab peoples from the very beginning of the conflict, decisively called for the total liquidation of the consequences of the Israeli aggression and suggested a constructive program for a Middle Eastern settlement (see 1967, Book I, report 113; Ibid., Book II, report 120; see also pp 376,379,380; 1968, Book II, reports 171, 182, 212, 242, 249, 260, 266, 314 and 315).

The Soviet Union, which showed the greatest possible responsibility for the fate of the world and the life of the people, pursued with equal consistency a line of peaceful settlement of the Indian-Pakistani conflict, which broke out in 1965. As the documents show, thanks to its noble initiative and skillful diplomatic mediation, our country was able to stop the bloodshed (see 1966, Book II, p 298).

The readers will find a significant number of documents and extensive information on problems of disarmament, United Nation activities and many others in the work under review.

In addition to its political significance, this new systematic publication of Soviet foreign policy documents is also of major scientific-theoretical, ideological-educational and counterpropaganda value. These documents, which bring to light the peace-loving foreign policy of the USSR, will unquestionably become a valuable support for our friends abroad, who are disseminating the truth about the land of the soviets, sometimes under exceptionally difficult circumstances, and of its tireless efforts to promote peace and friendship among the peoples.

It is no secret that the bourgeois mass information mass media are trying to distort the objectives and principles of Soviet foreign policy, and that they misinterpret some of its initiatives and practical steps. The West German journal EUROPA-ARCHIV is an example. Twice monthly it willingly lends its pages to the publication of extensive articles originating above all in NATO and Common Market countries, whereas documents originating in the socialist countries are allocated a much more modest space. The very choice and nature of the publication of such documents are tendentious. This, as the saying goes, can be seen with the naked eye. For example, in acquainting the readers with the materials of the 23rd CPSU Congress, the journal entirely deleted the second and fourth parts of the CPSU Central Committee accountability report, which were directly related to world politics. Also deleted were stipulations on the fact that a new world war was not inevitable, or that peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems cannot prevail where it is a question of internal processes of the class and national liberation struggle, which are also of great principled significance. Such "publications" mislead and disorient not only the reading public but also those who are especially engaged in the study of Soviet foreign policy. This reasserts the accuracy of Lenin's words to the effect that "if they are unable today to attack us with arms, they are attacking us with the weapons of lies and slanders..." (Op. Cit., vol 42, p 366).

The new edition is of considerable interest to anyone who, one way or another, has something to do with problems of Soviet foreign policy and international relations. It provides researchers, teachers in higher and secondary schools and foreign affairs journalists with an exceptionally extensive stock of collected documents, materials and information. This publication will help higher school student and students attending Marxism-Leninism universities, seminars and party education circles to become more extensively and thoroughly familiar with the principles, nature and implementation of Soviet foreign policy. It will enable lecturers and propagandists to explain more thoroughly and clearly to the Soviet people, the growing generation in particular, the most important problems of the theory and history of Leninist foreign policy in close connection with topical international problems. Unquestionably, the large category of readers interested in international politics and diplomacy will rate this publication highly.

This multiple-volume documentary publication, which helps to assert the historical truth of Soviet foreign policy and the exposure of bourgeois falsifications and disinformation, brings to light the great historical mission of socialism as a tireless and consistent fighter for peace and for security, cooperation and friendship among peoples.

5003
CSO: 1802/6

IN THE CENTER OF ATTENTION--KEY PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL LIFE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 116-120

[Review by Prof Yu. Pankov, of the following books: "Aktualnyye Problemy Mezhdunarodnoy Bezopasnosti i Razoruzheniya" [Topical Problems of International Security and Disarmament]. V. S. Shaposhnikov editor. Progress, Moscow, 1984, 502 pp; "Ravnaya Bezopasnost. Printsip Ravenstva i Odinakovoy Bezopasnosti v Sovremennykh Mezhdunarodnykh Otnosheniyakh" [Equal Security. The Principle of Equality and Identical Security in Contemporary International Relations] by V. K. Sobakin. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1984, 240 pp; "Borba za Razryadku Mezhdunarodnoy Napryazhennosti i Sotsialno-Ekonomicheskiye Problemy Kapitalizma" [Struggle for Detente and Socioeconomic Problems of Capitalism]. O. V. Salkovskiy responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1984, 261 pp; "Militarizm--Vrag Prirody i Obshchestva" [Militarism--Enemy of Nature and Society] by A. M. Sharkov. Mysl, Moscow, 1984, 189 pp]

[Text] The problems of war and peace have always been in the focal point of attention of Soviet sociopolitical thinking. The profound and thoughtful study of the complex and conflicting processes taking place in the international arena, their trends and patterns and the development of ways and means of safeguarding peace on earth and curbing the unrestrained arms race unleashed by imperialism have assumed an even more important and topical nature in the current dangerous situation prevailing on earth and become a vital practical task. It is no accident that as the role of the international factor in the life of mankind increases, so does the range of problems related to the search for real ways to prevent a nuclear catastrophe, to normalize international relations and to return them to the channel of peaceful practical cooperation, considered by our scientists.

The systematic and intensified study of the problems of war and peace leads us to believe that in accordance with objective historical necessity, a new trend is increasingly gathering strength in Soviet science: the theory of the struggle for the defense of peace. In recent years new and very interesting studies have been added to publications on such topics.

The authors of the monograph "Aktualnyye Problemy Mezhdunarodnoy Bezopasnosti i Razoruzheniya" convincingly prove, with the help of a large number of

specific examples, the manner in which the CPSU and the Soviet state are displaying their historically responsible approach to the solution of world problems in the tense and explosive situation which has developed in the international arena by the fault of imperialism in the 1980s. " The foreign policy of the Soviet Union," the monograph notes, "is based on Lenin's idea that peace is a mandatory prerequisite for the preservation of human civilization, life on our planet and social progress" (pp 8-9).

The problem of limiting and reducing strategic armaments is of unprecedented importance. The authors convincingly prove that the unrestrained arms race pursued by imperialism and the accumulation of a potential for destruction not only lead to a drastic aggravation of international tension and a tremendous increase in material costs and hinder reaching agreements, but also greatly increase the risk of global thermonuclear conflict.

The monograph discusses extensively problems of banning chemical, neutron and other types and systems of mass destruction weapons. It is common knowledge that the aggressive militaristic circles in the West are trying to put any achievement of scientific and technical progress on the service of the military-industrial complex. The Pentagon's experiments in the development and utilization of genetic, radiological, ecological and other weapons and the use of powerful electromagnetic radiation within a specific frequency range, which has a destructive biological impact, are a subject of deep concern. The Soviet Union has an essentially different stance concerning the new types and systems of combat materiel. It proceeds from the fact that it is easier to prevent the appearance of new weapons than to ban them afterwards. That is why a ban on the development of new types of mass destruction weapons remains one of the most important trends in curbing the arms race.

The problem of counteracting the dangerous U.S. plans in the field of militarization of outer space has become particularly relevant of late. "Even a partial implementation of the ambitious plans of the American administration to deploy in outer space a variety of weapons," the monograph points out, "would mean not only extending the arms race to yet another area, previously free from weapons. It would bring about a drastic increase in the threat of war as a whole and a substantial destabilization of the international situation...." (p 158). Hence the exceptional importance of the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union undertaken with a view to preventing the militarization of outer space.

One of the decisive sectors in the confrontation between the two trends in world politics is Europe, where the main area of strategic confrontation between the most powerful military-political alliances is located and where a tremendous economic potential and tremendous values are concentrated. In this connection, the fact that the monograph's authors discuss the problem of European security by itself, in a separate chapter, is justified as well as necessary.

The course charted by imperialism to military and power confrontation with the socialist countries is closely related to the policy of armed intervention in the affairs of countries which are defending the right of national independence and social progress in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The

Middle East has become one of the targets of such intervention. For several decades it has been subjected to the intensive military-political and economic pressure of the United States and Israel, its strategic partner, whose policy is the main source of the threat of war in the area. "Consequently," the authors of the monograph write, "the aggravation of tension and conflict and crises, which have become a permanent factor in the development of the Middle Eastern situation, have an extremely adverse effect on the international situation as a whole and are fraught with dangerous consequences for the international community" (p 238).

The broad masses the world over are becoming increasingly aware of the ruinous consequences of the arms race, the intensification of the atmosphere of tension and the threat of war. The headlong growth of the movements for peace and against the nuclear menace are becoming inseparable features of our time. They involve the participation of supporters of a variety of political and social trends and people of different nationalities and religious faiths. The monograph convincingly proves that by the turn of the 1980s the antiwar movement had reached a qualitatively new level and turned into a major factor of international life. The increased ranks of peace-loving forces and the scale and intensity of popular action for peace are historically unprecedented. "The growth of the antiwar movement in our days," the authors emphasize, "is the reaction of common sense and of intelligence, clashing with the nuclear madness and the irrationality of a policy based on nuclear military power" (pp 13-14). They extensively substantiate the conclusion that the unification of all peace loving forces in the struggle against the threat from the outside and for detente has become one of the main tasks today.

Exposing the false propaganda thesis of American imperialism, accordingto which military superiority of the United States over the USSR is a path to peace, is ascribed great importance by the peace loving states and peoples in this struggle. Actually, this is a path to war. That is why our country firmly states that it will not allow the violation of the existing military-strategic parity. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries counter the American thesis of superiority with the principle of equality and equal security.

The book by V. K. Sobakin describes the nature of the principle of equality and equal security and the history of its establishment as a necessary element of the international legal structure, and assesses the important role it plays in preventing a world war and ensuring the peaceful progress of mankind. This is a first attempt in Soviet scientific literature to sum up and analyze a broad range of problems related to the struggle waged by the Soviet Union for the application of the principle of equality and equal security in international-legal practice. A more thorough approach to describing the origins of the current interpretation of the principle of equality and equal security and the study of its content and conditions for implementation in terms of the problem of limiting and reducing nuclear armaments make this work particularly valuable.

Using unfamiliar sources, the author proves in detail that the idea of equal security has been the base of Soviet foreign policy, from the very first years of the Soviet system, and that "the very principle of equality and equal

security in its complete and final aspect as an independent, internationally mandatory and objective necessity, developed its current content only toward the end of the 1960s and during the 1970s" (p 5).

The author promotes the idea that equality and equal security are not only principles of international relations and norms of international law but also "an objective reality of the international situation" and a "categorical imperative" of our time. Enriching the content of the socialist concepts of equality and equal security and the dynamic development of their conceptual apparatus and specific features are its most important characteristics.

The principle of equality and equal security in its contemporary meaning was agreed upon by the USSR and the United States during the SALT-1 and SALT-2 talks and applied for the first time in the discussions of problems of limiting and reducing strategic armaments (see p 69). Subsequently, it was repeatedly included in a number of international treaties signed by the USSR and confirmed in joint declarations, communiques and other official international documents, including the Helsinki Final Act, which used this principle as a basis for the entire set of relations among European countries. The author has included among the most important components of the principle of equality and equal security "the inadmissibility and illegality of claims on the part of any country or group of countries to having unilateral advantages (in the military-strategic area, the aspiration to military superiority)" (p 77).

Citing specific examples, the author considers the struggle waged by the USSR against violations of military-strategic parity committed by the United States and its NATO allies on a European and global scale. He convincingly substantiates the incompatibility of the so-called "double," "zero" and "intermediary" solutions with the principle of equality and equal security. Essentially, its NATO interpretation is reduced to the legal codification of the doctrine of military superiority.

The author emphasizes the futility of the efforts made by aggressive and militaristic circles to prevent making the principle of equality and equal security "flesh and blood" of the international political-legal structure. "The vital force and effectiveness of the principle of equality and equal security," he writes, "are based on the fact that they are consistent with the realities of contemporary international relations and that powerful sociopolitical forces are defending them" (p 234). As a mandatory element of the basic principle of peaceful coexistence, the idea of equal security regulates the foundations of relations among countries in the epoch of the class confrontation between opposite sociopolitical systems.

The arms race launched by imperialism, which creates a real threat to the very existence of mankind, is already having a destabilizing impact with destructive consequences affecting all aspects of life in capitalist society, is a heavy burden for the working people and greatly complicates the solution of regional and global problems. The growth of military arsenals in itself has an extremely adverse effect on the entire structure of intra- and intergovernmental economic relations.

In an effort to conceal the antinational nature of their aggressive militaristic policy and to convince the people's masses of the need for "material sacrifices" for the sake of military superiority over socialism and reduce the intensity of the antiwar movement, the bourgeois apologists stubbornly claim that the arms race is "compatible" with the normal functioning of Western socioeconomic mechanisms and that it may even have a "beneficial impact" on the course of social progress. The collective monograph "Borba za Razryadku Mezhdunarodnoy Napryazhennosti i Sotsialno-Ekonomicheskiye Problemy Kapitalizma" exposes the reactionary nature and scientific groundlessness of the "arguments" brought forth by the defenders of the arms race. The publication of this work is particularly topical against the background of the drastic worsening of the socioeconomic climate in most capitalist countries pursuing an aggressive foreign policy course.

The entire experience of class confrontation in the capitalist countries convincingly proves that the struggle against the arms race and militarism is also a struggle for social progress. On this basis, it is more accurate to speak of the so-called "critical threshold of militarization," in which the scale of diverting social material, manpower and financial resources for military purposes becomes so great that it initiates an irreversible process of undermining the economy and drastic aggravation and intensification of socioeconomic contradictions.

The deformation of social production, developing under the influence of militarization, is expressed in the use of resources for nonproductive purposes, intensifying the imbalance of the reproduction mechanism and causing serious disturbances in the internal and external proportions of the national economy. The functioning of a war economy is inseparably related to the development of a military-inflationary situation which "consumes" a huge and ever growing share of the social product.

The predatory nature of militarism is manifested most emphatically in the tax-fiscal policy of the imperialist states whose priority structure is increasingly subordinated to the demands of the military-industrial complexes. For example, the U.S. federal budget has become a virtual "dollar pipeline" which siphons off financial resources from the pockets of taxpayers to the safes of the Pentagon and the war industry monopolies. They are "nurtured" by freezing or reducing allocations objectively necessary to meet social needs.

The distinguishing feature of contemporary militarism and the confirmation of its boundless greed and antihumane nature are revealed in the use for purposes of the arms race of resources obtained as a result of the financial and trade exploitation of other countries. This "dollar tribute" allows the United States to cover the huge gaps in its budget, caused by excessive military expenditures. Such "infusions" cover up to one-half of the country's budgetary deficit. The victims are countries ranging from American allies in military-political blocs to the poorest of the developing countries, which are forced to use up to one-third of their export earnings to repay debts owed to their capitalist creditors.

The authors subject to extensive criticism the bourgeois concepts of the imaginary beneficial influence of the arms race on social development, citing

convincing and extensive arguments in favor of decisively curtailing and eliminating it in the interests of the broad population strata in capitalist countries. One of the real ways of achieving this objective is converting war production, i.e., restructuring the war industry to produce civilian goods. The authors realistically approach the suggestions of progressive Western scientists and political personalities, who prove not only the urgent need but also the essential possibility of such conversion.

Assessing the economic effect of disarmament cannot be based exclusively on a one-time shifting to civilian economic sectors funds spent for military purposes. Although this method appears clear, it registers merely the one-time effect of the conversion and does not provide a full picture of all economic losses entailed by the arms race and all advantages related to shifting war production to a peaceful track. The arms race not only curtails civilian economic sectors by an amount equal to the sum total of military expenditures; there is also the accumulation of negative consequences of an unrestrained inflation of military items in the budgets which undermine the base for future economic development. It is a question of long-term trends such as an inflationary price increase, artificial narrowing of the front of scientific and technical progress and lowering the growth rates of labor productivity which, in the final account, causes serious harm to society.

Particularly noteworthy in this connection are problems of the destructive impact of the arms race on the condition and development of the natural environment. Today it no longer suffices merely to react to the dramatic consequences of the uninterrupted destruction of the biosphere. Exposing the sources of the ecological crisis, i.e., the mechanism of the harmful influence of capitalist monopolies, military-industrial above all, on nature assumes prime significance. Militarism has become the generator of an ecological crisis, for it undermines the foundations of the interrelationship between man and his environment.

A. M. Sharkov convincingly proves in this book that the scale and pace of degradation of the human environment, which is worsening under the influence of militarism, not only hinders normal economic activities but also distorts the entire social reproduction process. The social production process put on the service of militarism, the purpose of which is to prepare for, wage and service wars, assumes a truly destructive nature. The impact of the military factor on the ecological structure of the planet is fatal in all of its forms and manifestation. It is manifested in the waste of a tremendous quantity of nonrecoverable energy and raw material resources used in war production; the use of contemporary weaponry in local conflicts, provoked by the imperialist militarists; the testing of nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons; the "rehearsals" of ecological wars waged by the United States in Vietnam and Central America; and efforts to shift the arms race to outer space.

Today the question of preventing a planetary ecological catastrophe has become an area of political struggle where capitalism and militarism--the main culprits for the destruction of the environment--are opposed by the socialist world and all progressive mankind. The latter firmly called for lifting the military threat from the world and ending the senseless arms race. Naturally, the problems of disarmament are also directly related to eliminating the

threat of "ecological" warfare. The author is right by noting that "this connection is becoming increasingly stronger in time. Today it is not only possible but also necessary to combine the struggle for the preservation of the biosphere with the struggle against militarism and for democracy, socioeconomic rights of the working people and improving their living conditions on the national, regional and global scale" (p 179).

The books under review deal with topical theoretical and practical problems of global politics and bring to light the profound political and socioeconomic processes taking place in international life. Both separately and together these works provide a clear idea of the great and fruitful activities of the Soviet scientists in developing basic problems of war and peace and exposing imperialist forces which are trying to drag mankind into the fatal whirlpool of military catastrophe.

5003
CSO: 1802/6

BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) p 120

[Text] 1. "Resheniya Partii i Pravitelstva po Khozyaystvennym Voprosam" [Party and Government Decisions on Economic Problems]. Collection of documents. Vol 15. Part 2. May 1984-April 1985. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 320 pp.

2. "Sovetsko-Amerikanskaya Vstrecha na Vysshem Urovne, Zheneva, 19-21 Noyabrya 1985 Goda" [Soviet-American Summit Meeting, Geneva 19-21 November 1985]. Documents and materials. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 79 pp with ill.

3. Gromyko, A.A. "Rabotu Sovetov--Na Uroven Novykh Zadach" [The Work of the Soviets on the Level of the New Tasks]. Speech at the third session of the Gorkiy Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies, 19th convocation, held jointly with the party aktiv on 13 November 1985. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 32 pp.

4. "Dvizheniye Neprisoyedineniya" [The Nonaligned Movement]. I.I. Kovalenko responsible editor. R.A. Tuzmukhamedov publication scientific secretary. Nauka, Moscow, Chief Eastern Literature Editorial Office, 1985, 421 pp.

5. "Dvizheniye Neprisoyedineniya v Sovremennom Mire" [The Nonaligned Movement in the Contemporary World]. Authors: Etinger, Ya.Ya. (head of authors' group), Alimov, Yu.I., Alekseyev, Yu.N. et al. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1985, 288 pp.

6. "Doroga na Smolensk" [The Road to Smolensk]. American writers and journalists on the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people, 1941-1945. Translated from the English with preface by S.A. Dangulov. Compiled by B.A. Gilenson. Progress, Moscow, 1945, 472 pp with illustrations.

7. "Internatsionalnoye Sotrudnichestvo KPSS i BKP: Istoriya i Sovremennost" [International Cooperation Between the CPSU and the BCP: History and Present Times]. A.G. Yegorov (USSR) and D. Elazar (Bulgaria) general editors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 416 pp.

8. "Istoricheskiy Opyt Trekh Rossiyskikh Revolyutsiy. Kn. 1. Generalnaya Repetitsiya Velikogo Oktyabrya. Pervaya Burzhuazno-Demokraticheskaya Revolyutsiya v Rossii" [Historical Experience of the Three Russian

Revolutions. Book 1. Dress Rehearsal for the Great October. The First Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution in Russia]. Editors in chief: Golub, P.A. (head), Anoshkin, I.F., Antonyuk, D.I. et al. Editors: Kostin, A.F. (head), Aluf, I.A., Bondarevskaya, T.P. et al. Authors: Aluf, I.A., Ayzin, B.A., Kirillov, V.S. et al. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 575 pp, maps.

9. "Istoriya Esteticheskoy Mysli" [History of Aesthetic Thought]. The Establishment and development of aesthetics as a science. In six volumes. M. F. Ovsyannikov et al. editors. Vol 2. "Srednevekovyy Vostok. Yevropa XV-XVIII Vekov" [The Medieval East. Europe, 15th-18th Centuries]. Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1985, 456 pp.

10. Klopov, E.V. "Rabochiy Klass SSSR" [The Working Class in the USSR]. Development trends in the 1960s-1970s. Mysl, Moscow, 1985, 336 pp.

11. "Knizhka Partiynogo Aktivista. 1986." [Party Activist's Booklet, 1986]. Compiled by A.V. Shumakov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 223 pp.

12. Koginov, Yu.I. "K Komu Priletayut Aisty" [Where Do the Storks Go?]. Sovetskaya Rossiya, Moscow, 1985, 240 pp with ill.

13. "Kultura i Stredstva Massovoy Informatsii: Sotsialno-Ekonomicheskiye Problemy" [Culture and Mass Information Media: Socioeconomic Problems]. Ekonomika, Moscow, 1985, 255 pp.

14. Lifshits, Mikh. "V Mire Estetiki" [In the World of Aesthetics]. Articles 1969-1981. Izobrazitelnoye Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1985, 320 pp.

15. "Militarizm. Tsifry i Fakty" [Militarism. Figures and Facts]. Second enlarged edition. Authors: V.V. Borisov, V.P. Vasiutovich, P.L. Ivanov et al. R.A. Faramazyan general editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 287 pp.

16. Piskunov, V.T. "Besedy o Selskom Poryade" [Talks on the Rural Order]. The progressive system of labor organization and wages in kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 240 pp.

17. "Put k Pobede" [Road to Victory]. Compiled by M.M. Ilinskiy. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 254 pp with ill.

18. "Razoruzheniye--Veleniye Vremeni" [Disarmament--Imperative of the Times]. Documents and materials. Issue No 6. Compiled by N.P. Prozhogin. Pravda, Moscow, 1985, 255 pp.

19. "VII Syezd Sotsialisticheskoy Yedinoy Partii Zapadnogo Berlina 25-27 Maya 1984 Goda" [Seventh Congress of the West Berlin Socialist Unity Party 25-27 May 1984]. Translated from the German. V.S. Rykin general translation editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 111 pp.

20. "Spravochnik Propagandista" [Propagandist's Manual]. Authors: Anisimov, V.M., Babich, Yu.P., Belykh, A.K. et al. Compiled by Ye.G. Komarov. V.G. Baykova general editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 174 pp.

21. "SSSR-Luksemburg" [USSR-Luxemburg]. Pages from history, 1867-1984. Documents and materials. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 271 pp.

22. "Strany Mira" [Countries of the World]. Short political and economic dictionary. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 495 pp, maps.

23. "XIII Syezd Vengerskoy Sotsialisticheskoy Rabochey Partii. Budapesht, 25-28 Marta 1985 Goda" [Thirteenth Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party. Budapest, 25-28 March 1985]. Translated from the Hungarian. V.L. Musatov general translation editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 239 pp.

24. Firsov, F.I. "Lenin, Komintern i Stanovleniye Kommunisticheskikh Partiy" [Lenin, the Comintern and the Establishment of Communist Parties]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 359 pp.

5003
CSO: 1802/6

INDEX OF ARTICLES AND MATERIALS PUBLISHED IN KOMMUNIST IN 1985

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 85 (signed to press 11 Dec 85) pp 121-128

5003
CSO: 1802/6

END