

JPRS-UKO-87-019
23 November 1987

035093



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

KOMMUNIST

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

19980716 088

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

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

10
95
A05

Soviet Union
Kommunist
 No 12, August 1987

JPRS-UKO-87-019

CONTENTS

23 NOVEMBER 1987

Intensifying Restructuring Through Practical Action	1
In the Central Committee of the CPSU	7
Creative Theory of Developing Socialism. On the Publication of the Three Volume "Selected Speeches and Articles" by M. S. Gorbachev [G. L. Smirnov]	11
Soviet Economy at the Turning Point [Ye. G. Yasin]	19
Potential and Returns From the Kostroma Nonchernozem [V. I. Toropov]	26
Important Area of Openness [Yu. Yarmagayev]	32
Economics and Ecology [V. Dubinina]	32
Literature For Practical Workers [A. Gavrilov]	33
Democracy in the Life of the Scientific Collective [Ye. Mishustin]	34
Economic Aspect of the Preservation of Monuments [V. Vinogradov]	34
Literature and the New Way of Thinking [I. Dedkov]	35
KOMMUNIST Roundtable: Basic Stages in the Development of Soviet Society	44
Restructuring and the Trade Unions [M. Baglay]	57
History and Religion [A. Klibanov, L. Mitrokhin]	64
From the Depth of the Centuries [B. Raushenbakh]	71
Struggle For the Ideological and Organizational Strengthening of the Party	78
India: Forty Years of Independence [F. Yurlov]	84
American Scientist V. Leontiev on Changes in the Soviet Economy	88
Foreign Press Reaction to June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum	91
To Our Readers	91
Publication Data	92

Intensifying Restructuring Through Practical Action

18020018a Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 3-12

[Text] A meeting with the heads of mass information media and creative associations was held at the CPSU Central Committee, in the course of which its participants exchanged views and problems of further upgrading the role of the press, television and radio broadcasting in restructuring and in the implementation of the tasks earmarked at the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The meeting was addressed by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, who said:

Once again we meet. In my view, this is a good tradition. We highly value the contribution which our mass information media are making to restructuring. I include here our journals as well, including the literary journals, for political journalism plays a great role in their materials. I would even say that the party could have failed to reach the present level of discussion of the entire set of problems related to restructuring, which is quite broad, varied and contradictory, unless the mass information media had not actively and truly become involved in this process immediately after the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

This is first. Second, life is beginning to change. Perhaps it may be changing not so rapidly and fully as we would wish it. A variety of viewpoints exist on this matter: According to some, the processes of restructuring are too slow; others say that we are rushing. I believe that that which we are doing and developing in our society demands greater responsibility and consideration and it is on this basis that we must define our pace. We have a huge country and a huge people who have sacrificed a great deal to consolidate and increase the gains of the October Revolution and to make our homeland a powerful socialist state. Therefore, all the steps we take demand a feeling of great responsibility to the people and to all mankind, considering the role which our country and state play in the contemporary world.

Visible changes are taking place. A certain situation prevailed until the January Central Committee Plenum and the events which followed it developed in an entirely different manner. In preparing for the June Central Committee Plenum, we realized that before we put on the agenda the question of radical restructuring of economic management we would have to discuss the course of restructuring as a whole. This is entirely understandable. Despite the entire significance of basic phenomena in our economy the processes of restructuring within it will not take place unless accomplished in a state of interconnection with all other areas in our social life, the spiritual and political above all, democracy and many others. After the January Central Committee Plenum

these processes changed their nature. The pace of discussions and their sharpness and the content of the decisions made changed as well. We must frankly say that everything has changed and intensified. This means that at the January Plenum we properly formulated the question and that restructuring has begun to encompass all areas of social life and all popular strata. Through its mechanisms it has begun to involve millions of people and wherever there are millions of people is where major and responsible policy begins.

It is thus that we reached the idea that the report to be submitted at the June Central Committee Plenum had to include a political section which would provide an analysis of the overall course of restructuring and in the course of which we could consider what we have already accomplished and the point we have now reached. We realized that we are merely at the initial stage of restructuring. Nonetheless, this is already a sort of new period in our development. We have reached new levels of restructuring and a new starting level in our plans for the future.

In this connection, since the movement is accelerating, we must keep "checking our watches." This applies to the party and the mass information media. I believe that after the June Plenum the need for this has become even greater, for at that plenum problems of tremendous importance related to restructuring the management system of our economy were solved. I am confident that all of you are well familiar with the materials of the plenum and have reached your own evaluations and views. I believe that you agree with the main features, and that everything which we have been doing after the April Central Committee Plenum has been dictated by the very course of development of our society, the problems which had accumulated and the urgency of the problems which had to be resolved.

I keep talking about the society, for the Central Committee and the Politburo base their policy on the interests of development of the society and in accordance with the trends which are taking place in social development, according to the problems which concern society and which society discusses. Naturally, society is not something impersonal. It has its specific forces—the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia—and within them its strata with their specific features and interests. Restructuring and its problems are refracted differently in the various classes and strata of our society, in accordance with practical experience and the specific living conditions of the individual groups.

We must proceed from the fact that a large number of unsolved problems remain in society, and that in the economy, in particular, the situation is very stressed. It is precisely this that should guide us. We must see what has matured within the society and we must realize that our choice was the accurate one. The past 2 years have

indicated that the people are beginning to believe in the need for restructuring. Many people are even concerned about the survival of restructuring. They do not wish it to fail.

Let me emphasize (this was also discussed at the June Central Committee Plenum) that restructuring does not mean negation. If it does, however, it is a dialectical one. In formulating our line of acceleration and restructuring we do not stand on shaky grounds but on the firm grounds which were developed through the efforts of many generations of Soviet people; we stand on the results of the struggle of the pioneers which opened our way. They experienced everything: tremendous achievements as well as losses. There were difficult trials to be surmounted. I say this because even some of you ask if this new stage will turn into the denial of all that was, if we have forgotten our history and if the present policy will lead to underestimating what was accomplished by previous generations. I believe that such thoughts, comrades, are wrong.

I ask of you to rise above your emotions and comforts and convenient stereotypes. Rise and think about the people, about the society. Otherwise we would be unable to advance our initiated progress. As I have already pointed out there is something which, in my view, brings all of us together: We were and remain in the same boat; we were and remain on the same side of the barricade; we marched and are continuing to march along the same road. Therefore, when the passions heated up at the meeting of the board of the Union of Russian Writers, I asked the comrades to inform the members that we would have been greatly concerned if suddenly, instead of consolidation, our creative and artistic intelligentsia would begin to squabble, so to say, and its participants would try, under conditions of openness, candor and democracy, to seek revenge for any criticism. This, comrades, is inadmissible. This would mean playing games with the people, with the country, with socialism. In no case shall we accept this!

Even the most crucial problems should be discussed with mutual respect. Even the most extreme viewpoint may contain something that is valuable and rational, for the person who defends this viewpoint honestly is concerned for the common cause. You will recall Lenin's idea that one must be able to analyze the viewpoint of one's opponent, and even one's enemies, for no one can so profoundly and sharply raise questions and no one can so persistently find weaknesses in your position as your enemy. In our case this is not a class, an antagonistic struggle. It is a quest, it is a debate on how to reach the high road of restructuring, how to speed up our steps and make them firmer and help to make our movement irreversible. That is why I see no drama in polemics and in a comparison among viewpoints. This is normal. It is as though we are once again undergoing training in democracy. We are learning. We are short of political knowledge, of the knowledge of how to engage in debates and how to respect the viewpoint of our friend and

comrade. We are an emotional people. In all likelihood, all of this will go away. We shall grow up. I ask that the comrades be told that we greatly value everything which has been done by our artistic intelligentsia since April 1985 and that we hope that their contribution will continue to increase.

Therefore, you and I must keep "checking our watches." I have no reasons to address any kind of major political blame. Should any kind of extremes appear, and, incidentally, did appear, and we were able to notice them, and all of this nonetheless took place within the framework of the struggle for socialism and its advancement, within the framework of a struggle consistent with the interests of the people.

If people start searching and suggesting to us values and discoveries which go beyond the interests of the people and those of socialism, the Central Committee will publicly reject this criticism and assess it and, within the framework of democracy and openness, also express its principle-minded views. I believe that this is as it should be.

I am being extremely frank with you, something you should feel. I am sharing with you my deep convictions. I may be wrong in something and lay no claim to the absolute truth. It is together, jointly, that we must seek the truth. We should seek the truth also from the conceptual viewpoint and from the viewpoint of practical policy, method and of what is, so to say, our fulcrum. Such a fulcrum involves truly awakening the individual and using his rich political, cultural and scientific potential which has been accumulated within our society under the Soviet system.

That is why we suggested at the January Central Committee Plenum an entire constructive program, the main content of which is to develop the process of democratization in order to involve the activeness and interest of the individual in all processes in our life. This is the main point of everything we are doing, comrades.

The area of economics is no exception in this case. Here as well our approach is such as to actively involve the individual in production processes. Socialism offers tremendous opportunities in this area, for it is based not on private property but on our common possession. It is the starting point which allows us to find the most original methods for involving the individual, making him not in words but in truth the master of the production process and of all economic life. How to achieve this in practical terms? Such is the task which the June Central Committee Plenum faced.

In his article "On the Cooperative," V.I. Lenin wrote that the stumbling block for many socialists was the extent of combining the private, i.e., the personal interest and its control and supervision by the state and the

extent to which it is subordinated to the common interest, with the public objectives. He believed that cooperatives were one of the means of combining socialism with individual interests. It was this common methodological principle that guided us, making us aware of the fact that no progress would be achieved unless we reliably combine public ownership with the interests of the individual, his material interests and his interests as a person. A society cannot become dynamic and viable unless it takes into consideration interests and unless, with the help of a feedback, such interests influence politics and society. That is why the question of interests was raised at the June Central Committee Plenum. Including the interests of the individual in the common economic mechanism will enable him to feel that he is the master and motivate him energetically to participate in all the processes in the life of our society.

We began, as you know, with the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) and with formulating the ways for its implementation. Based on the results of the nationwide discussion, anything could be included was included by us in the law and all the necessary corrections were made. It is true that there were suggestions which went beyond the limits of our system, such as abandoning the instrument of a planned economy. We did not accept nor shall ever accept this, for we intend to strengthen socialism and not replace it with another system. This is entirely clear. Therefore, a great deal of what was suggested to us and was borrowed from a different economic system was unacceptable. Furthermore, we are confident that socialism, if its basic principles are enacted, has everything necessary truly to include the interests of the individual and to make use of the advantages of our planned economy. At the present stage, considering the nature of our society today, this will enable us to charge the economy with a new dynamism.

Anything which conflicts with the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) must be revised. This includes any stipulation concerning the work of any economic authority, such as the Gosplan, other economic departments and sectorial management authorities. Henceforth their functions must be consistent with this law. This is the trend followed in our efforts. This, essentially, is the focus of the decisions of the June Central Committee Plenum, which are based on expanding the line of the January Plenum: including the individual in all processes—economic and production—and making him the true owner, and combining the interests of the state with those of the individual and the labor collective.

In all likelihood life will make corrections to this process. We are confident, however, that we are following the proper way, for in this case we are already proceeding on the basis of a certain amount of experience.

Now, when a favorable spiritual, and moral atmosphere exists in society, an atmosphere of openness and the development of processes of democratization in the

country, we must set them on a proper legal foundation. We still have a great deal of democracy "by meetings," although the present juridical prerequisites should be enacted and use should be made of a great deal of what already exists. We are thinking of this and are drafting corresponding proposals for the 19th All-Union Party Conference. With a program for a radical reform in economic management we have created a broad front for mounting an offensive in all areas of democratization of society and accelerating and intensifying restructuring.

Such are some ideas concerning our plans and the importance of the work done by the June Party Central Committee Plenum. I would say that today the main strategic problems have been solved. We have created prerequisites for restructuring to develop on a new basis—political, ideological, moral, economic and legal. However, all of this is to be accomplished in the future, for these are merely prerequisites and practical work is only at its very beginning.

Naturally, the following question arises: What point have we reached now? A new situation has developed. This situation as well must be understood. If we agree that we have created the prerequisites I mentioned, perhaps the most important moment is now upon us. Now everything must be implemented. This means that millions, tens of millions of people will participate in a tremendous project. This is a true revolution, which includes the revolution of the mind, in thinking and in approaches to the work. As we know, Lenin cautioned that one must not joke with a revolution, one must not play at revolution. If we have undertaken to make such a revolution we must manage such affairs properly, with a tremendous feeling of responsibility and the understanding that any slowdown in the implementation of problems we have already decided to implement and which have been included in our program for restructuring is deadly.

Therefore, I would say that we are entering a stage of constructive work. Some comrades may interpret it as meaning that we have had enough criticism. I believe this to be wrong. I am convinced that without retaining the atmosphere of openness, candor and criticism, without broad and responsible debates imbued with concern for the needs of the people, for the destinies of the state and society, there will be no constructive work whatsoever and no constructive stage will come about.

The main thing for us now, therefore, is to act, to act energetically and purposefully; to seek possibilities, criticize errors and shortcomings and, at the same time, support that which is new and constructive; to develop activeness and initiative; to intensify democracy and openness, i.e., that which strengthens the atmosphere of restructuring and contributes to the acceleration of our socioeconomic development; to seek new forms of work which would promote the increasing participation of the people, of millions of working people. Such is the socio-political nature of the present stage in restructuring.

It is important at this point to see and note promptly anything, albeit the slightest, new feature which promotes our cause. At the June Central Committee Plenum I described many specific facts as proof that the positive process has begun and that we must become well aware of all of these new shoots. Here we must learn from Lenin. Recall the subbotnik at the Moscow marshaling yards depot and the way Lenin used this fact to develop his thoughts, some of which have remained relevant for us for several decades and will continue to be such.

It is very important at the present stage of constructive work and constructive actions to see anything positive that is taking place. Comparisons are particularly important in this case: Here we have side by side two rayons, two enterprises, two oblasts and two republics and yet in one of them a given approach leads to motion, acceleration and real results and in the other we see sluggishness, mental inertia, support for the old, and narrow-mindedness which fetters collectives and individuals. Today this is the main topic of journals and newspapers and works of fiction.

You will probably agree with me, and I am confident that you have already reached this conclusion by yourselves, that today all of us must be especially practical, responsible and specific in our actions. You have clearly felt, you must have felt the existence of at least two basic ideas which we wished to promote in the reports submitted at the June Central Committee Plenum in addition to what was included in the development of the program on economic problems.

The first is that the party cannot fall behind the processes occurring in society. The moment it falls behind, even in a single sector, shortcuts begin and overlaps appear. Conversely, whenever the party is on the level of the situation, it is able to make full use of its potential, authority and possibilities and assume vanguard positions in this process rather than operate according to the principle of "preventing," not allowing, banning, refusing, abolishing, etc. This is not a position. The party must lead. It can do so, for it has the proper potential in terms of cadres, theory, politics and morality. Let me emphasize the moral potential. Having indicated in the first part of the report submitted at the June Central Committee Plenum the contradictory nature of the contemporary stage in restructuring and the nature of the immediate and longer-range tasks, and having formulated a concept for radical reform, the party thus reasserted that it is implementing its mission as the guiding force of society. It is the true organizer of society and its political vanguard.

I doubt that at this point anyone would think that one could do without the party; we have 70 years behind us and we could draw simple conclusions on this basis, particularly now, at the stage of major changes in our huge country, when we are developing democratization,

debates and searches and, as we go along, secure restructuring and progress. This cannot be accomplished without a party which can think scientifically and formulate corresponding policies and strategy for the solution of practical problems, without the cadres which it trained over decades and is continuing to train. Anyone who things otherwise be wrong, to say the least. Socialist society needs an active, a strong party, and the party itself must be strong in order to be able to live a full life. It is only then that it would be able to fulfill its organizational and leading role. Next year we shall discuss in detail a great deal of problems at the All-Union Party Conference, including those related to the activities of the party itself.

This is the first idea. The second is the following: The people are concerned greatly about the restructuring. I already described my trip to Baykonur, where I looked at our equipment and met with the people. After one such meeting I was asked: "Mikhail Sergeevich, when will restructuring come to us?" To this I answered: "You better ask your leaders, let them think about that and then tell you." You know, the people have one very good quality: They can never be deceived.

When you and I painted life in a "rose" hue, the people saw everything and lost interest in the press and in social activities. They believed that they were being simply denigrated and insulted by attempts to trick them, for they knew what real life was, i.e., the nature of the real situation. Lenin said that the ignorant person stays out of politics. Today our people are educated. The way we have acted in recent years meant to keep them outside of politics. It meant disrespect for the people and some kind of elitism. Now everything must be put in its proper place through the democratic process. The single decisive force is the people. It is the people who promote cadres, leaders and literary workers.... Everything comes from and goes back to the people.

It was those contradictions between words and actions that the people noticed, based on their own experience. This means that not everything is as it should be, it means that there is a hindrance, that there are phenomena which seriously concern the people. The people realize that some problems of restructuring will require 5 to 10 years or even 15, for some of them. These are basic problems of tremendous importance, which should change the aspect of the country. However, there also are problems, such as the work of the trade system, urban transport, order in the streets and services. What is the attitude toward the individual in those areas? Is there an atmosphere of respect or sham? How are housing problems being solved? Is there any improvement, how is building going on? Such is real life in which the person, as he leaves his work, encounters immediately: how to take care of his children and his family, and how to solve one problem or another. Sometimes, thinking about all such matters, the person may say: "The speeches of leaders may change but life remains as it was...."

That is the reason for which the plenum report included a section on the primary, on the urgent problems which we must undertake to solve properly. The press must assume supervision over these problems, over the needs of the people, and describe the type of attitude toward them and, therefore, the attitude toward the people.

Generally speaking, whatever the position of the person, if he loses this quality of sensing the needs and difficulties of the people, if he stops understanding the way they live, such a person becomes unsuitable and must be replaced. We do not need him! I mentioned this at the Central Committee Plenum. This approach does not mean in the least a disrespectful attitude toward cadres. Yes, our cadres, our intelligentsia and our talented people must be surrounded with concern. Society cannot be equalized, for this would leave neither talent nor conscientious workers. This would be not socialism or social justice but equalization and demagoguery. Incidentally, social demagogues have found a place in some newspapers and journals. They are striking particularly at cadres. However, we must realize that the corps of cadres bears the tremendous burden of restructuring. Naturally, here as well there are people who have set up fiefdoms in their rayons and kolkhozes. Such people must be exposed. However, there must be no disrespectful attitude toward cadres in general.

At the same time, people who are careless, inattentive, who fail to see the needs of the people and who do not care for them, who do not react to them with all their hearts, must not be kept in leading positions. This was discussed at the June Central Committee Plenum and I beg of you to take all of this into consideration and to act. You must act in such a way that those who are concerned with the individual, with the people, with the simplest matters, with the most distant areas and the center, become the heroes of our press. It is the people who cannot be broken down who must become our "heroes."

At a recent Central Committee Politburo meeting a discussion developed on the way that in the past 2 or perhaps 3 years we had passed a number of resolutions on problems of providing the people with garden plots, little huts, construction materials, repair services, and so on. We said the following: Regardless of how much our construction organizations need such materials, such materials must be made available to the people and the stores. We began to investigate the implementation of these resolutions and we realized that they were being frustrated by one department after another, systematically. At this point we resolved the following: If we see that such resolutions are continuing to be frustrated, we shall fire those responsible and we shall do so openly, in front of the entire country.

You know that some plants, rayons and kolkhozes are already planning to solve the housing problem not by the year 2000 but in 7 to 10 years. All reserves are being put to use and the people have become active. In Volgograd

Oblast today the pace of housing construction has increased by 40 percent. All reserves must become involved. The people want to participate in this with their own funds. This is a useful action which has been initiated by the people and we must allow them to pursue it.

Or else consider the food problem. It is being successfully solved in many oblasts. Republics and oblasts were given the right, after meeting their obligations to the union fund, to keep their entire surplus to meet local needs and they became active and did everything they should. Many of you are familiar with this. In Saratov 17 different types of vegetables are available on a year-round basis and the situation with other types of food is not bad. Volgograd has changed in this respect and so have Tselinograd, Stavropol, Krasnodar, Omsk, Barnaul, Belgorod and others. Extensive work has been done in those areas and the results are obvious. I could name many such oblasts and cities. We are pleased to note that such processes have been initiated in Tula and Kaluga as well. Therefore, such problems can be properly solved even in the most difficult parts of the country. This equally applies to the Nonchernozem, which truly concerns us. In general, the Nonchernozem must be enhanced: We must build homes and roads there and develop this area in all respects. Many people would like to live in it. We shall systematically implement everything planned for the development of the Nonchernozem. If we offer our people the opportunity of displaying their intelligence and talent everything will develop well even in the most difficult areas.

As you understand, comrades, I have especially emphasized such primary tasks, for our restructuring will be futile unless the people feel that changes precisely in solving the primary, the vital problems, are taking place. I wanted to draw your attention to these two questions—that of the party and our priority tasks—so that you may clearly see here priorities and sequences in our restructuring work.

Another important problem is that of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. We must improve coverage of this most important event in our life. All of us, our present society, are born of the October Revolution and are the result of 70 years of post-October development. This is our common accomplishment and a turning point in the history of mankind, a path to a new world.

What great changes have occurred after our Revolution, not only in our country but throughout the world, and what important processes it initiated! All of this must be considered on a broad basis, without yielding to any kind of one-sided concepts and moods. It is not on such concepts and moods that we can build our attitude toward everything which happened after the October Revolution. This could lead us into error, comrades. I believe that we never can or should forgive or justify that which happened in 1937 and 1938. Never. It is those

who were then in power who will be responsible for it. However, comrades, this does not denigrate anything which we have today, which was accomplished by the party and the people, who underwent these trials. Losses were substantial and severe. We know what the result of the events in 1937 and 1938 were, and how this affected cadres in the party and among the intelligentsia and the military. Nonetheless, we must see the tremendous strength within socialism, within our system, which was able to withstand this and which joined battle against Nazism and won. That is why on the occasion of our 70th anniversary we must speak with pride of our great people, their history and their exploits.

We tell the truth and only the truth. We are proud of every one of our days and every day for us is precious, even when it was most difficult, for this was our historical school, our lessons in history. All of this you and I experienced, for which reason we cannot allow a disrespectful attitude toward our people and toward generations who experienced all this and led the country to its present. That is why let us most loudly speak of the October Revolution and socialism, of what we are and where we come from, and what we have as a result of the Revolution and the development of socialism.

A discussion about this has already been initiated, without any sensationalism, seriously and responsibly, for such matters cannot be discussed either with irony or malice, for this is the people's fate.

It is in the same way that we must speak of the present, of restructuring. Obviously, we must vary the forms in which such material is presented. It is a good thing for authors to describe their own viewpoints. However, I am much more interested, comrades, when I read materials on discussions. Such discussions involve workers, raykom secretaries, kolkhoz chairmen, scientists and men of culture. This is where the live thoughts come from. Or else, take the publication of letters to the editors. How captivating they are!

Something else. I already told you that it is undemocratic when Moscow authors usurp all newspapers and all journals. Journals and newspapers are for the union. When we read a newspaper, we sometimes ask: "But where is the country? Where is local opinion?"

Generally speaking, comrades, I invite you to think about how to describe for us better our Great Revolution, to remember the people, the heroes of the Revolution, the workers, the professional revolutionaries and the poets.... And to remember also those who were forgotten. All of us together must do this responsibly and profoundly, in a spirit of democracy and openness.

As we have mentioned frequently, openness and democracy is our common viewpoint. It does not mean total permissiveness. The purpose of openness is to strengthen socialism and the spirit of our people, to strengthen the

morality, the moral atmosphere in society. Openness also means criticism of shortcomings. However, it does not mean the undermining of socialism and our socialist values.

We have things to assert and protect. This includes the historical gains of our society as the best socially protected society. This may be questioned only by those to whom our socialist democracy and our demand of responsibility only hinder the satisfaction of their personal ambitions which have nothing to do with the interests of the people. We have struggled and will continue to struggle against this. We have no reason to embellish our policies and our values which are open to all. However, democracy also presumes a struggle for their assertion. I would sum it up as follows: Today restructuring processes are developing in width and depth. A difficult transitional period has arrived and competence and responsibility are particularly needed today.

We must act in such a way as to strengthen the spirit of the people. We must experience everything and restructure ourselves and it is thus that we shall obtain the results needed by society. That is why you must involve in your work more competent people. A great deal is being said in the mass information media about the economy. Unfortunately, however, in frequent cases it is being said poorly, superficially and sometimes either garishly and with total ignorance. In the course of the intensification of restructuring, demands concerning you will become stricter. That is why you must develop a reliable aktiv, good specialists—managers of enterprises, engineers, economists and scientists—and make use of the entire intellectual potential at our disposal.

You also suffer from the prejudice of limiting your authors to three to five people. Occasionally, this smacks of cliquishness. You must increase the variety of your materials so that the entire society might participate, so that socialist pluralism, so to say, be present in each publication. That is what we need!

Let me say in conclusion that the CPSU greatly values the contribution of the mass information media to restructuring. Why? Because everything goes through man. Man emerges on the front end of the struggle and it is through him that the entire restructuring takes place. Therefore, his thinking and views will be of decisive significance in the development of restructuring. We must engage in this type of conversation with man every single day, using the tremendous opportunities of the mass information media. The criterion, comrades, remains the same: more socialism and more democracy. All answers to the new questions must be sought within the framework of socialism and not beyond it. Socialism is the choice of our people. The party serves the people. Serving the people is the supreme duty of the workers in the mass information media.

I hope that in a spirit of frankness and party comradship I have told you that which I wanted to say after the June Central Committee Plenum.

The speech was followed by an exchange of views.

At the conclusion of the meeting, M.S. Gorbachev said: Everything which was said here inspires me a great deal. We highly value this meeting. We shall continue to structure our relations in the same way in the future. The Central Committee, those who are today within it and who guide the state, conceive of our relations precisely on this basis—on the basis of encounters, talks, discussions and formulation of a single approach, with respect for the opinions and views of interlocutors, on the basis of our common responsibility. All of us serve the people and our country, all of us serve socialism. The party serves the people and all creative forces serve the people. Such service must be worthy. Worthy and courageous! This is first.

The second is this: I am quite satisfied with the atmosphere which prevailed at our meeting. It is a reflection of what is taking place in the country, in society. I think that without such an atmosphere the impression which I take with me from this meeting would not exist. All of us must care for such an atmosphere and strengthen and develop it. Naturally, our contacts must not be limited exclusively to such conferences. The Central Committee is open and, if necessary, one could seek its advice. You are welcome, therefore, to come for an honest, open and direct discussion.

You bear tremendous responsibility for our political line and course of social renovation to gather strength, to intensify and to yield ever greater results. You carry this responsibility together with us, with the party.

We are approaching the 70th anniversary of our Revolution. We must draw profound summations from the path which was covered. We must organically link historical analysis with the solution of contemporary problems of restructuring. We are proud of our rich and great history and are ready to multiply our common wealth, both material and spiritual. We must preserve the atmosphere of openness in our society within the framework of candor, democracy and criticism.

That is why I would like to end our discussion with what I began. We highly value the front which you are holding: Without this front, comrades, we cannot do. We would not like to see this front to remain unchanged but, on the contrary, we would like for changes to be in the spirit of the way we have structured our political line for the future. I wish you success!

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

In the Central Committee of the CPSU
18020018b Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 13-18

[CPSU Central Committee Resolution "On the Work of the Kazakh Republic Party Organization for the International and Patriotic Education of the Working People"]

[Text] The resolution notes that under the Soviet system, and with the all-round aid of all fraternal peoples, the Kazakh SSR achieved significant successes in its economic, social and spiritual development. Today the republic is a major industrial and agrarian area. A real cultural revolution has taken place and a scientific and creative intelligentsia has been created. Relations of equality, trust and reciprocal respect have developed among the multinational population, on the firm foundations of socialist internationalism and common basic interests. At all stages in building socialism, the working people of Kazakhstan displayed high Soviet patriotism and loyalty to the Leninist principles of internationalism and friendship among the peoples.

Nonetheless, the former leadership of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee and many party committees in the republic made serious errors in the implementation of national policy and substantially weakened other efforts for the international and patriotic upbringing of the working people. The fast growth of national self-awareness was not taken into consideration; no prompt and accurate solution to arising problems was provided. At a certain point, the party organizations essentially terminated their struggle against manifestations of chauvinism, nationalism and parochialism and in the economic, cultural and spiritual areas. This adversely affected the republic's socioeconomic and cultural development.

By the turn of the 1980s Kazakhstan's contribution to the unified national economic complex of the country increasingly failed to be consistent with its growing economic and scientific potential. Phenomena of stagnation spread throughout all economic sectors and areas of sociopolitical life. The pace of output declined drastically and quality indicators in economic development worsened. In the past 10 years the lowest rates of growth of the national income and labor productivity took place here. Manifestations of exclusivity and dependency increased. There was a systematic shortfall in deliveries of industrial and agricultural commodities to the union stock and to consumers in other republics.

Plans for sociocultural building were systematically frustrated. The population's food supplies worsened. The principles of social justice were violated. Theft of socialist property, figure padding and bribery increased significantly. Drunkenness and drug addiction became widespread. All of this created an unhealthy moral atmosphere and triggered undesirable phenomena in

relations among nationalities. It created concern and lack of understanding and indignation on the part of party members and all honest working people.

CPSU Central Committee resolutions repeatedly drew the attention of Kazakhstan Party Committees to its shortcomings in the development of the economy, low party and state discipline and omissions in ideological and political work. However, the proper conclusions were not drawn in the republic. Ostentatiousness and glorification blossomed as in the past, achievements were exaggerated, results were assessed uncritically, and failures and shortcomings were concealed. This led to the development of an erroneous idea concerning the real state of affairs. Some cadres developed feelings of national egotism and complacency.

The republic's leading authorities neglected the purposeful training of national cadres of the working class—the main bearer and promoter of the ideas of internationalism. The share of Kazakhs among workers in industry, particularly in the coal and metallurgical sectors, declined. Few young people of Kazakh nationality are enrolling in vocational-technical schools and secondary specialized schools which train cadres for leading industrial sectors. Meanwhile, the network of higher educational institutions and their branches were being expanded without sufficient reasons. Priority was given to Kazakhs in VUZ enrollment; favoritism blossomed; the rules governing enrollment were violated and the grades of students were deliberately raised. The training of specialists was carried out regardless of real needs. As a result, a significant number of VUZ graduates assumed positions which did not require higher or secondary specialized training.

Gross errors in cadre policy caused great harm to the international upbringing of the working people. In frequent cases the decisive factors in the selection and promotion of personnel to leading positions were not political, practical and moral qualities but national origin, family and home-town relations and personal loyalty. Many key positions in party, state and economic bodies, scientific institutions and schools were held by careerists, time-servers and toadies, in an atmosphere of cliquishness and reciprocal insurance. A moral decay in some cadres developed.

Proper representation of the individual nations and ethnic groups living in the republic was not ensured on all levels of the sociopolitical structure. Shortcuts were used, based on nationality, in shaping the party and state apparatus, the law enforcement authorities, and scientific and cultural institutions and creative unions, as well as enrollment in the party and nomination for governmental awards. Such violations and lack of attention paid to the needs and requirements of some ethnic groups resulted in the fact that part of the population left the republic, particularly people from Guryev, Dzhezkazgan, Kzyl-Orda, Semipalatinsk and Tselinograd Oblasts.

For years on end the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee and the party obkoms, gorkoms, raykoms and primary organizations failed to consider problems of international upbringing; there was no profound study of occurring processes. The past of the Kazakh people was frequently idealized in scientific works and in works of literature and the arts; efforts to rehabilitate bourgeois nationalists were made.

At the same time, the revolutionary past of the peoples of Kazakhstan and their struggle for a Soviet system and for socialism were essentially ignored. Friendship among the peoples was mainly simply proclaimed and the fraternal aid given to the establishment and development of Soviet Kazakhstan was mentioned only during anniversary celebrations. Trends toward national exclusivity were intensified; relations with fraternal republics were curtailed and reduced to ostentatious measures; there was virtually no practical exchange of experience or efficient competition.

The struggle against feudal-bai mores and patriarchal-clannish customs was essentially abandoned. Insufficient work is being done to expose the reactionary nature of Islam and its efforts to preserve obsolete traditions and concepts and to strengthen national exclusivity. A revival of religious activities is taking place and the influence of clergymen on various aspects of the population's way of life is intensifying in many rayons. The party organizations are displaying tolerance toward leading officials and party members who participate in religious ceremonies, justifying this with respect for specific local mores.

Formalism, a bureaucratic approach and meaningless edification have taken firm roots in youth education. The party's guidance of Komsomol organizations has been weakened. No profound study has been made of the processes occurring in youth circles, university student collectives in particular. The number of young people joining all-union shock construction projects has diminished. Military-patriotic upbringing has been neglected.

The serious errors and blunders in the work of party committees in the republic have brought about a growth of nationalistic manifestations which were not promptly eliminated and, furthermore, were concealed or described as ordinary hooliganism. The Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee even failed to give a sharp political assessment to the nationalistic actions which took place in Tselinograd in 1979. Last December's rioting in Alma-Ata was also a manifestation of Kazakh nationalism.

The creation of an unhealthy situation in the republic's sociopolitical life, including in the area of national relations, was greatly assisted by the unprincipled position adopted by the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee Buro and the gross violations of the standards and principles of party leadership by D.A. Kunaev, the former Central Committee secretary. His

workstyle displayed subjectivism, violated collective rule and encouraged subservience and toadiness. Nepotism was promoted and many individuals who were violating their official position for selfish purposes turned out to be members of his closest retinue.

The CPSU Central Committee deems intolerable the violations of the norms of party life and of the Leninist principles of national policy which were allowed to occur in Kazakhstan. Today, when the revolutionary processes of renovation are encompassing all areas of social life, the prompt solution of problems which arise in the realm of national relations assumes most important significance. Any manifestation of chauvinism, nationalism, national exclusivity and boastfulness must be considered encroachments on the greatest possible gain of socialism—the fraternal friendship among peoples and the international unity within Soviet society.

The resolution notes that of late work is underway in the republic to improve the situation and bring order. However, it has still not acquired a suitable scope and depth and has not involved actively all levels of the republic party organization. State agencies, trade unions, the Komsomol and creative organizations and institutions are restructuring themselves all too slowly.

It is deemed necessary for the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, and the party obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms and primary organizations immediately to take most decisive steps to eliminate shortcomings in the internationalist and patriotic upbringing of the working people and to ensure the advancement and further development of national relations.

The CPSU Central Committee has emphasized that internationalism must be manifested not in words but in actions above all in increasing the contribution of Kazakhstan to the unified national complex of the country, in the steady increase in returns on the scientific and production potential developed in the republic and in its active participation in solving national problems.

The republic's Communist Party Central Committee and Council of Ministers must formulate and implement specific steps to surmount within the next few years stagnation phenomena in the economy, ensure the strict implementation of the Food Program, achieve a drastic upgrading in quality indicators and eliminate its shortfalls in procurements of commodities to the union stock. Manifestations of parochialism and feelings of dependency must be decisively eliminated. The strict implementation of procurements based on contracts, inter-republic in particular, must become a standard governing the activities of each production collective.

The efficient utilization of manpower must be ensured. Particular attention must be paid to the further strengthening of national cadres in the working class, above all in the leading industrial sectors. The inter-republic exchange of cadres and the participation of workers and

specialists in the development of new areas must be expanded. Efficient competition and exchange of experience must be organized with labor collectives, cities, rayons, and oblasts in other fraternal republics.

The development of the sociocultural sphere must be encouraged purposefully and persistently. The responsibility of party committees and soviet and trade union authorities and economic managers for providing the necessary working and living conditions, the implementation of programs for housing and cultural construction and for improvements in food supplies and medical aid to the population must be enhanced.

Guided by the resolutions of the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the Kazakh party committees must radically restructure their entire system of work with cadres which must assume a truly democratic nature. They must see to it that each party organization makes full use of its statutory right to solve cadre problems. Openness must be developed comprehensively. The opinion of labor collectives in the promotion of managers must be taken more fully into consideration and the elective principle must be expanded. Favoritism and the selection of personnel based on family, origin and friendship must be decisively uprooted.

Proper representation in the leading agencies, the party and soviet apparatus and public organizations of all nations and ethnic groups living in the republic must be ensured without any haste or the application of a mechanical approach. The training of leading party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol personnel and economic managers and ideological cadres must be improved in the area of the Marxist-Leninist theory of nations and national relations and CPSU national policy. The study of such problems must be organized in all units of political training and economic instruction, and in seminars and course retraining of cadres. Every manager and party members must systematically implement the Leninist national policy and set the example in the implementation of international and patriotic duty. The Party Central Committee deems that one of the main trends in organizational and political work among the masses must be the development of firm international beliefs and patriotic feelings. It is very important to ascribe to such activities a systematic nature and to perfect their scientific foundations. A profound study must be made of processes and trends developing within the area of national relations. The situation must be realistically assessed and the characteristics of the various population categories and groups must be taken into consideration.

The historical accomplishments in solving the national problem and the role of international fraternity in the destinies of the Kazakh people and in the development of Soviet Kazakhstan must be described vividly and profoundly, with specific examples, with the help of all

propaganda and mass political work media. The objective nature of the process of intensification of internationalization in all areas of social life must be convincingly explained. Constant concern must be shown for the satisfaction of the daily and cultural requirements of all nations and all ethnic groups and arising problems must be solved promptly. The necessary conditions must be created for the further development of national-Russian bilingualism.

The need has been pointed out to pay particular attention to organizing the international and patriotic upbringing in the scientific and creative intelligentsia and in youth circles. High standards of relations among nations and a respectful attitude toward the history, language and customs of fraternal peoples must be developed. The ability must be promoted to approach all national problems on the basis of class positions. Active and aggressive struggle must be waged against nationalistic feelings, feudal-bai mores and family-tribal traditions and religious prejudices which are adversely affecting the national self-consciousness. Hostile misrepresentations of CPSU national policy and attempts on the part of bourgeois propaganda to promote discord among nations and ethnic groups must be suitably exposed.

The Central Committee has made it incumbent upon party and soviet authorities in the republic to improve the training, assignment and utilization of specialists with a view to the long-term socioeconomic development of Kazakhstan. Steps must be taken to ensure the more efficient specialization of schools, to streamline their network and to close down branches, departments and laboratories which are short of skilled scientific-educational cadres and proper material facilities. Favoritism, bribery and other negative phenomena in VUZ enrollment must be uprooted.

The role of the training and education process in VUZs, technical schools, regular schools, and general education schools must be enhanced in shaping the scientific outlook and the ideological-moral and civic development of young people. The standard of teaching the social sciences must be raised. An atmosphere of friendship and mutual aid must be asserted in the multinational student collectives. The initiative and autonomy of student youth must be promoted in solving all problems of the organization of training, socially useful labor, free time and way of life. Regular meetings must be held between leading party and soviet personnel and the faculty, school teachers, and university and secondary school students.

The party's guidance of the Komsomol must be strengthened. The participation of young people from all ethnic groups in all-union construction projects of the 5-year plan must be assisted. Tourism and cultural and sports relations with other republics must be developed.

The role of the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences in the implementation of practical assignments in the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, which face the republic's national economy, must be enhanced.

The more active participation of social scientists in developing topical problems of the struggle against nationalistic and other negative manifestations and in providing party, soviet and economic authorities with specific recommendations must be increased. Coordination with the country's scientific institutions must be improved in studies on problems of national relations. The study of the history of the Kazakh SSR and of Russo-Kazakh relations must be based on systematic Marxist-Leninist positions. Secondary school and VUZ textbooks on the republic's history must be reviewed with a view to the objective interpretation of the events of the past and of historical personalities.

Improving the party's leadership of the creative organizations and associations has been suggested. The primary party organizations in the creative associations must be strengthened with involvement of talented and socially active members of the artistic intelligentsia. Workers in literature and the arts must be given comprehensive support in creating new and significant works which would depict on the basis of class positions the essence and meaning of the Leninist national policy and events and phenomena of reality and of the past of the Kazakh people, contributing to strengthening the friendship among the peoples of the USSR.

Particular attention must be paid to intensifying the processes of reciprocal enrichment among national cultures. To this effect shows, concerts, art exhibits, and motion picture festivals in union and autonomous republics must be regularly promoted. The repertory of professional groups and of amateur artistic creativity units of heroic-patriotic topics and the works by authors of fraternal republics must be expanded. The role of museums in promoting unity among Soviet peoples in their common struggle for socialism must be enhanced.

Efficient steps must be taken to strengthen law and order, discipline and organization in various areas of republic life. A decisive uprooting of corruption and parasitism must be achieved with the help of all means of party-political influence and administrative steps. The role of the labor collectives must be enhanced in the struggle against theft, figure padding, drunkenness, alcoholism and drug addiction. The administrative authorities must be strengthened with cadres and their activities must be enhanced in ensuring the strict observance of the laws, the rights of citizens and the principles of social justice.

The central committees of communist parties of union republics and the party kraykoms and obkoms must profoundly analyze the state of the work for the implementation of the stipulations of the 27th CPSU Congress and the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum

in the area of national relations. They must formulate and implement efficient steps to strengthen the international and patriotic upbringing of the various population groups. To this effect they must enhance the preparations for the celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the 65th anniversary of the founding of the USSR.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

Creative Theory of Developing Socialism. On the Publication of the Three Volume "Selected Speeches and Articles" by M. S. Gorbachev
18020018c Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 19-32

[Article by Georgiy Lukich Smirnov, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, director of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism; article published on the occasion of the publication of the three volumes of "Izbrannyye Rechi i Stati" [Selected Speeches and Articles] by M.S. Gorbachev]

[Text] The events taking place today in the country will have profound and significant consequences in terms of the future of socialism and peace. The processes of renovation affect every Soviet person and trigger great interest abroad. They create in the Soviet people the desire to understand the very nature of current events. We frequently hear conflicting views and heated arguments. Public attention is focused on economic, sociopolitical and social problems and on the ideas of acceleration and restructuring.

In this connection, the publication of three volumes of selected speeches and articles by M.S. Gorbachev, prepared for printing by the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism and Politizdat, are of tremendous interest. They reflect the party's intensive theoretical and practical work and its searches and solution of problems which face Soviet society. Everything in them is related to restructuring, from initial concepts to clearly formulated ideas and specific ways of its implementation. The three volumes include works stretching over a period of nearly two decades, from November 1967 to July 1986 [M.S. Gorbachev, "Izbrannyye Rechi i Stati," vol 1-3. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987. Subsequent references indicate volume and page only].

Starting with the first articles and throughout the entire work, the author concentrates his attention on perfecting the political methods of party leadership, the use of progressive equipment and technology, efficient economic management, problems of the social life of labor collectives and town and country, and developing an internationalist and patriotic awareness. They clearly reveal the particular interest shown in crucial and

unsolved problems. The works enable us to trace the way the ideas of accelerating the country's development were born and matured under the influence of vital social needs, and the way the need for decisive changes and radical restructuring of economic, social, political and spiritual life was realized.

The works included in the volumes cover a wide range of socially significant problems and provide answers to basic problems of the theory and practice of socialism, development of the world during one of the most serious and crucial periods in history and of drastic change in the life of mankind. They include materials of the April Plenum and the CPSU Central Committee political report to the 27th Party Congress. The further development of this set of ideas, and their shaping within the overall concept of restructuring and renovation of economic and sociopolitical life was achieved with the reports submitted at the January and June 1987 Central Committee Plenum. The reader becomes the witness of the profound and comprehensive study of domestic and international life: The all-embracing characterization of the historical achievements of socialism, a realistic study of reality, uncompromising assessment of the processes of hindrance and phenomena of stagnation; the course of development of the concept of acceleration of socioeconomic development and the task of achieving a qualitatively new condition for the society; and the formulation of new approaches to safeguarding peace and international security and the development of a new philosophy of peace.

This article is an attempt to discuss essentially a few problems of the theory of socialism at the stage of revolutionary renovation. What makes this even better substantiated is that the theoretical activities of the party are becoming one of the main motive forces in building socialism and communism and the most important instrument in restructuring.

The main topic which runs through all three volumes is that of the destinies of socialism and peace in their close and unbreakable interconnection. It is precisely the road of socialism that is the high road of acceleration and restructuring and of meeting the vital interests of the working people. And it is only under conditions of peace that a progressive development of mankind is possible today, for history has left us no other choice. The new realities of contemporary life were understood within a strikingly short period of time; innovative approaches were formulated on the basis of daring and substantiated summations. In their totality they are the foundations of the new way of thinking which is so greatly needed today by socialism and by the world at large. Naturally, to a great extent the program for political action of the Soviet communists is the result of collective creativity and collective party thought. However, the author of the volumes has made a significant, comprehensive and clearly original contribution to such activities.

1

Addressing oneself to revolutionary theory and to V.I. Lenin's creative legacy and method is the duty of any thinking communist. However, one could become well familiar with and recall Lenin's works and quote them constantly but nonetheless find himself helpless in the face of changing reality. M.S. Gorbachev's use of Lenin's works is always of a purposeful creative nature: how to interpret events in the country and the world from the viewpoint of Leninist methodology and how to define the nature of arising tasks and ways of solving them.

Attention is focused on the following question: What does working in a Leninist fashion mean? Above all, it means putting the national, the state interests as a foundation, to be organized, efficient and purposeful, to act in accordance with long-term developments, relying on science and sober consideration, and to anticipate the consequences of decisions (see vol 1, pp 393-394). The author studies Lenin's view of the line separating the use of economic from administrative management methods and how to take most adequately into consideration the entire variety of interests and to use them in pursuit of common objectives. The constant reference to Lenin's theoretical and political legacy helps to formulate the type of methods for analysis and nonstandard approaches which enable us creatively to interpret today's reality and find innovative ways.

What are the methodological characteristics of the party's contemporary theoretical work, reflected in these materials? They include, above all, the requirement of being familiar with the modern dialectics of life—the ability to assess with profound realism vital processes, to see the world in its development, to have the courage, without idealizing anything, openly to acknowledge that which actually exists and, therefore, to be ready to study within any socially significant process the struggle between opposites and to consider contradictions as a source, as a motive force of development, rather than to suppress them. "Unfortunately, developing contradictions cannot be always identified and eliminated promptly. This is frequently hindered by the power of inertia, mental conservatism and inability or unwillingness to change existing forms of work and convert to new methods which provide scope for anything progressive and consistent with the needs of the present and the future" (vol 2, p 81). The study of the necessary restructuring of society, which is a complex and contradictory process related to clashes among different interests, most clearly manifested during a time of transition, is particularly valuable in terms of theory and practical work.

The most important requirement in a dialectical-materialistic analysis is the ability to distinguish the profound content of processes from the forms and means of their manifestation and the essential, the main thing from the nonessential, the secondary and the transient. The idea of socialism as the live creativity of the people, the decisive role of the activeness of the masses in building

socialism and the steady attention which must be paid to their comprehensive interests and the consideration of their specific nature are among the mandatory methodological rules which the author strictly observes. The study of experience, and turning to practice is the highest criterion of familiarity with Leninist requirements which are always formulated as necessary prerequisites for theoretical and political activity. Naturally, this does not cover the entire methodological content of the published works but already confirms the dialectical combination within them of theoretical analysis with scientific approaches and the art of politics, which are necessary components in the creative mastery of reality.

2

Never before has real socialism with its achievements and problems, theory and practice been studied so thoroughly, profoundly and intensively as the CPSU has done in the post-April period. This was necessitated by the urgent need to solve accumulated problems and because forces which could make a profound study and efficiently apply the richest possible experience and daringly undertake radical changes, dictated by life, had matured within the party.

The aspiration theoretically to interpret the nature of socialist development and the right problems is what distinguishes as a whole the entire work. However, a turning point is achieved with the report to the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The April Plenum inaugurated one of the most important and theoretically and politically most saturated periods in the life of the party and the people. It can be said that the April Plenum marked the beginning of the type of understanding of the role and purpose of Marxist-Leninist theory of socialism in which the main task of the moment includes a comprehensive study and detailed analysis of reality, the creative solution of new radical problems, an antidogmatic trend and a firm rejection of stereotypes and obsolete patterns.

A creative and innovative approach to theoretical and political party work is directly related to the basic methodological Marxist-Leninist stipulation to the effect that a specific modification of socialism, as developed at various stages in history, should not be identified with its essential, its fundamental features. It is only on the basis of such positions that a daring and uninterrupted search for efficient ways and means of development can be conducted. In the recent past transitional forms which had been set up were either perceived or presented as the essence of socialism, for which reason a peculiar mentality gained the upper hand in political life: "To improve matters without changing anything;" in theory the choice of a variety of quotations which could weaken unpleasant sensations caused by alarming facts and confusions played a comforting role.

Nonetheless, the new stage in historical development demanded changes in the established practices and in the style of theoretical and political thinking. Although the view that materialism assumes new forms with each major scientific discovery is accurate, it is equally accurate that at each transitional stage the history and theory of socialism cannot fail to change substantially. While constantly emphasizing the permanent significance of the universal historical achievements of socialism, M.S. Gorbachev nonetheless noted that "Naturally, we are by no means depicting socialism in an idyllic manner. Each new stage in its development formulates its own tasks and problems and creates its contradictions" (vol 2, p 70). Such a dialectical formulation of the problem takes us closely above all to the need to update our concepts on the economic points of socialism, the radical restructuring of the economic mechanism, which would provide scope for the accelerated growth of production forces, and the need for a radical renovation of the social and political structures with a view to extensively developing the energy and improving the life of the working people. Such is the way the question has been formulated by the objective course of history and only thus can its contemporary challenge be understood!

However, even being aware of the truth that as society advances any historical social form inevitably ages and must be gradually replaced by a new one, it was necessary clearly to define what precisely had become obsolete, what could replace it and how could this be accomplished? The truth, as V.I. Lenin loved to repeat, is always specific. It was precisely in this area that the entire theoretical research was started as of April 1985. The historical destiny of socialism became firmly linked to the strategy of the acceleration of socioeconomic progress. The question was raised not simply of accelerating growth rates but of having socialist society reach a qualitatively new level. "Through the acceleration of socioeconomic development of the country to reaching a qualitatively new state in Soviet society. Such is the formula which expresses the essence of the contemporary party course" (vol 3, pp 7-8).

The concept of socioeconomic acceleration and, on its basis, reaching a qualitatively new status in Soviet society, formulated at the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum and comprehensively enriched at the 27th Party Congress, was an essential step in the intensification of the theory of socialism. It set economic, political, social and ideological-political tasks on realistic grounds.

In this connection, we must return to the question of "developed socialism." In analyzing this topic, we must display extreme care and precision. Naturally, it is not a matter somehow to avoid the concept of "developed socialism," or to be rid of it. As the first phase in the communist system, sooner or later but inevitably socialism must cover a stage of its highest maturity on its way to communism. We know that V.I. Lenin predicted this stage and indicated its inevitable arrival in the future (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works],

vol 40, p 104; vol 36, p 139). However, it is a question of using this concept with maximal scientific accuracy, without exaggerating the real extent of advance made by Soviet society along this way. It is also important to shift the emphasis from a description of developments to the dynamics of a social system which is steadily renovating itself.

It was precisely thus that the question was raised in the CPSU Central Committee political report to the 27th Party Congress. The report confirmed that our party had entered the historical stage of developed socialism, which was codified in the new edition of the CPSU program. It was taken into consideration that the task of building developed socialism was also formulated in the programmatic documents of a number of fraternal parties in the socialist countries. However, attention was also paid to the fact that the thesis of developed socialism, which had been formulated in the past as a counterweight to the simplistic concept of the means and time needed for solving problems of building communism, had been subsequently used quite one-sidedly. Frequently matters were reduced merely to noting successes, whereas many vital problems related to converting the economy to intensification, the growth of labor productivity, improving population supplies, and surmounting negative phenomena were left without proper attention. Willy-nilly this was a characteristic justification of slowness in the solution of ripe problems (see vol 3, p 276). In this aspect, the concept of developed socialism not only failed to reflect the real situation but even distorted it, disorienting practical policies.

The existing circumstances required that theoretical and political thinking be concentrated above all on the serious study of reality and on substantiating the ways and means of acceleration of socioeconomic progress, to which the quality changes in various areas of life are related.

The April Central Committee Plenum, the 27th Party Congress, the June 1985 Conference on the Acceleration of Scientific and Technical Progress and the January and June Central Committee Plenums are important landmarks leading to the creation of an integral concept of restructuring, which includes both criticism and formulation of new policy in economics, in the social area, in ideological and political life and in foreign policy.

The formulation of the new socioeconomic strategy itself was possible only on the basis of a thorough theoretical study of the reasons for the phenomena of stagnation and pre-crisis, which slowed down the progress of Soviet society and to the growth of a great variety of negative processes. Let us note among the hindering factors a technocratic style of thinking, departmentalism, egotistical interest, residual methods in planning the sociocultural area, underestimating the requirements of social

justice, shortcomings in the development of democratic institutions and in ideological work, and an obvious lag of theoretical thinking behind the needs of social practice.

All of these phenomena were summed up in the concept of the "obstruction mechanism," which is an essentially new concept in the theory of scientific socialism, for before it, as a rule, we were satisfied with indicating vestiges of the past, the lagging of awareness from daily life, and the obsolescence of forms of production relations. The "obstruction mechanism" is a broader concept which combines phenomena of a different order, borrowed from different areas of life, including politics, but nonetheless interrelated within a kind of conservative unity, an entity which opposes progress. The fruitfulness of this concept is found also in the fact that it presumes its "opposite," the concept of the "mechanism of acceleration," which must play a synthesizing role, by combining a variety of ways and means aimed, together, at surmounting stagnation and decisively accelerating our progress.

It is important to emphasize that the study of both negative and positive processes are never of an abstract, not to say anonymous, nature in M.S. Gorbachev's works. Even behind the broadest possible summations we always see an individual or a group of individuals motivated by specific interests or bearers of specific views. The author either names specific individuals by name (production frontrankers, outstanding organizers), in connection with the solution of one specific problem or another or the study of progressive experience, or else combined characters and social types which express significant trends. The social classification enables us to make the description of problems and processes extremely clear; it exposes more profoundly the nature and significance of the social phenomena under consideration.

It is on the basis of the description of the negative processes and shortcomings, for which the party today assumes responsibility, that serious and harsh lessons were drawn up at the 27th Congress. Their significance to all party managers or party members would be difficult to overestimate. These are the lessons of truth. The responsible study of the past clears the way to the future, whereas half-truths, which shyly avoid sharp angles, hinder the formulation of real policies and their implementation. This indicates the need for purposefulness and decisiveness in practical action. Having initiated the reorganization, we must not limit ourselves to halfway measures. We must act systematically and energetically and not hesitate even in taking the most daring steps. The main lesson is that success in any project is determined to a certain extent by the active and conscious participation of the masses. To convince the broad toiling strata of the accuracy of the chosen way, to interest them morally and materially and to restructure the mentality of cadres are the most important prerequisites for the acceleration of our growth. Progress will

become the faster the greater the discipline and organization and the responsibility of everyone for his assignments and for results of the work become (see vol 3, pp 201-202).

These lessons may sound like moral imperatives. At the same time, however, they also trace a political line and provide prerequisites for success. It is only their strict observance that can guarantee that the set objectives will be achieved. Actually, if we compare these requirements with the style applied in managerial activities in the recent past, the heavy burden which we will have to eliminate in the course of restructuring becomes clear. It is only the honest conclusions from such lessons that could rid us (and already are, step by step) of inertia, sluggishness, negligence, the disparity between words and actions, and lack of purposefulness, decisiveness and courage. This is one of the important facets of restructuring.

The June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum made a particular contribution to the study of the reasons for stagnation. The report submitted at the plenum provides a profound theoretical and objective study of the reasons for the aggravation of crisis phenomena by the turn of the 1980s. The party deemed necessary to point this out once again, most frankly, taking into consideration existing doubts as to the need for such sharp assessments and the urgency of radical change. "I believe that had such moods prevailed and had our present policy been based on them, this would have been fraught with extremely difficult consequences for the country and the people," M.S. Gorbachev emphasized at the plenum.

3

Naturally, economics is the focal point of the party's theoretical and practical activities, because it is the vital foundation of society and because the strongest obstruction factors developed here. The nature of the problems called for the elaboration of an essentially new economic strategy and entirely different approaches, for the previous measures were of a halfway nature and, furthermore, were not systematically implemented. The June 1985 CPSU Central Committee Conference on Problems of Accelerating Scientific and Technical Progress and the 27th CPSU Congress played an important role in formulating the new economic strategy. In this respect the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum is of particular importance. It was here that the overall concept of a radical reform in economic management was formulated.

The materials contained in the three volumes enable us to trace the establishment and development of the theoretical concepts on the tasks and nature of economic changes. The system of economic management, which was developed in the 1930s and 1940s, was characterized by rigid centralism, detailed regulations and mandatory assignments. In a certain sense, this was objectively determined by the situation and needs of the country,

although erroneous approaches were allowed and subjectivistic decisions were made. Within the shortest possible historical time this system enabled us to surmount the country's technical and economic backwardness and to solve the strategic problems of building socialism and strengthening defense. At the present stage, however, it sharply clashes with the conditions and needs of economic progress.

Based on a profound analysis of present-day reality, the party formulated the basic trends of economic policy, and the reconstruction of the national economy on the basis of scientific and technical progress. It radically changed its structural and investment policy, giving priority to machine building and formulating the most important tasks in all the other sectors of the national economy. However, the successful solution of all such problems is possible only if the obsolete economic ways and means of management are abandoned. Reality demands of us, M.S. Gorbachev said at the 27th Party Congress, to take a new look at some accepted theoretical ideas and concepts (see vol 3, p 217).

Let us consider above all the dialectics of production forces and production relations. Practical experience proved the groundlessness of concepts according to which under socialist conditions the consistency between existing production relations and the nature of production forces is ensured somehow automatically. In reality everything is more complex. Thus, the forms of production relations and the economic management system which had been retained to this day were developed essentially during the period of extensive economic growth, under the substantial influence of extreme conditions and tasks. Subsequently the conditions and tasks changed substantially and, gradually, these forms became obsolete. They began to lose their stimulating importance and turned into an obstruction to the further upsurge of the national economy. Today we are trying to change the trend of the economic mechanism, to eliminate its outlay nature, and to direct it toward upgrading quality and efficiency, accelerating scientific and technical progress and increasing the role of the human factor. In fact this will mean perfecting socialist production relations and will open new scope for the growth of production forces (see vol 3, p 218).

The view that the interaction between production forces and production relations is complex and the fact that the dialectical relation is not automatically established offers tremendous opportunities for the scientific study and evaluation of existing forms of production relations from the viewpoint of their consistency with the interests of the production process, society and the collectives of working people. This will provide a firm foundation for the radical renovation, for the revolutionary restructuring of socialist economic relations.

The author pays particular attention to ownership relations. This complex set of relations is in a state of constant dynamics and requires an equally constant

interpretation. It would be naive to imagine that a feeling of ownership can be developed through words, without it being implemented in daily practical activities. One cannot be master of the country without being true master at home, in one's plant or kolkhoz, shop or livestock farm. M.S. Gorbachev points out that the attitude toward ownership is shaped above all by the real conditions under which the person finds himself and the possibility he has of influencing production organization and the distribution and utilization of labor results. Therefore, the problem lies in the further intensification of socialist economic self-government. We must decisively enhance the role of labor collectives in the use of public property. It is important strictly to implement the principle according to which enterprises and associations are entirely responsible for their efficient work. This precisely is the nature of cost accounting. The labor collective must be responsible for everything. It must be concerned with increasing the public wealth. Such increase or its lack should affect the level of income of the individual member of the collective.

The adoption of cost accounting as a principle of economic relations means that the labor collective, as it creates certain values in the course of the production process and as it represents a segment of the people, actually acts as the co-owner of state property. However, the existing partial nature of cost accounting led to the fact that the collective had no legal rights without the permission of the superior authority in handling the property entrusted to it. The new USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) allows the labor collective to make use of the property of the whole nation as its owner; the enterprise is considered the owner of its specific share. The labor collective, which is the full master of the enterprise, independently solves all problems of production and social development. The collective uses its cost accounting income autonomously, and this income cannot be appropriated. The state is not responsible for the obligations of the enterprise and the enterprise is not responsible for the obligations of the state or of other enterprises, organizations and establishments.

The right to cooperative ownership has been restored, for it has by no means exhausted its possibilities in socialist production and in terms of the better satisfaction of the needs of the people. Practical experience indicates that a real possibility exists of increasing the production of commodities and services by the comprehensive development of cooperatives and individual labor activity. It is a basic Marxist tenet that no economic form can be discarded before it has exhausted its possibilities. In the past, however, we neglected this wisdom and thus did ourselves great harm.

With such prejudices in mind, which included the underestimating of commodity-monetary relations, at the 27th Party Congress M.S. Gorbachev cautioned against the trend to consider any change in the economic mechanism as virtual violation of the principles of socialism. In

this connection he emphasized that "...The supreme criterion in perfecting management as well as the entire system of socialist production relations should be the socioeconomic acceleration and the strengthening of socialism in fact" (vol 3, p 218).

The concept of restructuring management, which was formulated at the June Plenum, is aimed at redirecting economic growth, with the help of intermediary results, toward final and socially significant results and satisfying social needs, ensuring the comprehensive development of man, making scientific and technical progress the main factor of economic growth and creating a reliable anti-outlay mechanism. It should result in entirely new economic forms of socialist economic management. This will lead to the implementation of profound revolutionary change. The party is offering a radical restructuring of planning and management methods, which substantially change relations of ownership and distribution (naturally, within the framework of socialist ownership and of the basic socialist principle "From Each According to His Capabilities and to Each According to His Work"). All of this means an interruption in the gradual approach, a breakthrough in evolution and a progressive quality leap. Such steps largely indicate the triumph in socialist practice of Lenin's perspicacious ideas and projections and, in terms of their social nature, are a continuation of what began in October 1917. They are the continuation of the Great Revolution.

4

In this work problems of the theory of social relations and social policy are being solved in a nontraditional and profoundly innovative manner. We must mention that despite the fact that various documents in the past repeatedly made mention of the social aspects of politics, in theory they were being developed poorly and in practice were being implemented even less frequently. This is confirmed by the extensive practice of the application of residual financing of the sociocultural sphere and the violation of the requirements of the basic principle of socialism and the norms of social justice, increased thievery, bribery, and so on, as a result of weakened control.

The report submitted at the 27th Party Congress provided an expanded description of the nature of social relations and considered their place in the social system. "The social sphere covers the interests of classes and social groups, nations and ethnic groups, social and individual relations, and conditions governing work, way of life, health and recreation. It is precisely in this area that the results of economic activities, which affect the vital interests of the working people are implemented and the supreme objectives of socialism are embodied. It is precisely here that the humanistic nature of the socialist system and its qualitative difference from capitalism are manifested most extensively and clearly" (vol 3, pp 223-224). The level of development which was

reached, the quality of the new efforts and the clear formulation of tasks enable the party and the state to pursue a long-term profoundly planned, integral and strong social policy which encompasses all aspects of social life.

The idea of social justice runs through the improvement of socialist social relations. This involves real democracy, true equality among nations and the creation of ever broadening prerequisites for the comprehensive development of the individual. It also involves extensive social guarantees, such as the right to work, accessibility of education, culture, medical services and housing, and care of the aged, of motherhood and childhood or, in short, anything which could be described as a firm social protection of the individual. Nowhere had this ever taken place before socialism. Furthermore, anything which makes socialism what it is must be strengthened and developed.

The nature of social justice under socialism is found in its basic principle "From Each According to His Capabilities and to Each According to His Work." Distribution according to labor means the implementation of social justice. This is a demand based on the current level of development of production forces and social relations and is consistent with the interests of society and the members of society. Its violation and the trend toward equalization or toward unearned income are violations of justice.

The principle remains the same. It is inflexible, for it expresses an essential aspect of socialist relations. However, the practice which had developed of paying wages regardless of end labor results separated the interests of the individual worker from those of the collective: However matters in the collective developed, the person had to receive "his due." We see here an amazing example of turning into a fetish an adopted but quite undeveloped wage method (the individual "piece rate" in this case). Appearance is accepted as reality. It is considered that the piece rate is a wage based on labor. In socialist society, however, the quantity and quality of the labor of the individual worker cannot be separated from the state of affairs in the collective. It was precisely this approach that was asserted at the 27th Party Congress (see vol 3, p 226).

The unity of socialist society, which developed in the course of the entire 70-year history of the Soviet state, does not mean in the least any equalization of social life. Conversely, socialism develops the entire range of interests, needs and capabilities of the people. It actively supports the autonomy of social organizations and associations which express it. Furthermore, socialism needs the type of variety, finding in it a necessary prerequisite for the further enhancement of the creative activeness of the people, initiative and the competition among minds and talents, without which a socialist way of life or in progress are generally inconceivable.

It is precisely this type of creative and dialectical approach that characterizes the study of national relations within developing socialism. Today, when democracy and self-government are expanding, and when the national self-awareness of all nations and ethnic groups is increasing rapidly, and when internationalization processes are intensifying, the timely and just solution of problems which arise here becomes particularly important, providing that they are solved on the only possible basis of promoting the well-being of each nation and ethnic group and their further rapprochement and in the interests of the entire society.

"Our party's tradition which comes from Lenin, which is to be particularly sensitive and cautious in anything which relates to national policy and affects the interests of nations and ethnic groups and the national feelings of the people and which, at the same time, involves a principled struggle against manifestations of national exclusivity and boastfulness, nationalism and chauvinism, whatever appearance they may assume. We, communists, must firmly follow the wise Leninist advice which we must creatively apply under the new conditions. We must display extreme attentiveness and principle-mindedness in national relations for the sake of the further strengthening of the fraternal friendship among all the peoples of the USSR!" (vol 3, p 234).

5

The development of socialist democracy and people's self-government is the most important idea of restructuring. It is an idea which is organically related to upgrading the activeness of the masses, anticipating the awareness of the individual and enhancing the role of the human factor. The democratization of society is a guarantee and a necessary prerequisite for the success of restructuring.

M.S. Gorbachev's words "more democracy and more socialism!" have become a kind of slogan, a call for restructuring, the understanding of and loyalty to which are today being tested in every party member and Soviet person.

Two very serious considerations arise in this connection. If we need more democracy it means that we were short of it. This is indeed the case. In the pre-crisis situation of the 1970s and 1980s, our democratic institutions were not functioning properly. The voice of criticism and public opinion was, naturally, heard quite weakly or, in any case, not so loudly and authoritatively as to influence the adoption of timely and efficient solutions in matters of accelerating scientific and technical progress, upgrading economic efficiency, converting the economy to intensive development, ensuring efficient control in distribution, solving ecological problems, etc.

The second aspect is that the growth of democracy directly coincides with the growth of socialism. The nature of socialism as a social system is such that it can

be successfully improved only if the masses themselves work actively and are aware of everything. This Leninist philosophy of activeness of the masses is comprehensively developed in these works in terms of the contemporary socialist stage. They emphasize that "The socialist system develops successfully only when the people really manage their affairs, when millions of people participate in political life. This precisely is what self-government by the working people means in its Leninist understanding. It is the essence of the Soviet system" (vol 3, p 235).

Social creativity and blocking negative, routine and conservative phenomena and processes are possible only under the conditions of democracy. Particularly valuable in this respect are daring decisions of a theoretical and practical nature affecting the further identification of mandatory attributes of democracy, such as openness, criticism and self-criticism. Openness is a mandatory prerequisite for the enhancement of social life. It is "a prerequisite for a statesmanlike attitude, imbued with a feeling of responsibility, toward the work of tens of millions of workers, kolkhoz members and intellectuals. It is the starting point for the psychological restructuring of our cadres" (vol 3, p 241). However, openness is not simply a wish or an automatically operating socialist institution. One must work for its implementation. It must be a part of our policy and have legal backing. Openness is also a means of informing people of the state of affairs and management decisions. It must be supplemented with the opinion of the working people expressed on the subject of that same information and their assessment of the situation. This can be achieved through criticism and self-criticism. "We have no opposition in our country, for which reason we must pay greater attention to criticism and self-criticism. We must be able properly to react to criticism, to develop and support it. Criticism and self-criticism are needed by us like the air we breathe," the author notes (vol 3, p 17).

However, one must be able to use criticism the way one must know how to live and work under conditions of democracy. The call for learning how to live under conditions of democracy may have seemed almost blasphemous before April: What does "learning" mean if since our childhood we have lived in an atmosphere of democracy?... Yes, naturally, our society is essentially democratic. However, it is precisely because of the weakness of democratic institutions and our practical inability to solve arising problems democratically that we frequently do not know how to work under conditions of democracy. Quite frequently we still show no respect for the views of others. We do not listen to the arguments of opponents and react to criticism improperly or even painfully. It is precisely concern for the inability shown by many to live and to work under conditions of developing democracy that brought to life the appeal of "learning democracy!" which is essentially specific and bold.

Democracy under socialism cannot be consistent without democratization of the life of the labor collective.

"The task is for each labor collective actually to become a cell in the socialist self-government of the people" (vol 3, p 414). Formulating the question of self-government in the labor collective means adopting a practically new approach to problems of democracy under socialist conditions.

Naturally, a factory or a plant has its trade union and party agencies. Nonetheless, these are specific organizations with specific functions. The current labor collective councils are people's authorities whose nature is similar to that of the soviets of deputies of the working people. They supplement the latter and form a single system of people's soviets, a system of people's rule. Naturally, substantial differences exist between them but these are only differences. We are speaking here of similarities, of common features, which are also quite substantial. This is a major political step which enriches the theoretical concepts on ways of expanding socialist democracy.

Naturally, whatever questions may be considered or problems solved, the author focuses his attention on the party's life and role under the new circumstances and the task of democratizing its activities. "The Leninist Party, the party of communists, has always marched in the vanguard of the people. Today it is called upon to head the nationwide movement for the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development" (vol 2, p 162).

It was precisely the party that found within itself the necessary strength and courage to assess the situation soberly and critically, to admit the need for radical change in policy, in economics and in the social and spiritual areas, leading the country along the road of change and guiding the masses. This raised the question of the development of intraparty democracy. The steady and broad ties between the party and the masses, perfecting the ways and means of its activities, problems of ideology, education, the strict selection of people for party membership, shaping the party members in a spirit of the high Leninist requirements and asserting the honest and pure features of the party member are topics of great social significance and are extensively discussed in the work.

The mastery of political methods of management by the party organizations is a matter of prime importance. This is particularly necessary in connection with the radical reform in economic management. However, the aspiration of party authorities to assume administrative functions is not subsiding. The predilection for the use of the habitual methods is continuing. In the past this was the result of necessity, compensating for faults in the economic mechanism. Today such practices are twice as harmful. We must boldly abandon the practice of dispatcher functions. The main object of concern of the party worker must be the labor collectives, the people; the main area of his activities must be the political analysis of social phenomena, socioeconomic tasks, scientific and technical problems and identifying possibilities inherent in the human factor.

The changes which are occurring in society also affect problems of culture and are unquestionably having a beneficial influence on it: Today we can speak with full justification of an "explosion" of activeness in the spiritual life of Soviet society. The party deems its development to be one of its priority tasks. At the same time, the party's guidance of such processes is no simple matter. It requires tactfulness, an understanding of the nature of creative work and a mandatory respect for talent.

6

M.S. Gorbachev's speeches and articles develop and profoundly substantiate the new concept of foreign policy. Today, one way or another, problems of peace and international security, disarmament and the prevention of thermonuclear war are related the world over to the truly dialectical logic which has been described as "new political thinking."

On the basis of Lenin's concept of peaceful coexistence between the two world systems, the author unconditionally rejects war as a means of solving international political and economic contradictions and ideological disputes. Our ideal is a world free from weapons and violence, a world in which each nation can freely choose its way of development and way of life. It is an expression of the humanism of communist ideology and of its moral values (see vol 3, p 244).

The new political thinking is based on the clear and profound humanistic idea according to which with the existence of a destructive thermonuclear weapon human social interests assume unquestionable priority over the interests of countries, classes, nations and ideologies. The contemporary world has become too small and fragile to sustain a policy of force. It cannot be rescued and preserved without firmly and irrevocably breaking with the type of thoughts and actions which for centuries were based on the admissibility of wars and armed conflicts. One of the real obstructions to radical disarmament is mental inertia and a lagging in our thinking behind a world which is tempestuously changing under our very eyes. Many habitual conflicts and traditional ideas which may have been true 30, 20 and even 10 years ago have become today hopelessly obsolete. In a nuclear century with a world armed to the teeth and continuing to arm itself, this same world is fraught with the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war, even though we may assume that no one wishes it (see vol 3, p 139). All countries and nations without exception face a basic task: not to ignore social, political and ideological contradictions and to master the science and the art of behaving in the international arena with restraint and caution, to lead a civilized life, i.e., a life consistent with the requirements of proper international intercourse and cooperation (see vol 3, p 246).

The foundations for a comprehensive system for international security, formulated in the CPSU Central Committee political report to the 27th Congress, became the

specific embodiment of the Soviet philosophy of peace. The 16 January 1986 declaration of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary includes a plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction and the prevention of the militarization of outer space before the end of this century. These documents, and the entire set of other Soviet proposals have substantially changed the situation in the world and are creating favorable opportunities for achieving agreements, providing that our partners and opponents would heed our suggestions and the wishes of the peoples.

What makes this even more important is that the peoples the world over are facing a number of extremely difficult problems which can be solved only jointly and mandatorily under the conditions of a guaranteed state of peace. These problems involve ecology and energy. Another threat of upheavals comes from the growing gap between a handful of highly developed capitalist countries and the developing countries (which are in the tremendous majority!) whose lot is poverty, hunger and hopelessness. Mankind can solve all such problems today if it joins forces and minds. This would make new heights in the development of civilization accessible as well (see vol 3, p 108).

The course of history and social progress demand with increasing urgency the establishment of constructive and creative interaction among countries and peoples on a global scale. It not only demands but creates to this effect the necessary prerequisites—political, social, material and moral.

There is an urgent need to solve jointly and in the interests of everyone the aggravating problems of mankind, above all that of the survival of the human species. The real dialectics of contemporary history is found in the combination of competition and confrontation between the two systems and the growing trend of interdependence among countries within the world community. It is precisely thus, through competitiveness and the struggle of opposites, with difficulty, as though sensing it, the conflicting yet interdependent and largely integral world is developing.

M.S. Gorbachev's selected articles and speeches lead to an important conclusion which is that Soviet socialist society is a society which is quickly changing and intensively developing today. In the new historical round socialism needs a new system of theoretical views which, based on the firm foundations of Marxism-Leninism, would provide a modern idea of the trends and the ways and means of its development. Such a theoretical system must be as new as reality itself, as our present life. It must shed light on our immediate and more distant future.

The foundations for this new system of views on socialism has been laid and many of the important elements of the building itself have been erected. However, a great deal more remains to be done. Major efforts must be

made and a breakthrough is necessary on the theoretical front, a powerful breakthrough which will make clear the meaning of practical actions and offer new opportunities which would inspire the builders of the new society to a great and active social creativity, for the vision of the future and the new forms of socialist community life and a realistic awareness are the most powerful, the most captivating incentive of all, an incentive which moves the will, awareness and feelings of man and his behavior and activities.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

Soviet Economy at the Turning Point

18020018d Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 33-42

[Article by Yevgeniy Grigoryevich Yasin, head of department at the USSR Academy of Sciences Central Economic-Mathematical Institute, doctor of economic sciences, professor]

[Text] Our national economy is experiencing an exceptionally important and difficult period. A radical reform in the economic management system is being initiated. A turn must take place, felt by everyone. Until recently the increased activities of society were paralleled by increased concern. This was mentioned at the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum by M.S. Gorbachev: "The people are writing that they favor restructuring but see no change about them." Everyone has become accustomed to the fact that words may differ from actions and fears that restructuring may end with words only. The time for real actions, real results, has come.

Changes in industrial management became apparent as early as 1984. The first step was the large-scale economic experiment. Today all industry is essentially working on the basis of its stipulations. An effort was made through this experience clearly to abandon the concept of "gross output," and planning with mandatory volume indicators, and instead to formulate a plan based on the requests of consumers and interest the enterprises in implementing their procurement obligations and to use standardized methods in forming the wage and economic incentive funds.

Although small in themselves, changes which are real have revived economic and organizational work and made possible to assess the pluses and minuses of new developments. It became clear that the regulated establishment of the wage fund could stimulate the growth of labor productivity and output. However, it also became clear that planning based on consumer orders, all other conditions being equal, and applying the accepted methods of incentives for 100 percent implementation of

deliveries, leads the enterprises to avoid complex orders or to limit their size. A potential danger of reducing growth rates became apparent.

To avoid difficult assignments and a stressed plan was the stereotype of behavior of economic managers, which developed over decades of work within the framework of an administrative system dictated by realistic (rather than political economy textbook) production relations. They have remained unchanged to this day, for which reason the enterprises do not find it necessary to abandon the existing stereotype. If surveys would indicate that enterprises, shops, or brigades would begin to seek work instead of avoiding it, one could confidently say that restructuring in the economy has been completed. That would have been a simple and accurate indication! It would have meant that sufficient changes had taken place in production relations so that they could become boosters rather than obstructions in the development of production forces. The experiment neither yielded nor could yield such results.

The conversion to full cost accounting, self-support and self-financing was the next step. It was based on replacing the complex system of distribution of profits, which had not justified its use in the course of the experiment, with a simpler system in which the standards issued to enterprises were set on a level which allowed them to finance current activities and capital investments with leftover funds. The other elements remained unchanged. As you know, self-financing was initially tested at the Sumy Association imeni M.V. Frunze and the AvtoVAZ. The frontranking enterprises showed good results. Was this adequate proof of success? It became clear that it was not.

Several hundred associations and enterprises converted to self-financing starting with 1987. Half a year later, it turned out that the results they had achieved were no better than those of the others and, in some cases, were even worse. Could this be considered an argument against self-financing? Once again, let us not jump to hasty conclusions.

To begin with, several hundred enterprises equipped with different facilities, based on different production standards and operating under different financial conditions are not the same as two enterprises. All such enterprises had to be provided with economic standards which would have a stimulating effect. It was precisely here that the true difficulties appeared. Success in self-financing is inseparably related to identical rates, perhaps only on the level of defining regulations. If this condition is violated a trade begins as is the case in issuing mandatory indicators. In the course of the experiment rates which related the increased economic incentive funds to increased fund-shaping indicators were applied. Despite their obvious shortcomings (we are not discussing the substantiation of the existing level of funds and fund-forming indicators) it was easy to make rates uniform. The ministries now issued the enterprises

individual rates based on volume indicators of the already adopted 5-year plan. This meant that in most sectors enterprises which were converted to self-financing felt that virtually no changes had taken place. Matters at that point were different only at Minkhimmash, where uniform profit distribution rates were applied.

Furthermore, even if the enterprises earn the money they cannot spend it as they wish. The decision was made that the assets of economic incentive funds should be backed above all by material resources. The decision exists but there are no asset funds.... Practical experience has indicated that in frequent cases no more than 60 to 70 percent of requests are met. The Gosplan, the Gosnab and the ministries were allocating cranes, cement and bricks with an eyedrop, although they should have sought ways to eliminate reasons for shortages and seek ways of improving the balancing of material and financial turnover. Under such conditions even uniform rates do not guarantee that interest will be generated. Purchasing, selling or offering a suitable price to a partner is not permitted. One could offer higher salaries but the people take their earned money to stores where shelves are equally empty.

In order to make the enterprises increase the volume of output and collect consumer orders, prior to the enactment of economic incentives, the "gross output" was restored or, rather, it was its twin brother—the commodity output indicator. Once again it became the main feature in assessing enterprise activities. Today, the managements of enterprises, associations and ministries, are concerned with nothing other than the "commodity" in terms of meeting the stipulations of the planned period. Ministers order directors to "give us a million, give us 10 million."

The growth rate of commodity output began to increase in the second half of 1985; in 1986 it increased 4.9 percent in industry. At the same time, however, the indicator of meeting procurements began to decline and once again stocks of unsold goods began to accumulate and a significant percentage of them had to be shipped for "responsible storing" to Gosnab bases, and efforts are being made to force the consumers to buy the remainder. Is the price—material as well as moral—not too high? The people who have begun to believe in restructuring and openness would like to understand why is it that they must once again work on the basis of indicators.

Starting with 1984 the Minelektrotekhprom has conducted surveys of enterprise managers. At that time, when the experiment was launched, a positive assessment to the new economic management conditions was given by 60 percent of the respondents; the figure dropped to 55 percent in 1985 and to no more than 36 percent in 1987, on the eve of the June Plenum; 53 percent believe that the rights of enterprises have actually not been increased; 27 percent consider that the rights have become even lesser compared to 1984; 61

percent of managers believe that planning commodity output will not contribute to the true solution of the problems of acceleration and 72 percent have estimated that in the past 3 years no changes whatsoever have taken place in planning, such as to improve the substantiation of plants.

The common feature characteristic of these problems is that they all are based on the incomplete nature of the steps which were taken. The distribution of income is being restructured but the dynamics of the flows of materials has remained virtually untouched. The rights of enterprises are being increased but the superior organizations continue to work as they did in the past. A mechanism deprived of internal coordination cannot be efficient. The experience of the 1960s should be a lesson to us. The administrative system, which has endured by virtue of its integrity, which was developed over a number of years, should be countered with a new system consistent with contemporary requirements, and equally integral. What precisely should it be? How to solve the problems which hinder restructuring?

The historical role of the June Plenum is that it answered these questions. Today we have a scientifically substantiated concept for a new integral economic management system. We have a program for the implementation of this concept, which lets us hope that the target will be met. Restructuring was given a new powerful impetus.

The concept is based on a course of expanding the autonomy of enterprises and total cost accounting. This is not self-seeking but a means of intensifying economic responsibility and interest. We can reach the individual and make him a proprietor only by changing the status of enterprises and influencing them economically, for a true proprietor is only he who knows that he will keep the just results of successful work but also that he will be held responsible for eventual losses.

How to accomplish this? There are two prerequisites: self-support and self-financing. However, there is a third prerequisite as well: The enterprise must formulate independently its production and procurement plans, ensure a market for its output, choose its suppliers and actively participate in setting the price of produced and consumed commodities. Discipline in the implementation of plans must be backed by extensive rights in the course of their formulation and coordination. It is essentially this that is known as autonomy. And it is these three prerequisites, combined, that form the content of full cost accounting.

Unlike the first two principles, the third has triggered fierce debates. The reason is simple: It is precisely these requirements that affects the true foundations of existing economic management methods—planning, production and distribution of commodities from above, allocation

of centralized funds and assigning consumers to suppliers. Since matters have gone that far, this means that it is not a question of decorating the facade of the obstruction system but of dismantling its bearing structure.

In the eyes of many people it is precisely these methods that are the nucleus of a planned economy. If the enterprises plan, accept and place orders for themselves and set their own prices, would it not be a return to a "market economy?" We are as yet to hold theoretical discussions on this topic. For the time being, let us approach this problem pragmatically.

Long years of functioning of the administrative system proved that it is precisely these features that trigger the mentality of dependence: give less and take more. Perhaps these are the origins of scarcity, hindering scientific and technical progress, for they do not allow a fast procurement of the necessary materials and equipment precisely consistent with needs and direct contracting with related enterprises, which would also include price setting. The economy is based on prohibitions and in this case those who can sign, permit and grant gain special power within it. Over the past 20 years its has also become clear that it is impossible to eliminate such shortcomings by improving on existing methods. Further arguments to this effect have been added over the past 2 years: No self-financing is possible if such shortcomings are not eliminated. If earned money cannot be spent without the permission of the Gosplan or Gosstab, it means that it cannot be spent profitably. What then is the point of earning it?

If, as we consider such arguments, we are convinced that such a degree of independence of enterprises means a re-creation of the "market" it means that this is necessary. It would benefit the people and socialism. This would be beneficial even if we have to abandon dogmas based on skillfully selected quotations.

As to centralized plan management, it remains an intrinsic feature of the socialist economy and must become more efficient. It is clear today that the old methods created the illusion of planning and true centralism. We must learn to manage in a new style, without orders and directives. As it is, the state has sufficient instruments to accomplish this without them. If the enterprises truly convert to full cost accounting they will become responsive to economic management methods. At that point instruments such as state orders, prices and economic rates will become truly efficient. Financial resources, concentrated in the hands of the state, will become an efficient instrument in the exercise of an active investment and scientific and technical policy. The elimination of centralized funding does not mean abandoning the plan or socialism. It only means abandoning an administrative management system which has become a hindrance to its development.

The plenum formulated the main set of steps which constitute the content of the radical economic reform: conversion to wholesale trade, restructuring of price setting and the financial and credit system and the organizational management structure. Wholesale trade without stocks and orders, and with the free choice of partners gives enterprises true autonomy. In order for the enterprises to use such autonomy in the social interest, the prices which must be set should reflect the social usefulness of products and socially necessary outlays for their reproduction. It is only such prices that can coordinate interests of the enterprises with those of society and create incentives for the growth of productivity and the economical consumption of scarce goods. That is why prices must be linked to the plan and the realm of application of contractual prices must be broadened. Finally, restructuring in price setting and improvements in the financial-credit system and in monetary circulation enable us to strengthen the ruble and to increase its value. Within the organizational structure a new type of relations must be established between enterprises and economic management authorities, which would exclude the possibility of bureaucratic administration. If we succeed in doing so it means that the mechanism would be able to function at full capacity.

After the June Plenum the tasks of radically restructuring economic management were shifted to the area of practical steps. The reform must be prepared and completed before the start of the 13th 5-year plan. Ahead of us is the struggle related to solving a large number of practical problems, for which reason it is important to anticipate them and to assess on time and realistically the difficulties this involves.

The most urgent problem today is to combine the reform of the economic mechanism with the implementation of the 12th 5-year plan. I believe that it is clear that the good indicators of 1986 were achieved essentially not through economic but through essentially administrative methods. The growth rates declined sharply in the first quarter of 1987. Currently we are catching up but with a great deal of difficulty.

Meanwhile, the stress of the planned assignments is increasing every year within the 5-year period, which could aggravate the scarcity of resources and worsen the imbalance. We must take into consideration that the 5-year plan was drafted within the framework of the existing management system and bears the marks of its shortcomings. The growth of many types of commodities was planned above realistic needs. As cost accounting strengthens, demand for investment resources declines. We are already forced to limit the production of combines. For the sake of the plan light industry is producing a great deal of commodities which are not in demand. A structural reorganization is needed in all sectors, something which poorly agrees with the high pace of economic growth. We must display a more serious attitude toward the lessons taught by the state inspection system and accurately interpret Lenin's words "better less but better."

Naturally, we must not weaken our efforts in increasing the production of commodities needed by the country. Under the current circumstances, the fear of corrections to be made to the 5-year plan, based on a sober assessment of the situation, could trigger increased disproportions and harm restructuring. The 5-year national economic plan is, above all, not a set of assignments concerning growth rates but a set of objectives of socio-economic development, concretized in a system of indicators. It is particularly important today to emphasize quality changes which we are trying to achieve during the 12th 5-year period. The time has also come to consider yet once again whether or not in some sectors we should sacrifice quantitative growth for the sake of efficiency, technical progress and balancing. Furthermore, should we switch into high gear while simultaneously trying to replace the engine?

V.I. Lenin believed that "Involvement with labor is the most important and most difficult problem of socialism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 33, p 285). So far, we have been unable to solve it. In guaranteeing the right to work, socialism has deliberately rejected an inhumane incentive such as unemployment. Unemployment should be replaced by distribution based on labor. However, this substitution can be fully effective only when differentiations in earnings, based on labor results, reflecting its quantity and quality, are sufficiently broad.

In fact, the opposite can be noticed. The current economic mechanism allows enterprise administrations to pay wages regardless of labor results. Under the influence of existing economic relations, an atmosphere of lack of discipline, low reciprocal exigency and tolerance has become the standard for a significant percentage of labor collectives. This lowers the prestige of highly skilled work and initiative and strikes at labor morality. The people prefer to show their enterprising nature outside public production.

The popularization of the collective contracting order, combined with management democratization, is one of the approaches to the solution of this problem. We are familiar with many cases in which such methods have yielded significant results. We also know that because of a formal attitude toward them, for the time being they have been unable tangibly to influence overall results. A principle-minded approach to the development of collective contracting was formulated at the June Plenum. It involves combining it with full enterprise cost accounting.

In this connection, the use of the residual method for the distribution of the gross income is of particular interest. It is mentioned as a second model, as the collective contracting model, in the "Basic Regulations on the Radical Restructuring of Economic Management," which were adopted at the June Plenum. For the time being, an unwillingness to apply it has been displayed, and so has fear of risk. Nonetheless, this method has

already proven its usefulness. For example, starting with 1 January 1987 a similar system was applied, combined with internal cost accounting, at the Veshkinskiy commercial equipment combine of the USSR Mintorg. In 5 months the volume of output increased by 16 percent; labor productivity increased by 27 percent and average wages by 11 percent. The collective wage fund accounted for 92 percent of the respective period in 1986 and the personnel was reduced by 10-12 percent. Conflicts appeared, for conscientious workers began to refuse to work alongside loafers.

Since the beginning of the year 16 associations of the USSR Mingeo have begun to make extensive use of the collective contracting method, under full cost accounting conditions. The results of the first quarter are the following: Compared with the same period in 1986 gross income increased by 10.6 percent; labor productivity by 13.4 percent; and the wage fund per worker, by 10.1 percent. The personnel was reduced by 2.5 percent. Characteristically, in a number of associations the workers asked for stricter output norms, for earnings no longer depended on meeting them; the associations began to get rid of surplus stocks and requirements concerning the development of new equipment based on their orders became considerably stricter. Good results were also achieved by the Belorussian Ministry of Light Industry, where this method was applied as well. Let us not jump to hasty conclusions. A profound study and the evaluation of all pluses and minuses are necessary. However, we must also more boldly undertake experimentation and gain experience.

Lack of preparedness for the mastery of the new conditions is a major problem. This applies to independence for enterprises and managing with the help of economic methods by ministries and departments.

It is above all the frontranking collectives and strong managers who are interested in independence. Laggards and those of "average" strength are in no hurry, for the present system suits them, concealing their work faults. Particularly noticeable is the lack of preparedness on the part of enterprises to convert to wholesale trade. Consumers fear a worsening in material production support. In the survey we mentioned 72 percent of enterprise managers expressed themselves in favor of wholesale trade but only 29 percent believed that it could be organized properly by the Gosstab territorial authorities; 48 percent were unwilling to rely on it. Producers have also become accustomed to guaranteed sales. They do not know how to study demand nor do they have the necessary services to this effect. The socialist market in means of production cannot be left uncontrolled. However, its organization requires the establishment of a special infrastructure, a system of information, advertising, legal services, insurance, etc.

The habit of taking exclusively the views of superior into consideration developed in the course of decades. Under those circumstances a number of progressive initiatives

can be discredited. Already now there have been cases of reduced responsibility of suppliers in converting to direct relations. The applied incentives for meeting procurement requirements played a certain role without, however, solving the problem. In order to eliminate the existing style firm measures will be necessary. We must increase economic penalties and relate them to the amount of harm caused and apply some of them to the specific culprits.

We are not entirely prepared to work under the new conditions and all of us must reorganize our work. However, this particularly applies to economic management authorities and the personnel of ministries and departments. So far they have used almost exclusively administrative measures and have become accustomed to power. Occasionally, as we read departmental documents in which economic methods are fully approved, the feeling develops that efforts are being made to hide the old directives and orders behind new terminology.

Starting with next year, many ministries will undertake to place state orders. The USSR Gosplan is already drawing up their list. We are short of time and yet we are starting another new process. The simple solution suggested is for state orders to apply to the most important variety of goods which determine basic ratios. This should apply to fewer items which, however, account for 50, 70 or 90 percent of the volume of output, depending on the sector. The implementation of state orders would be mandatory and such goods would be marketed at stable state prices which cannot be raised. The question is the following: What makes such state orders different from ordinary plan assignments? One thing only: The enterprise is granted the possibility of planning for itself the balance of its output. Naturally, as such state orders are placed, the ministries will have no difficulty in "issuing" their assignments as always. This approach, however, leads to the fact that the enterprises will find unprofitable precisely the state orders which will become similar to the tax in kind. The enterprises will demand that state orders be backed by material resources. Their variety will have to be increased, and soon afterwards it will be business as usual.

However, the system of state orders is planned as being a new type of vertical relations, not of administrative but of a cost accounting nature. These must lead to reciprocally profitable relations among partners and be based on contracts, involving material liability of the parties for the implementation of their obligations. Their particular feature is that one of the parties is a state authority and the object of the order is goods which the state considers particularly important, for which reason it assumes the obligation to distribute them. Priority in output could be expressed in economic terms, through higher prices, tax benefits or any other method. Only then could we speak of any competition for obtaining state orders.

The following question requires a clear answer: Under the conditions of reform what type of goods should be considered important? If this is the only thing which determines the national economic ratios, we shall never be able to reduce the volume of state orders and truly to develop wholesale trade and the market mechanism. It would be more natural to include in such trade, in addition to strategic goods, goods based on scarcity, while, at the same time, restricting the range of commodities in short supply on the basis of the implementation of a set of financial and crediting measures which would lead to a decline in inefficient demand. In such cases state orders will become effective should the market either fail to act out properly or triggers undesirable processes.

With such an understanding of state orders, the ministries will have to conclude contracts with enterprises, assume responsibility for the volume of the order and guarantee its implementation. They are not ready for this. This makes it even more important to learn how to work in a new style so that state orders may become an efficient instrument in controlling the market. It is important, albeit in no more than a few sectors, to convert to self-financing starting with next year and to stipulate precisely such a procedure for placing state orders.

Under the new circumstances prices and economic standards become the main management instruments. The materials of the June Plenum include the stipulation that prices will be set on a centralized basis only for the most important commodities, along with the formulation of the state plan, as part of the plan. Prices must be such as to encourage the implementation of the plan and to reflect planned reproduction ratios. If the task of conserving resources is formulated, we should plan not mandatory assignments on the conservation of materials with prices which lead to their waste but prices which would make the enterprises interested in resource conservation.

The idea is clear and the question is how to implement it. Naturally, the thought arises of linking the planning of prices to state orders, for state orders will apply to the most important goods which are particularly scarce. Balances will be drawn up precisely for such goods and they will be given priority in terms of investments. Prices are a suitable instrument to make such output profitable to producers and force consumers to moderate their appetite. They could be set on the basis of talks, in placing state orders and in setting fund ceilings. This would mean managing the socialist market on the basis of its own laws.

Today, before we have experienced the realities of the new mechanism, it is usually believed that planned prices and rates must be stable for at least 5 years. The merits of such stability to enterprises and planning

workers are understandable. But in such a case how to react to changes in demand and technology which are flexible by their very nature?

We believe that stability should not be understood simply as variability. It is rather a stability of rules and the predictability of change. A differentiated approach will have to be applied. Some rates, such as those pertaining to profits (income), and payments for assets, should remain firm. Others, such as prices of fashionable goods, or bank interest rates will change flexibly, reflecting demand.

Departmentalism and petty supervision are not the results of malicious thoughts. They are an inevitable consequence of the conditions under which the enterprises are subordinate to the ministry which bears responsibility for all aspects of their activities. A different type of relations, based on clearly demarcated competences and reciprocal material liability, is only starting to be applied. For the time being, many features of the administrative system have been retained and the decisions which are being made are frequently of a temporary nature. Recurrences of the past are inevitable and so are contradictions and straight opposition. That is why openness is particularly necessary today. We have a commission in charge of perfecting economic management and planning. Its activities affect everyone. However, information which becomes accessible to the public essentially ends with an enumeration of the problems the commission has considered. The current publication in the open press of such materials concerning the nature and development of discussions of most important documents drafted by this commission and by its scientific section are natural steps which would enable us to improve the efficiency of democratic control over the implementation of the plenum's decisions.

For a long time concentration and strict item specialization were the main principles governing the planning of the production process and investments. These were dogmas which few people question to this day. They were based on the simple idea of saving on the scale of the production process. The mass production of standardized items lowers production costs to a minimum. This is particularly true if we ignore the consumer.

The result is that today in many sectors a specific item is produced by one or two enterprises which acquire a monopoly status. Parts and technology specialization is developed poorly. Conversely, everyone tries to develop his own "barter economy," being unwilling to depend on the monopolies. It is believed, not without reason, that the dominant position of producers in the current economic management system leads to centralized allocation of resources and to assigning consumers to suppliers. Tomorrow, however, it will be a matter of replacing them. At that point we shall see that under the new conditions as well the consumer will have no choice, for in frequent cases there will be only one possible supplier.

The June Plenum indicated the need to develop economic competition and the competitive placement of state orders. This is an exceptionally important idea which as yet is being discussed shyly. We have lost and continue to lose a great deal for lack of real competitiveness and a long struggle against duplication and parallelism and the fact that we did everything possible to convert our economy into a bureaucratically rational one, without "unnecessary" parts to its machinery. In the new economic management mechanism competition becomes vitally necessary. Cost accounting, contractual prices, and wholesale trade are very dangerous in the hands of a monopolist who could dictate his own conditions to an even greater extent. It is no accident that many consumers fear to face him on a one-to-one basis and demand that the assignments issued to them be included in the plan and that centralized stocks and supplies be retained.

As a rule, there should be no losing or underprofitable enterprises under the new economic mechanism. Nonetheless, currently they account for 15-20 percent in many sectors. It is believed that the reform in price setting would substantially change the situation for the better. This, however, is true only for the extracting industry sectors. The situation may even worsen in the processing industry. Some of the losing enterprises are newly built and technically well-equipped. However, hopes for their profitable work are few, for it is not a question only of the long time needed for reaching their capacity but also of economically unsubstantiated plans, faulty assessment of the need for their output and their technological rigidity. This is a burden of the past which will take a long time to lift. What we should do is avoid making such errors in the future. What is particularly sad, however, is that sometimes such hopelessly losing enterprises cannot be closed down for they turn out to hold a monopoly and are irreplaceable producers of a certain commodity. The stipulation of possible bankruptcy, as found in the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) may be unable to play its role in this connection.

A course must be charted to creating the necessary conditions for economic competition and for giving a choice to the consumers in the placement of state orders, allocation of capital investments, and determining the organizational structure of the production process and the structure of associations and enterprises and foreign economic policy. Nonetheless, it would be expedient to concentrate the production of a given commodity within a single enterprise for a variety of considerations, a special statute must be drafted for such an enterprise which would exclude the possibility of it abusing its position.

One of the most crucial problems of restructuring is that of the methods of party management of the economy. As we know, usually in the local party committees economic matters are dealt with by people with experience in party economic management. It is no secret, however, that in the past bureaucratic administration frequently replaced

political guidance. The practice has still not been eliminated of "establishing" gross output indicators at all cost. There have been cases of obstructing steps aimed at terminating or closing down individual inefficient production facilities and enterprises and transfer of output with a view to preventing a worsening of rayon indicators. Of late a great deal has been justifiably said about the fact that the party authorities must not replace economic and soviet agencies. However, it is difficult to abstain from interfering if due to shortages in construction materials the building of most important social projects is being frustrated, if equipment idles due to lack of fuel, if underprocurements of complementing items lead to a halt in the production process, and so on. Nonetheless, the work style of party authorities must be changed. On the one hand, there should be fewer opportunities for interference. On the other, we must make use of their tremendous political potential in supporting collectives which are in the vanguard of restructuring and in solving the most difficult social and ideological problems with which any serious economic reform is inevitably related. We are as yet to face a serious and blunt discussion on this topic. We must seek new and nontraditional ways so that the authority and strength of our party may be fully put in the service of restructuring.

The Soviet economy has reached a turning point. The road ahead is open. However, we are not guaranteed from a retreat. Today the resolutions of the June Plenum are on the balance and the arm of the balance has swung upwards. However, we are faced with difficult problems the solution of which is hindered by bureaucratism, dogmatism and the habit of working at half strength and wait for our superiors to do everything. Many are standing by, waiting to see what will happen. Yesterday something could be achieved only in specific circumstances but not as a whole. Today the very circumstances are changing but we must struggle for the restructuring of our life. If it turns out tomorrow that restructuring has yielded nothing, the blame will go both to those who have become accustomed to and find so convenient the skepticism with which to justify their passive attitude. A "beautiful future," as M.S. Gorbachev said at the plenum, "may not come about if today we do not sweat as we work for it, changing our way of thinking, surmounting inertia and mastering new approaches." This is the duty of everyone who cares for the interests of the homeland and the destinies of socialism. A fighter engaging in a duel knows that he could lose but believes in victory. This victory becomes the more possible the stronger our faith is and the more we dedicate our forces to it.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

Potential and Returns From the Kostroma Nonchernozem

18020018e Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 33-52

[Article by Vladimir Ivanovich Toropov, first secretary, Kostroma CPSU Obkom]

[Text] The June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which adopted a program for radical reform in economic management, set each unit within the national economy and each party organization tasks the urgency and significance of which would be difficult to overestimate. Today the demand for a comprehensive approach to the solution of the main problems related to the further intensification of restructuring, formulated by the plenum, assumes particular meaning. As was noted in the plenum's document, the new system will be effective only if it is able to combine and harmonize the variety of interests of our society, including the interests not only of enterprises and sectors but also of republics, krays, oblasts, cities and rayons or, as we usually say, territorial interests. This conclusion also presumes, first of all, the intensified study of the specific nature of one area or another from the viewpoint of its socioeconomic potential and long-term development, and, second, planned and energetic actions by all units within the regional national economic complex, aimed at the integration of local interests and requirements with those of the whole people. From this viewpoint what is currently the situation in Kostroma Oblast where, we believe, the problems which are typical of the Russian Nonchernozem are clearly seen? What are the main areas in which the oblast party organization is seeking efficient means for their solution?

Facing Individual and Social Problems

Recently, in a visit to Mezhevskiy Rayon, one of the distant rayons in the oblast, I asked Aleksandr Stepanovich Zabayev, chairman of the Rassvet Kolkhoz, about the nature of his thoughts once the urgency of the sowing or harvesting campaign has passed and everything has relatively calmed down.

"I dream," Zabayev answered. "I see our village at the end of the 5-year plan in such a way that young and old walk on asphalted streets, and flower gardens instead of dust and puddles. People going to the livestock farm in a bus with stereo and curtains on the windows...."

Such thoughts may seem too down to earth to some: What is so special in such signs of urbanization and sufficiency, for today many people in the countryside already lead this type of life? However, one must be well familiar with the Kostroma interior to appreciate Zabayev's dreams. Today in some villages here for weeks on end one cannot use a motor vehicle for lack of roads; the caterpillar tractor becomes the main transportation vehicle. The land is by no means generous. It is podzolized and loamy, difficulties in animal husbandry have

become chronic and there is a grave manpower shortage.... Nonetheless, Aleksandr Stepanovich's thoughts are based less on emotions than on sober estimates. In terms of production indicators, the Rassvet Kolkhoz is not among the best even in the lagging Mezhevskiy Rayon. However, everything seems to indicate that this period will soon become part of the past. And, one would like to hope, that this will be final. Prerequisites for this hope are the active construction of housing, schools, kindergartens and internal roads, the park which was built by the kolkhoz youth, and the concern of the chairman to equip this park with entertainment facilities.... This means that the people trust that social priorities in our present policy are not promises but specific actions which imbue all party committee plants. Once the people believe they link ever more solidly their future to their native land and production indicators go up. Naturally, this is providing that the collective and its leadership work persistently and skillfully.

What is the essence of the most topical problems of the oblasts' socioeconomic development? Under the Soviet system basic positive changes have taken place in the region. A major production and scientific potential has been created. Although our northeastern rayons, which are the most distant from the oblast center, developed much more slowly, as a whole the oblast advanced quite successfully. However, starting with the beginning of the 1970s, the regional economy began to lose its pace of growth. Difficulties and unsolved problems multiplied and stagnation phenomena appeared in the production area and in the moral stance of many people. At recent CPSU obkom plenums we analyzed the reasons for the situation closely and self-critically and reached the conclusion that the difficulties typical of the entire national economic complex for the past 15 years had been aggravated by serious omissions and errors. Obsolete party management methods applied in economic construction, conservative moods, weakened discipline, inertia in solving social problems, which worsened the effect of an imperfect economic mechanism, prevented us from efficiently influencing the development of the economy and culture of towns and villages. The party obkom is fully responsible for this to the party members and to all working people in the oblast.

According to some sort of tradition to this day some people consider unacceptable to discuss in detail errors and distortions allowed in the recent past. However, we cannot understand the present or see the future without the past. The Central Committee has set the example to every party member and its party organization of uncompromising truthfulness in the study of previous decades. To follow this example means, above all, to extract the positive, the constructive knowledge from experience, including negative experience, the more so since it frequently is quite constructive.

Without discussing problems common to industry, such as the link between science and production, the quality of output, capital returns, and so on, let me cite a single

example: development of industry on the territorial level. This development was extremely uneven. Industry essentially developed in Kostroma and in Nerekhtskiy and Sharinskiy Rayons, which had rail connections. However, a study has shown that this circumstance was not decisive in setting priorities. For example, the city of Galich also has a rail track but most of its enterprises were ignored by the oblast and central economic management authorities.

Chaos and arbitrary decisions in the region's economy led, among others, to the fact that in recent years industrial commodity output in nine oblast rayons not only did not increase but even declined. As a whole, the adverse oblast industry indicators of job availability, worn down equipment, use of manual labor in "forgotten" rayons in terms of planning, worsened substantially. It was precisely here that sectors which traditionally suffered from lack of scientific and technical progress predominated: timber, timber processing and local industries, the food, leather-shoe and construction materials industry. The result was the following: Although positive examples could be found in industrial development, stagnation predominated in an entire group of rayons.

As to the oblast's agriculture, in the past 15 years more than 2.5 billion rubles of capital had been invested in that area. Such substantial investments helped to develop a major production potential in the countryside. However, it is being used quite insufficiently and is not yielding the necessary returns. For example, whereas basic production capital nearly quintupled over the past 15 years, compared with the 10th, during the 11th 5-year plan gross output increased only by 6 percent and was even lower compared with the ninth. In hydraulic construction alone more than 200 million rubles have been invested since 1970. However, this has not brought about any serious changes in the utilization of the land or in increased fodder production. As a result, grain crop yields have remained on the level of the 10th 5-year plan and in many farms the productivity of the daily herd has even dropped below the 1975 level.

What are the reasons for this situation, considering that we have set ourselves important and universally significant objectives and assigned multimillion rubles worth of investments to accomplish them, while real conclusions justify neither expectations nor expenditures? Why is it that sometimes tremendous organizational efforts and the work of hundreds of thousands of skilled people who care for the common project, yield no results? The answer to this main and just about most crucial problem of our social reality is provided in the party documents of the post-April period. The formulation of basic concepts such as "human factor" and "democratization" predetermined the main trend in the efforts aimed at the qualitative renovation of social life. Obviously, today there is no more relevant assignment for the party members than that of surmounting a decades-old tradition according to which party and soviet authorities and

economic managers and even public organizations in the center do not focus their concern on the individual with all of his real demands and interests but on technical and economic production indicators, considered as unrelated to the working and living conditions of the people and to problems related to improving production relations. What was the eventual result? Let me cite the following example:

As many other areas, in its time the oblast engaged in the energetic development of central farmsteads of sovkhoses and kolkhozes and built expensive animal husbandry complexes. However, this emphasis on the consolidation and intensification of agricultural production ignored the real and already long-developed structure of the Kostroma countryside, primarily consisting of forests and roadlessness, considering that the field, the cow barn, the school and the outpatient clinic should be close to the house. In reclassifying, as of 1971, of more than 1,000 villages as "futureless," about 500 schools, 248 stores, 74 clubs, 33 medical institutions and 45 post offices were closed in the oblast. The socioeconomic consequences of these steps were not slow in coming. In some 15 years 120,000 people left the Kostroma village and the number of people employed in the farms of a number of rayons dropped by an average of 14 percent. The impact which this had on production indicators is self-evident.

Understandably, the elimination of such "avalanches," and "deposits" is no easy matter. However, an increasing number of people link production work with its social aspects. The party's course of democratization and improvement of the human factor and democratization of all areas of social life is meeting with the warm support of the oblast's communists. Suffice it to point out that in the course of the party meetings which have taken place after the 27th CPSU Congress about 400 specific and thought out proposals have been formulated, aimed at the acceleration and intensification of the initiated beneficial processes. Now it is a question of implementing the concept of restructuring systematically and persistently.

Certain positive results are already obvious in the acceleration of the development of the social area. For example, last year's housing construction assignment was overfulfilled. All the planned schools, children's preschool institutions and culture and health care projects were completed. The work of the transport organizations was enhanced and assignments for trade and consumer services were fulfilled. I believe that the reasonably good indicators of the first year of the 5-year plan in industry and the agrarian sector are directly related to this; as a whole, they substantially exceed the average annual results of the 11th 5-year plan. However, these are merely the first steps in restructuring and we cannot describe them as a new quality of the work. Clearly realizing that the main effort remains ahead, the oblast's communists try to find the type of objectives which would take present requirements most fully into consideration.

Eliminating the Obstruction Mechanism

It is our conviction that one of the urgent tasks is the equalization of the indicators of oblast kolkhozes and sovkhozes, bearing in mind the acquired potential and achievements of the best collectives. For example, whatever the weather conditions may be, the Kolkhoz imeni 50-Letiya SSSR Kostromskiy Rayon, averages 45 quintals of grain per hectare; some 100 km away from this farm the average is 5-6 quintals. Similar disparities exist in the indicators of milk production and cattle weight increases. As a whole, the level which is being established is clearly insufficient to ensure the fast increase of goods on the shelves of stores and on the market. What is being planned with a view to surmounting the existing situation?

It was decided, above all, to streamline the allocation of resources throughout the oblast's territory and to eliminate disproportions as a result of which, until recently, approximately one-third of allocations for contractual construction went to Kostromskiy Rayon, which surrounds the oblast center, while the other two-thirds were distributed among 23 other rayons. We are planning drastically to increase the amount of housing and road construction, above all in the economically weak farms of the northeastern part of the oblast, where the negative consequences of population migration are still being felt. Naturally, this demands fundamental restructuring in the minds of many party and economic cadres: It is one thing to build not far from Kostroma and something entirely different to build almost 500 km away from it, in Oktyabrskiy or Vokhomskiy Rayons. Let me point out that last year not all that was planned was carried out, essentially because we were not able entirely to surmount the mental inertia of managers who continued to build as in the past, not where building was necessary but where it was more convenient. Strict measures had to be taken and construction problems had to be systematically supervised by the party obkom and raykoms. Today work on the development of the northeastern part of the oblast is being conducted according to schedule, although many further opportunities remain unused.

We consider as the second most important trend in increasing the efficiency of our agrarian sector the expansion and intensification of cost accounting principles in farm activities. It is hardly necessary today to prove that the comprehensive solution of organizational-production and social problems is impossible without perfecting economic work in all units of the agroindustrial complex. The knowledgeable and flexible utilization of all types of collective contracting enables us, among other advantages, successfully to counter manpower shortages, which for us is a very essential matter. The point is that although in the past 10 years the number of young people in the oblast aged under 30 increased from 16 to 36 percent, the problem of labor resources remains unsolved. Today the labor shortage in the countryside equals approximately 25 percent. For example, we are short of about 700 milkmaids and there are 78 mechanizers per 100 tractors.

The oblast party organization is achieving some results in the dissemination of progressive forms of labor organization and wages. Currently 78 percent of the Kostroma arable land is cultivated by collectives on the basis of contracting orders; the same principles are applied by 45 percent of the livestock breeders. The results of the economic autonomy of the basic production unit have been unquestionably positive: The average milk production of collectives working on a contractual basis is 12 percent and of crop growing by 20 percent higher than in usual subdivisions. Contracting is particularly effective wherever it has been developed not as an "oasis" in the midst of obsolete farming methods but has encompassed the entire collective. Indicative in this respect is the experience of Gridinskiy Sovkhoz in Krasnoselskiy Rayon.

Several years ago this farm was among the weakest, with low crop growing and animal husbandry productivity, a constant shortage of cadres and a backward social infrastructure. L.A. Ivanov, the new sovkhoz director, and the sovkhoz's party and social organizations decided to rely on cost accounting. All plowland and all cattle were assigned to subdivisions based on collective contracting principles. Today the kolkhoz is firmly standing on its feet, annually increasing its labor productivity by 12-15 percent. Profits and wages are rising and housing construction has been drastically intensified and so has the building of sociocultural and youth projects, roads and production premises. In short, the process discussed at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum is the one which is precisely taking place in Gridinskiy Sovkhoz: In order to ensure the fast increase in output we need good equipment, chemicals, strains resistant to adverse conditions but, above all, responsible people infinitely interested in the results of their work.

Yes, man is truly the measure of all things and his knowledge, experience and convictions are of decisive importance in all of our current projects. For example, whereas the collective contracting system has already become the basic form of labor organization in Kostromskiy, Nerekhtskiy, Krasnoselskiy, Makaryevskiy and many other rayons in the oblast, the situation with the use of cost accounting in animal husbandry is considerably worse. The family contracting system is being applied extremely unsatisfactorily and so is that of the intensive labor collectives, which is a highly efficient system. What is the reason? The reason is that many heads of farms and primary party organizations have very little economic knowledge and, this being the case, there is an inevitable development of formalism and notorious "measures," and "coverage" figures instead of the establishment of true cost accounting which must be absolutely clear to anyone applying it. What kind of understanding, not to mention competence, could there be a question of if, for example, in considering the work of the Kadyyskiy Party Raykom, at an obkom party meeting, on the application of cost accounting in agriculture secretaries heads of raykom departments were unable to solve basic problems?

That is why we assumed the task of training all party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol workers and cadres within the agroindustrial complex in the use of economic management methods. In accordance with the comprehensive plan formulated by the party obkom buro, in the implementation of which scientists, the most experienced specialists in the agroindustrial committee and the RAPO and economic managers were involved, last winter more than 56,000 workers took the "Economics of Cost Accounting" course. Characteristically, in the course of the training process we tried to abandon the traditional system of "lecturer-audience," and allow the people the opportunity to study specific experience in the various farms, exchange views, argue and test theoretical knowledge on the basis of practical work directly on the spot.

Today the results of such steps are being felt comprehensively and increasingly cost accounting forms of labor organization in the countryside are becoming basic. It is becoming increasingly frustrating to see the way the growing skills and the desire for independence among the people, which are directly related to them, clash with sluggish administrative-bureaucratic methods, which frequently continue to influence practical work. The press has frequently cited astronomical figures of documents "originating" from the republic and USSR gosagroproms. Alas, this "paper storm" has not bypassed Kostroma Oblast. The majority of documents are the result of useless conferences and meetings, taking kolhoz and sovkhos managers and specialists away from live action. We believe that the administrative units of the agroprom should abandon more daringly and firmly the worst tradition of the former agricultural administrations and the ministry of agriculture. Here as well, we believe, priority should be given to the views of party member-managers who could and should successfully counter the difficulties of the transitional period, objectively existing in the economic mechanism—its units, functions and relations which were established in the recent and more distant past.

What is a frequent practical result? We know the great attention which the party and the state pay to the development of the Nonchernozem and laying here the firm foundations for improving the well-being of the people, ensuring highly efficient production and recovering from the losses which this area experienced during the war and during other periods in the country's history, when the heavy burden of supplying the country with food, equipment and cadres fell on the Nonchernozem oblasts. However, the activities of some ministry workers essentially conflict with the solution of this national task. Let me cite the following examples:

A combine for the building of wooden houses, with a capacity for 250,000 square meters of housing per year, under the jurisdiction of the USSR Minlesbumprom, was built in Shari, in the northeastern part of the oblast. The production of individual insulated apartments was

planned. Before the enterprise could even begin operations it was already issued a plan broken down by quarters and consumers. The ministry not only insists on the immediate commissioning of 50 percent of its facilities without, naturally, providing any clearing facilities or any kind of social infrastructure, but, energetically, citing the USSR Gosplan, insists on issuing a "quota" of output—13 percent—to the Kostroma people. And all this is taking place in a situation in which the enterprise will be operating exclusively on the basis of local materials and will be staffed with oblast workers and engineering and technical personnel! It is obvious that we are not laying a claim to any kind of "monopoly" in this case: Unquestionably, the combine must meet governmental rather than oblast objectives. However, should the interests of the territory where it is located not be taken into consideration?

Or else let us consider the position of the USSR Mine-nergo on the use of capital investments at the Kostroma GRES. Everything pertaining to industrial construction was accomplished in full and on time. However, the percentage planned for providing social support for normal work or, in broader terms, for the activities of the enterprise collective, reached no more than 62 percent. In practical terms this means that the sports stadium, the commercial center, the public housing and laundry combine and a considerable amount of housing remained unbuilt. Here is a characteristic feature: In 1984 the ministry ordered the elimination of the lag in the construction of social projects for the GRES. However, year after year this plan is not being fulfilled and our repeated requests to Minenergo are left without any subsequent action.

Similar examples could be cited for enterprises under the MPS, Mintransstroy, Minstankoprom, Minpribor, and Minavtoprom. What is clear in each separate case is that sectorial headquarters are concerned only with the production functions of enterprises, as they did 10 or 20 years ago. It is as though restructuring is taking place separately, not affecting even the party committees of some ministries, which would have the right to demand of the senior personnel within their apparatus the implementation of the tasks which the party has set today to every one of its members. I am saying this in order to re-emphasize that the problems which have accumulated in the Nonchernozem can be solved only through the joint efforts of the central and local authorities. For example, currently the oblast is implementing a 5-year program aimed at the accelerated construction of housing in the countryside, in the economically weak farms above all. The plan calls for tripling the volume of new construction and all of our possibilities have been harnessed to this effect. But how will the collectives of sponsoring enterprises and organizations in cities and settlements, which come to help the rural builders, feel if their own social programs are being implemented on the basis of the "residual" principle? The enactment of the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) will create an essentially new situation in which command-administrative management methods or neglect of the administrative interests of labor collectives will be inadmissible. We must as

of now extensively undertake to make quality changes in relations between enterprises and ministries, not relying on the miraculous power of a document, however important it may be.

In our view, the problems related to improving territorial economic management are ripe for solving. They demand a systematic and energetic solution. The radical changes planned in this area, particularly in terms of the economic and social development of the individual areas, drastically enhances the role and responsibility of local authorities. The strengthening of the soviets and their executive committees and restructuring the activities of the permanent commissions and deputy groups are the foundations for the forthcoming extensive work. This process has already been initiated and is gathering speed. For example, currently the sessions held by local soviets are considerably more energetic and fruitful. Comprehensive "health," "culture," "trade," and "daily life" programs have been developed and are being implemented. The oblast executive committee has set up three new departments which coordinate problems of construction, transportation and trade, and consumer services, which are within the competence of the local authorities. However, are the limits of such competence not excessively tight? Today any socioeconomic situation is mediated by a number of factors which exceed the limits of an "individually considered" territory. In this connection, obviously, it is proper for the question of revising the role and functions of the oblast planning commission and of considerably expanding its rights and obligations is legitimate and is increasingly being discussed in the press and at various conferences. I believe it is precisely the oblast executive committee and the oblast planning authorities that should have the final word in the consideration of problems such as production of consumer goods, construction, location of new enterprises and determining the size of their personnel.

I wish to be understood accurately. The oblast's economy has a number of strictly "internal" problems which it alone can solve. For example, a recent study most clearly indicated that the reason for the failure of plans in industry, agriculture and construction in oblast rayons, such as Chukhlomskiy, Buiskiy, Pavinskiy and Pyshchugskiy, is the result above all of shortcomings in the work style of the respective raykoms and gorkoms which, as they have done in the past, emphasize command-administrative methods, belittle the role of primary party organizations and labor collectives and adopt a voluntaristic approach to cadre selection and placement. Many opportunities remain in the oblast in terms of all other areas of party, soviet and economic activities. However, existing difficulties drastically increase whenever "local" errors are worsened by decisions in which arbitrariness is sometimes significantly greater than common sense. For example, last year the oblast failed to fulfill its industrial profits plan. The main reasons were the unsatisfactory work of enterprises in lowering production costs and a variety of losses. However, the negative effect was significantly worsened by the fact

that repeatedly, as many as five times, the profit plan was changed in the course of 1986 in an upward direction and the largest oblast enterprises were subjected to this type of pressure. This occurred at a time when approximately one-half of them had initiated a conversion to cost accounting principles.

To Develop Initiative and Restore Principle-Mindedness

In the course of one of my assignments in Chukhlomskiy Rayon, I had a discussion with S.S. Ozerov, party committee secretary at Shartanovskiy Sovkhoz. I sensed the insufficiency of his knowledge in the area of party construction. I requested the minutes of party meetings, party committee sessions and work plans. I realized as I read them that both the party committee and the party organization were not dealing with their direct functions. Meetings dealt with work results of the sovkhoz over a specific time segment; sessions dealt with percentages, tons, rubles and kilometers. Where were reports submitted by party members and where were studies of the activities of shop party organizations and party groups? Why was the efficiency of decisions low? How were party assignments to party members, who were members of the trade union committee or of people's control, being implemented? No answers were found to these or many other questions which today naturally arise, when the party organization must provide maximally convincing examples of restructuring. Yet, in all likelihood this farm and its party committee had been frequently visited by senior raykom personnel and members of the CPSU obkom. Obviously, however, not one of them was truly interested in determining the manner in which the kolkhoz party committee was working and what concerned the local party members. Although many accurate statements were made, they failed to reach the target. The comrades assigned to such studies also engaged in "mowing," "milking," "plowing," or "repairing."...

This may be an isolated case but what a large number of major and crucial problems it reflects! The main one is what are the new features which should become apparent in the activities of the party committees under the conditions of the reform in economic management, and what was the main guideline in surmounting stereotypes which developed a long time ago? Unquestionably, the personnel of the obkom, raykom and gorkom apparatus should have a profound understanding of economics and other areas of knowledge, particularly in their own sectors. However, familiarity with the features of the assigned sector is one thing and taking over from economic managers is something entirely different. Why conceal it, to this day by no means have all party officials developed a clear awareness of the separation of functions which are "theirs" and "extraneous." It is at this point that we come across situations in which on the surface all components of party work may be found other than one—end results—which are difficult to express with figures. Hence the passive attitude of party members, impersonal meetings and abstract decisions.... The

result is poor economic management and sluggishness in social restructuring. Whereas yesterday we did not always pay proper attention to the condition in which a given primary party organization found itself, today such a "contemplative" attitude is no longer permissible. This drastically enhances the significance of the professional training of party workers, their political skills and the moral example they set.

I must point out that a turn for the better in this case has already started. A number of party gorkoms and raykoms have elected as first secretaries comrades who have not only solid knowledge and good practical experience but also the desire to raise party-political work to the currently needed standard. Let us take V.V. Afanasin, first secretary at the Galich CPSU Gorkom. In the course of his 38 years Viktor Vasilyevich has worked as a foreman in a plant shop, design engineer, city raykom secretary and secretary of a Komsomol obkom, and party obkom instructor. Assuming the leadership of one of the large party organizations in the oblast, he started not with meetings and cadre shifting but with visits to labor collectives where in the course of frank discussions with the people he systematically and persistently studied the real situation in all areas of enterprise life, in agriculture, schools, and so on. It was only on the basis of the personal and direct study of the views of party members and nonparty comrades concerning the practical aspects and problems of restructuring that the gorkom first secretary undertook to update the forms and methods of activities of the rayon party organization. It is too early to speak of any achievements in this case. For quite some time Galichskiy Rayon was in a state of stagnation and many problems with an extensive "root system" had accumulated. However, the initial steps taken by V.V. Afanasin instilled the hope that a creative, a daring approach based on the best qualities of the people, which is so greatly needed today, has been established in the work of the CPSU gorkom.

Noticeable changes in work style are taking place today in Mezhevskiy, Oktyabrskiy and Kadyyskiy CPSU Raykoms, where V.I. Osokin, N.M. Kostrov and V.I. Kulish were respectively appointed first secretaries. What links these generally quite different people? Above all, it is their sincere interest in what surrounds them, an understanding of the insurmountable fact that restructuring and quality changes in our reality are impossible without releasing the constructive potential of individuals. This being the case, means of democratization of social life are being increasingly applied in practical work and the party committees are acting more flexibly and efficiently.

For example, a tradition is developing in Kadyyskiy Rayon of discussing character references of managers and specialists at labor collective meetings, certifying cadres, sponsoring reports submitted by party members at party meetings and party raykom buros and plenums and holding private talks. It is natural that after turning

to the people and the study of the real motivations of their behavior, the decisions made by the Kadyyskiy CPSU Raykom are becoming better substantiated.

Naturally, these examples are not an indication that no negative manifestations exist in the life of the oblast party organization. According to the party control commission of the CPSU obkom, violations of discipline among party members are declining too slowly. Many cases of abuse of official position remain and, sometimes, of illegal activities on their part. Drunkenness has not been surmounted as yet. For the oblast as a whole, last year the party committees leveled charges against more than 1,000 party members and the number of those expelled from CPSU ranks increased by 9 percent. Some of them held managerial positions.

Let me emphasize, however, that this does not make the CPSU obkom buro pessimistic. Furthermore, in our view a clear trend toward improving the situation in the majority of party collectives in the oblast is clear. This is based on the strengthening of the high moral principles in current sociopolitical practices, and the shoots of civic-mindedness, honesty and principle-mindedness which are appearing everywhere. Let me cite a single episode which brings to light the mechanism of this most important process.

Before he was made chairman of the Put k Kommunizm Kolkhoz, O.D. Shelbakov was considered in Nerekhtskiy Rayon a person worthy of respect. However, his leading position quickly went to his head. He began to behave rudely with those around him and became intolerant of other opinions. He made decisions without coordinating them with the kolkhoz board. As usually happens in such cases, errors began to be made in managing the farm and cadre blunders. The kolkhoz party members repeatedly tried to correct this administrator who had become carried away, both in private talks and at party committee sessions. Increasingly, however, the chairman alienated himself from the collective. At that point, party gorkom member Yu.V. Korovin, kolkhoz mechanizer, took the floor at the plenum of the Nerekhtskiy CPSU Gorkom, and described with extreme frankness the conflict and the position held by the primary party organization. A general meeting of kolkhoz members was held soon afterwards, at which the collective expressed its lack of confidence in O.D. Shelbakov. A strict party punishment was imposed on the former manager. Unanimously, engineer M.N. Bogdanov, a fellow villager, was elected kolkhoz chairman.

Naturally, both the obkom and the Nerekhtskiy party gorkom drew proper conclusions from this recent event: One must make a thorough study of promotion candidates, not relying on a "paper" reserve or character references. What happened in this ordinary kolkhoz most clearly indicated how matured our people had become and how their inner dignity has strengthened. In thinking of such facts one understands that today restructuring is affecting the deep foundations of popular

life and that we, party members, must do everything possible so that every Soviet person will know that his voice is being heard, his opinion is being considered and anything that is useful and necessary will be mandatorily applied.

The June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which completed the elaboration of an integral concept for restructuring, shifted the ideas of the post-April period in party life to the practical level and to the decisive social area—economics. The difficulty of the initiated stage and its “mixed economy,” in which factors of the new and the old economic mechanisms are operating simultaneously, formulates the strictest possible requirements for every one of us. The special responsibility of the party committees today is due to the fact that the initiated radical reform affects the economic interests of millions of people. That is why today, more than ever before, what is needed is political maturity and firmness, combined with a sober analysis of the complex processes occurring in economic and all other activities of social reality. Having started the year with a lag in the basic indicators in industry and capital construction and some units of the agroindustrial complex, today the oblast working people are correcting their errors and surmounting the failures of the beginning of the year. Although many of the still extant negative aspects in economic management have not disappeared, nor could they disappear “by themselves,” the oblast party organization looks at the future with confidence, above all because the objective is clear and all the necessary means of achieving it are available.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS “Pravda”. “Kommunist”, 1987.

05003

Important Area of Openness

18020018f Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) p 53

[Letter to the editors by Yu. Yarmagayev, candidate of economic sciences, associate at the Leningrad laboratory of the Scientific Research Price Setting Institute]

[Text] In my opinion, under the new economic management conditions, we shall not be able to avoid the need for comprehensive information on the condition of our financial system. It is only on this basis that competent decisions can be made on all levels of production management, for the Gosplan and the ministries will have thoroughly to substantiate the efficiency of planned measures; enterprise managers will have to follow closely the situation with delinquent payments and changes in balances of loans to banks and seriously consider their outlays, production stocks and marketing; the Gosbank will have to display firmness and demand reliable guarantees in making loans.

Understandably, many organizations find it much simpler to work as in the past. It is only openness and extensive control by specialists and the public in the area of monetary circulation that can control departmental interests. For example, today one can obtain information on strategic armaments from the open press. Meanwhile, information concerning many most important financial indicators is much harder to obtain. We believe that there is no reason here for any secrecy, as confirmed by our own historical experience.

In its time the journal KREDIT I PLANOVOYE KHOZYAYSTVO, which was published by the USSR Gosbank between 1925 and 1930, provided a monthly study of the volume and structure of funds in all USSR banks. VESTNIK FINANSOV, which was published by the People's Commissariat of Finance between 1922 and 1930 printed the Gosbank and Gosbank Board balance sheets and the consolidated balances of the country's credit institutions, monthly data on the state of financial resources, and so on. In the 1920s the newspapers and journals published detailed comments and analytical surveys literally in the footsteps of events. Openness in the area of finance greatly contributed to the establishment and strengthening of monetary policy at that time.

Today a great deal is being discussed about the harm of “surplus money.” In the case of money surpluses the idea of enterprise autonomy will unquestionably remain nothing but a dream. That is why I consider it necessary to open access to information and finances. No objective obstacles appear for the regular publication of full reports by the USSR Gosbank Board on changes in the volume and structure of bank assets and liabilities and the thoughtful and serious study of the reasons for such changes.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS “Pravda”. “Kommunist”, 1987.

05003

Economics and Ecology

18020018g Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 53-54

[Letter to the editors by V. Dubinina, candidate of geographic sciences, scientific secretary of the Scientific Council for the Comprehensive Utilization of Water Resources and Protection of Water Ecological Systems, Ichthyological Commission, USSR Minrybkhhoz]

[Text] In my opinion, putting an end to a situation in which environmental protection steps are becoming a “burden” to industrial projects under construction or in operation could be helped by the search for economical and ecologically safe decisions at the pre-planning stage. No comparison is possible between the current expenditures of the national economy for environmental protection and the “advantages” of unjustified lowering of the

cost of projects in technical-economic proofs and blueprints. This was confirmed yet once again with the planning and construction of the Astrakhan Gas Condensate Complex (AGKK). It has already become clear that steps for environmental protection, planned for the period of its exploitation, do not exclude the possibility of causing irreversible harm to the ecological systems in the lower reaches and the delta of the Volga and the Caspian Sea, and the pollution of water reservoirs with effluents.

The project seems to include what appears to be the latest technology for obtaining sulfur from sulfurous gas (99.6 percent). However, what is the meaning of the remaining 0.4 percent? It means that 10,000 tons of sulfur will be released into the atmosphere in the operation of the first part of the complex, i.e., 20,000 tons of sulfurous anhydride. Some 2.5 million tons per year of carbon monoxide will be released into the atmosphere. The gross release of toxic substances in the air alone will reach 100,000 tons annually!

The environmental protection measures currently planned have fallen behind the pace of construction of the industrial complex, which increases the degree of atmospheric saturation with gas: The content of sulfur dioxide in the air in the AGKK zone frequently goes beyond the maximally admissible concentration by a factor of 4-8 or more and reaches and in the area 80-100 km away (the area of the Damchik sector of the Astrakhan reservation), by a factor of 2-2.5. In 1986 the content of industrial lead, copper and aluminum in the delta water reservoirs exceeded the basic level by a factor of 6.7; and of mercury, by a factor of 10-16. The ecological situation in the AGKK zone is alarming. Suffice it to say that after a breakdown of the operating part of the complex in March 1987 there was a drastic reduction in the number of food microorganisms in the waters of the Akhtuba and Malyy Lanchug. It is still difficult to gain a full idea of the entire consequences of the operation of the AGKK in terms of the natural environment of this unique area. However, we must as of now think about them and make the necessary decisions urgently.

Bearing in mind the tremendous scale of industrial output planned for the Caspian area, related to the extraction of petroleum, natural gas and mineral raw materials, the only economically expedient and ecologically substantiated way of their development should be the creation of wasteless production facilities and production complexes. At the present time the commission for the study of production forces and natural resources of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium is having a program drafted for the development of production forces in the Caspian area, with a view to defining the main long-term areas of development of the national economy in this region. At the same time, a program for environmental protection must be developed on the corresponding scale and in accordance with the rate of expansion of the industrial program.

In my view, for the time being it would be expedient to halt the exploitation of the operating part of the AGKK, which is the gas processing plant, and to convert the first part of the complex into an experimental production facility in which one would be able to gain an accurate idea and study quite extensively ethical and ecological problems. It is only on the basis of the results of such studies that it would make sense to resume the designing of the second and third sections and to undertake the industrial exploitation of deposits.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

Literature For Practical Workers

18020018h Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 54-55

[Letter to the editors by A. Gavrilov, rector, Volgograd Agricultural Institute, doctor of agricultural sciences, professor]

[Text] In my view, the time has come to change the approach to the publication of works for specialists-practical workers in agriculture. Naturally, many good textbooks exist along with classical works in the agrarian science and works written by modern authors. However, we are obviously short of publications on vital practical problems and on long-term developments. The agroprom is converting to intensive development. Scientific systems are being applied for crop growing, feed production, animal husbandry and management. Publications for use by practical workers should be given a scientific content.

Every single day the press, radio and television bring us additional news from experimental fields and research laboratories. However, these are only "bridges" leading to the search for more basic data, for the steady enhancement of the professional knowledge of agroprom workers is impossible without specialized publications. We believe that the published stereotyped works no longer meet present requirements. The consolidation of Agropromizdat has increased the variety of topics. We believe, however, that this has not had any influence on improving their content. The same applies to Rosselkhozizdat. All works prepared for printing are strictly classified into "scientific" and "production," as though the need for the integration between science and production does not exist. Requests for the publication of works "on theory and practice" are even not accepted for consideration. I have noticed that students enrolled in skill-upgrading departments try to stock up with "production" pamphlets and more expensive scientific publications. According to them, this not only provides more new information but also, strange though it might seem, such works are written in a more intelligible and simpler language. Yet the authors of these works are frequently the same. The explanation is simple: The publishing

houses tend to "emasculate" scientific works less and do not try to classify them under some kind of common denominator. A good editor who helps the content of a book to become more concentrated and intelligible is, naturally, necessary. From personal experience and talks with my colleagues, however, I know that the interests of authors and editors do not always coincide. There is frequently fear of controversial ideas and of new developments from research. Frequently important fine points, details and findings disappear in the course of the editing although it is they which allow to perfect agrarian technology on the basis of local conditions. In my view, it is precisely this that is most necessary, for it would be difficult without such shades of meaning to understand why a specific method yields excellent results in one farm and very modest results in another. It seems to me that it is important for the personnel of publishing houses today to be better familiar with the nature of their main readers, and their interests and requirements.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

Democracy in the Life of the Scientific Collective
18020018i Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) p 55

[Letter to the editors by Ye. Mishustin, academician]

[Text] In my opinion, it is important today to take a real look at the problem of democratizing the life of scientific collectives. I believe that the steps which are being taken in this area by the USSR Academy of Sciences are of a formal halfway nature.

Actually, the new provisional statutes on institute activities note that the management of institutes is achieved by developing openness, criticism and self-criticism, taking public opinion into consideration and ensuring favorable conditions for creative work, debates and competitiveness among scientific ideas and results. A collective participates in management of institutes in accordance with the Law on Labor Collectives. However, according to the new bylaws the rights of the scientific council, which is the specific self-governing authority of scientific institutions, and which includes the most prestigious specialists are, in my view, "decorative." According to the bylaws, the scientific council is a consultative authority under the institute's director. The composition of the council is approved according to presentations made by the director and the council decisions become effective subsequent to their approval by the director. The scientific council has no influence on the director other than that of a publicly expressed opinion. The director is totally unaccountable to the council; he is chosen by a specific department of the USSR Academy of Sciences and is accountable to that department only.

Actually, the new bylaws, having proclaimed the need to consider public opinion and the development of openness, criticism and self-criticism, has ignored the instrument with the help of which all of this could be efficiently implemented—the institute's scientific council.

According to many specialists in recent years the quality of scientific publications has declined substantially: They frequently look like newspaper ads. Naturally, this has been helped by the system of certifying scientific workers according to the number of their printed publications and the requirement of the Higher Certification Commission that publications are a preliminary condition for the defense of the dissertation (i.e., the publication of actually unfinished projects!). However, another important fact is that the opinion of a specialist can be published only after his manuscript has been personally approved by the institute's director. Yet publishing in a scientific journal is the basic path through openness and criticism in the life of a scientific community and a natural method for the exchange of ideas and the development of science.

Obviously, in special cases one-man command principles should be preserved. This is expedient in the case of urgent and large-scale target programs, which are usually of an interdisciplinary nature and the topics of which exceed the framework of a single institution. However, the scientific life which develops in the institutes is not determined exclusively by target programs but covers a variety of areas. It can be guided only on a collective basis by the director with the direct participation of the scientific council, the membership of which should be democratized and whose rights should be increased.

In order to enhance the individual responsibility of the scientist and not replace it with the responsibility of an institution in which he works, a true democratization in the life of scientific collectives is necessary.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

Economic Aspect of the Preservation of Monuments

18020018j Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) p 56

[Letter to the editors by V. Vinogradov, associate at the Spetsproyektrestavratsiya Institute]

[Text] In my opinion, despite our understanding of the political nature of the problem of safeguarding historical and cultural monuments and protecting the architectural originality of our towns and villages, we still give little thought to the specific mechanism which makes such problems so difficult to solve.

However, there is a corresponding article in the USSR Constitution; there is also the USSR Law on the Preservation and Utilization of Monuments of History and Culture; there also exist numerous important and good resolutions which, essentially, are violated.

Why is this? Could it be explained as a result of someone's ill will, ignorance or circumstantial considerations? Naturally, no. The fact that violations of legislation in the reconstruction of historical cities were and remain precisely a system, leads us to assume the existence of some kind of basic fault in the existing approach to the solution of the problem. What objectively leads the local authorities to violating the law?

The natural wear of historical buildings, which for years were left with virtually no preventive or capital repairs, has made us drastically to increase the volume of reconstruction work over the past 20 years. As a result, historical buildings have begun to wear out much faster than the restoration of individual monuments. Yet without such restoration the monuments themselves become "morally destroyed" as a cultural phenomenon.

The most important reason for the extensive spreading of this condition, I believe, is the fact that reconstruction plans are drafted and approved regardless of the condition of the historical-cultural stock. Basic technical and economic capital construction indicators used on all levels of planning still inevitably lead to the mass wrecking of so-called low value or obsolete buildings. But who determines the degree of their value, where and how?

Gosgrazhdanstroy regulations do not mention the need for special preplanning work for the historical-cultural substantiation of the need for reconstruction. Blueprints and building projects on which the activities of the local authorities are based presume the formulation of technical and economic indicators only for capital construction, excluding outlays for capital repairs and restoration. Yet the amount of such work in historical cities is no lesser than the amount of new construction.

Under these circumstances, in some areas it becomes more profitable, at the design stage, to classify a building, ignoring its historical-cultural valuation, as an obsolete property of little value. It is more profitable to build a material-intensive capital building paid out of centralized funds. It is more profitable to "procure" such funds rather than to develop repair and restoration. The existing approach does not allow the local authorities to "combine" funds from local and centralized budgets and to determine the correlation of work for the repair and restoration and admissible new construction or to judge substantiatedly on the efficiency of such a correlation included in the plan.

That is why it would seem expedient for the regulations to stipulate the Historical and cultural substantiation of reconstruction, approved by the local soviets preceding the design projects. This would develop as a kind of

inventory which would adequately reflect the conditions of historical buildings. It should be used as a base in issuing initial design data, assessing the cost of reconstruction and ensuring the continuity of the steps which are being taken. Otherwise, without an assessment of the historical-cultural fund, the reconstruction of our towns and villages will continue to take place at the expense of cultural monuments and the historical environment.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

Literature and the New Way of Thinking

18020018k Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12,
Aug 87 (signed to press 29 Jul 87) pp 57-65

[Article by Igor Aleksandrovich Dedkov, *Kommunist* political commentator]

[Text] "Should we remember...should we..., do we need all this?" Yuriy Trifonov asked in the novel "Vremya i Mesto" [Time and Place] (1981). Is it necessary, since our fathers did not come back, the children grew up and became adults, and an entire age is gone?

The bitter answer which asserts itself is that "No one has to do anything." However great the sadness of a minute may be, that minutes passes and so do years of bitterness but eventually it turns out that one has to.

Otherwise could we consider ourselves sufficiently honest and courageous? Could moral political force do without a clear and full historical self-accountability? Could conscientious historical thinking survive on innuendoes, suppressions or deletions? Could artistic and literary-critical thinking pretend that something did not exist even though it did?

Ever since childhood, since school, generation after generation accepted the idea that communism is a moral political force ("the mind, honor and conscience of our age"), that Soviet historical science is a loyal servant of the truth, and that Soviet literature means being loyal to reality, the education of the new person, and the defense of the lofty spiritual and moral values of mankind.

Whatever serious corrections were made by practical experience to some of these concepts, they essentially remained unchanged. As we know, for a variety of reasons implementation deviates from intention. However, the more people formulate intentions and struggle for them, the more inevitable becomes a return to it, checked against the new knowledge and the lessons of the past.

In his novel "Posledniy Otpusk" [Last Leave], which was written in the mid-1960s, Aleks Adamovich describes the shadow which was cast by a "man shorter than average, who skillfully positioned himself against the rising young sun of the Great Revolution."

Need we recall how long it took us and the difficulty we had in getting out from under this thick shadow? Is this necessary, if we find that same shadow on some faces, old and young, to this day? No, I have no intention of discussing all the alarming facets of this "shadow" topic in its old and new varieties. I shall discuss literature only and the words must and necessarily do apply, above all, to literature.

The reason for which I would like to recall something now is not for the sake of deliberately finding out, "digging up," but only because I cannot forget and have never forgotten this. What a thorn in the flesh this has been, for years on end....

Actually, this was nothing special, not to say exceptional....

In 1965 one of our central newspapers used the following terms in reviewing a novel by a young writer: "isolated, petty truth," "uninteresting attitude shown by the characters in the novel toward labor," "their duty on this earth appear dull, poor in content, uninspired;" labor is depicted "as something strictly ordinary, deprived of any whatsoever romanticism or shade of heroism."...

Petty, poor, uninteresting: Let us remember these words.

The novel "Semero v Odnom Dome" [Seven in a House] by Rostov writer Vitaliy Semin, of which it is a question, which was one of the best works of our prose in the 1960s, was first reprinted 10 years after such a negative review. I am not discussing the consequences of such criticism or blame someone for an error made a long time ago. At that time, in 1965, such ideas struck me for their strange and arrogant alienation from the realities of life and the obvious unwillingness to accept a mention of such facts without being asked. It was as though literature was being assigned a specific level of "interest," heroism, romanticism, and "great truth," and any inconsistency with them was persecuted as though it were ideological heresy. This socioaesthetic concept was based on the fact that everything which one had to know about the life of the country and the people was perfectly well-known, for which reason there was no need for someone to discuss in literature and, in general, in art, the question of how does the individual live today and what kind of individual is it? If the talent of a writer, as was the case with Semin's novel, led to the creation of an outstanding and attractive image of what was "not interesting," the conclusion was that "the author's talent only intensifies shortcomings" of some type of work based on an "erroneous idea." The attitude of the artist toward reality was thus simplified and the artistic ability itself to go beyond the initial idea of objectivity was

belittled. Meanwhile, the stimulating influence of the "right idea" on the artist was overemphasized. Bearing in mind that the accuracy of a "right" or "true" idea was doubtful, the impressive stipulation that art should be strictly consistent with the "great truth" proved unfounded both aesthetically and politically.

What is this? Many people asked themselves this question at that time. Why is there an "appearance" of truth in Semin? Since when in a socialist country has the life of a worker in an outlying area, of working people, become "uninteresting?" Is it because the writer is bad and has converted the "interesting" into the "uninteresting," or is it that his "interesting" and talented depiction is socially "uninteresting?"

Here is what was proclaimed "uninteresting:" people and the way of life of a worker in an outlying settlement, their destinies, characters, concerns, professions, discussions and recollections. The fact that the novel was focused on the strikingly vivid depiction of a factory worker, Mula (short for Mamula), dedicated and frenzied in her round-the-clock need to work ("I may die but I cannot stop working"). The fact that the young characters in the novel have no fathers and that their lives—harsh, poor, rough and, sometimes, even cruel—would have been different had their fathers returned back from the war is unimportant.... Equally unimportant is the fact that the women in this outlying area remember the occupation, the loss of family, disease and hunger....

A great deal of "important" things pile up, such as the fact that they surmounted hardships, that they did not forget how to help one another and even the fact that life was changing for the better.

What then becomes "important?" What is important is that "the bosses" had been depicted wrongly: There is too much callousness, indifference, omnipotence and no one is able to oppose this bureaucratic power. This is totally improper, for that is not the way it should be. The author is told that "the truth of life and the truth of art" have two aspects: the "external" ("the cover," the "appearance") and the "inner" ("the true content of a person or a phenomenon"). In other words, you should not trust your eyes too much.... Something may appear to be bad but look deeper: Somewhere there everything is properly balanced, coordinated, thought out and taken into consideration; heartlessness has been noted, callousness has been blocked and omnipotence in general is only imagined....

I recall this in detail to prove that such literary-critical reflections of reality have no "alibi." Objectively, for the sake of socialism, democracy and the blossoming of culture, society was deprived of this, that and the other....

The displeasure expressed in the central press at the sociocritical and democratic spirit of literature was neither harmless nor accidental. At that time there was a

"hierarchy" of ideological-esthetic evaluations, consistent with the "hierarchy" and "seniority" of printed matter. The authority of an evaluation was related not to the authority and competence of the people, not to the dignity and power of the mind but the high position held by a newspaper or a journal. Such an automatically influential evaluation could predetermine the fate of a book (a motion picture, a show, etc.) for years on end. Nor can we describe as accidental and rare the type of review given to Semin's novel. The ideas it expressed had been popular for a long time precisely in the "loftiest" publications. For the sake of fairness, however, let us say that they were being manifested even more persistently and more extremely in journals and newspapers of lower standing.

As a means and form of artistic knowledge, achievements, discoveries or mastery of the world, literature was actually underestimated and it seemed sometimes that as such it was, generally speaking, not especially necessary.

Why was that? If the critics already know how things should be, if everything concerning man and society is known in advance, what is its purpose?

Was it to confirm, consolidate, illustrate and propagandize what was necessary?

When literature said, this is life, this is the truth, the omniscient critic undertook to refute and argue: This is an "appearance," a "similarity," and no truth whatsoever. Our people are different and they do not think this way; they did not fight this way and they live differently and their mood is different....

Years later we would hear calls for "more socialism, more democracy." Among others, this would mean that today there is less of either than there could have been.

It was not only zealous administrators who promoted this state of affairs....

When it was said about the characters in the novel from that worker suburb that "...their 'duty' on earth is uninspired! It looks as though all of them are failures, that they are blind to beauty, they are deaf to art...." the feelings of social justice and democracy were justifiably hurt. However, they were hurt so frequently and in such a variety of ways that, in the final account, such feelings began to look old-fashioned and unattainable.

One of the minor characters in the novel "Traditsionnyy Sbor" [Traditional Rally] by V. Rozov, is Lida, quiet and timid, a worker in a savings account bank, living way out north. "Lida needs so little to be happy," a mass-circulation journal wrote, "and she herself is so insignificant that even identifying her becomes difficult!" The general alarm was sounded that playwrights had ignored "the true hero of Soviet society, who can not only commit exploits but can commit them ceaselessly."

The critical spirit rose high above our life! How important was an ordinary human face, an ordinary human voice?! Who was this Lida with her "uninspired" job! She was an insignificant, a secondary detail in an interrupted heroic landscape!

I shall deliberately not name authors, journals or newspapers: There are striking similarities and instructive differences and the time period was a complex one: the end of the 1950s and the 1960s. There is no similarity even in the rejection of the characters as depicted by V. Semin, V. Rozov, F. Abramov, A. Volodin, G. Baklanov, A. Arbuzov, V. Bykov, A. Yashin, N. Voronov and B. Mozhayev and many others; the similarity is found not only in the choice of a "target" but in the "concept" of man, his purpose and value, his place and role in dynamic history, in society and in the state, from which came a rejecting and expository critical enthusiasm. More precisely, it was a "concept" of socialism, of its moral, ethical and esthetic principles, but an amateurish one, an abstract-schematic, poster concept, which feared any touch with real history and contemporary reality.

"It is hard to imagine," we were told, "that people who assumed the tremendous task of postwar rebuilding, who were given the opportunity to undertake the building of a communist society, would appear 'unfortunate' or be represented by characters who are not representative of this society." The positive character is a progressive person, the writers were told. That is why the reader is so eager to learn about the inner world of the head of a huge enterprise, an outstanding woman scientist and soviet deputy, a leader of an oblast inhabited by 3 million people.... What characterizes our reality, it was said, is the tempestuous growth of ordinary people, their advancement, unparalleled in history....

Was it worth asking what was this "happiness of conversion" and why would a literary character, even in his own hut, not simply live but act as a representative of his country on a foreign mission? How had it been determined that the readers were "eager to enter" precisely the soul of an outstanding leader? And why would he want to run not a simple enterprise but a "gigantic" one? And why would a simple person who, worse, appeared "unhappy" be of no interest?!

Yes, we were told, loneliness, which is one of the varieties of unhappiness, is "justified when we are speaking of the Americans but entirely puzzling if we speak of the life of our people."

There was a strange preference for "significant" as compared to "insignificant" people in the literary criticism of that period. It was as though in consolation that we spoke of the "tempestuous growth," the "mass promotion" of "ordinary" into "extraordinary" people, as though without such a promotion and enhancement of the toiling person with his daily concerns into positive and frontranking characters, literature could not succeed....

In recalling the age of the French Revolution, in his book on Dickens, Gilbert K. Chesterton wrote: "At that time everything was expected of everyone. At that time all people were called upon to become people.... He (Dickens—I.D.) shared some virtues with the revolution: He begged man to become himself.... When we experience the unrestrained Dickensian joy of life, inseparable from the feeling of freedom, we find the best in the revolution. We understand the first order of democracy: All people are interesting."

Something was bound to happen, something slowly accumulated for this feeling of "better" to abate and this order was somewhat forgotten or concealed behind the privileges of rank.

It was during the 60th year of our revolution and, answering a NOVYY MIR survey on Gorkiy, Vitaliy Semin considered that it was necessary to single out in Gorkiy that which was "always staggering:" "The great thought used to take the measure of even the most 'uninteresting life.'" Add to this Gorkiy's invariable "interest" in "simple" people.... Semin was convinced that "The noninteresting is almost always within the realm of our incompetence.... In different times the area of the 'uninteresting' expands so greatly that what is left as 'interesting' becomes almost untrustworthy." Something like a "false confidence that we have eliminated the uninteresting!"

On one occasion, that same Semin said, a writer was reading his play to some actors. He was told that "Your menshevik is poorly described." He answered: "I will not give him the honor of describing him better."

Here everything is interrelated: One person is depicted "with great honor." Another is considered too petty to be looked at ("Ilin is a failure and Tamara is dull," was what they wrote about A. Volodin's "Five Evenings"); others again are quite doubtful: They act in "close and stifling little premises where rather base and philistine petty ideas are voiced."

The realm of the "uninteresting" expanded. This was the result of political, social and moral considerations. Something like a mandatory political-esthetic "variety" of literature and art developed. It projected a most profound mistrust of people, of the reasoning and awareness of the people, of anything which is true and real and alive around us.

In a book on "the tradition of Gogol" in modern plays (1953) the then famous literary critic Vasilii Yermilov wrote: "Beauty lies in the spring of mankind, the motherland of socialism in its struggle, in its tireless forward progress!"

N.G. Chernyshevskiy's formula ("life is beauty") was firmly exceeded. Naturally, Chernyshevskiy had in mind not any life but life "such as it should be in accordance with our concepts." Nonetheless, he spoke of life in its

full dimension, as a prerequisite and a foundation for beauty. Despite its entire ideological impeccability, Yermilov's formula had something of a bravado, something quite lightweight and thoughtless. It largely ignored life with its eternal values and ideals, narrowing and curtailing the foundations of beauty and unwittingly one wanted to ask: What struggle are you talking about, be more specific.

Yermilov explained: "We must eliminate from life everything that is negative, rotten and hindering progress; evil must be mercilessly persecuted and destroyed."

This may sound almost contemporary but let us not delude ourselves: In addition to the repelling mercilessness of those verbs we find an algebraic convention: All of these symbols ("evil," "negative," etc.) could be ascribed any suitable or imposed significance. Yermilov called upon literature irreconcilably to struggle against "rotten people, rotten ideas, rotten feelings," but not confuse this rottenness with Soviet people who made a mistake but recognized it. It was assumed that a Soviet person could show "weaknesses" but the moment they appeared he would no longer be a positive character and should take "the path of true correction of errors." The "weaknesses" were then subject to "uprooting" and were accurately enumerated: "being scatterbrained, inability to identify the enemy," "slackness in life," "philistinism, blabbering, vaingloriousness," etc.

Such lists of correctable and forgivable weaknesses or ineradicable and unforgivable vices (such as "menshevik," "rotten intellectual," died in the wool philistine in a "tiny apartment," etc.) or else "positions," uninspiring or inspiring, were by no means as harmless as they may seem today. They were part of the ideological stereotypes which hindered for a long time the development of literature and the arts and literary-critical thinking as a variety of social thought. It is no accident that some of our respected writers are not republishing their works of the end of the 1940s and beginning of the 1950s, not because they suffer from youthful imperfections. Something else is embarrassing: obedience to stereotype. Nor is it accidental that many works written then and previously, which are now the pride of Soviet literature, waited for their hour to strike for years and even decades. Furthermore, the entire development of our literature in recent decades took place in the course of a slow and difficult surmounting and abandoning social and esthetic schematism and the pragmatic and utilitarian approach to man and to life itself. This was a struggle against fluctuating success, sometimes dramatic, but the fact that today the "new style of thinking" is gradually assuming the upper hand over the "old style," may be, to a certain extent, perhaps thanks to the fact that our literature in its best segment—artistically and socially mature and profoundly socialist and democratic in spirit—contributed to its establishment and dissemination among the people. It was as though literature developed within itself the social, moral and ethical

foundations of a renovated understanding of the world, which inevitably opened new horizons in sociopolitical thinking and spiritual culture.

It also happened that Mikhail Pryanin, Fedor Abramov's favorite character, would read a central newspaper and his heart would burst from jealousy: "Big life was being lived somewhere, there were inspired noble people who performed every day and every hour exploits for the glory of the homeland and colorfully described them in their letters and reports." "Meanwhile, what was happening in Pekashino? he asked himself. What kind of life was this?"

As we can see, the writer was familiar with and recalled the inspired "heroes" and their continuing exploits but preferred to speak of an unknown, of an "unimportant" life led by Pekashino and its people which, if we are to believe some chroniclers, did not exist in general although it certainly did! Fedor Abramov was able to see and hear life, particularly life in the northern Russian countryside which, however, was a reflection of everything which was happening throughout the country. This writer, who was once accused of "casting aspersions" on Soviet reality, is read today as one of the most consistent of our realistic writers, loyal to the truth of life which is the foundation for the most important party documents of recent times. Fedor Abramov truly thirsted after becoming part of the souls and destiny of his contemporaries: He found equally interesting the old-fashioned raykom secretary and the inflexible old peasant woman who had suffered for her faith, and the experienced Bolshevik, the fanatic of the revolutionary reshaping of mankind, but particularly the kolkhoz men and women of wartime and the postwar period of hunger.... He saw as the prime resource of his fatherland the people and his heart ached when he came across scorn for human life and the wasting of it....

Fedor Abramov was one of the first among our best writers of the 1960s fiercely to write works conflicting with literary-critical prescriptions, pious wishes and categorical instructions. Today, in my view, the historical, social and esthetic justification of this "contrary" writing is obvious.

It is easy to note that, to use military terminology, literature has "landed on the shore" and "captured a bridgehead," it will not surrender it but will hold it forever and, steadily, inch by inch, widen it providing, naturally, that it finds an internal, necessary and noble reason to do so.

That which was initiated in the mid-1950s by Valentin Ovechkin and his fellow workers went on, expressed in artistically strong and free writing, with a different choice of characters and plots—"the rural prose"—which was an outstanding phenomenon of the multinational Soviet literature of the 1960s and 1970s.

The "bit of land" to which the characters of G. Baklanov and Yu. Bondarev clung for the first time, although there were previous infrequent examples of the same, gradually spread throughout the huge and terrible space of the last war and once again, honestly and courageously, for the sake of avoiding a repetition, and in the name of those who had died and those who had won, represented by our "military prose" whose merits to society and the people are perhaps still not properly appreciated.

Whether we like it or not, and whether it is pleasant to be aware of this, this prose, as represented also by K. Simonov, V. Bykov, V. Bogomolov and K. Vorobyev, also began with a list of recommendations and cliches.

The "new style of thinking" in literature, nonetheless, let us admit, matured not in those who indulged in falsehood and lies, but in those who learned how to follow and did follow the complex and conflicting realities of life, history and human destinies.

The critics who had liked the reliable "high shore" (V. Dudintsev's expression), hastened to frighten the public by claiming that the "truth of the trenches" was to be found in the dark literary bottoms, reasserting a "Remarquism" alien to us.

Let us not go into the details of this memorable confrontation. As Vladimir Dudintsev wrote in "White Clothing," on a different but typologically similar occasion: "Those who were in the lowland could see their justice with increasing clarity. They also knew that those on the high shore were already planning an organized retreat."

Let us note one characteristic: the recommended method for eliminating the limitations of the "truth of the trenches," i.e., the truth of millions of people. The recommendation was to add to it the truth of "headquarters," so that the common picture be illuminated by a superior way of thinking. The viewpoint of a soldier or a junior commander, i.e., the man who had until recently been a worker, a kolkhoz member or an intellectual, a person whose life could come to an end in the war, was considered insufficient, too narrow, too close to the ground and, therefore, not interesting. No, these critical accusations were not triggered by concern for properly depicting the activities of the various headquarters. The familiar energy was pulsing in those headquarters: observe the chain of command, respect your seniors, do not allow your characters to appear unhappy, etc. It may have seemed that the time to cool off such "defensive" energy had come. However, this cooling off was dragged out. I dare to claim that occasionally such criticism assumed a clearly antidemocratic trend.

Gogol had written that "Nothing could be angrier than departments, regiments, offices and, briefly, any kind of officialdom. Today all honest people consider themselves insulted by the entire society. The story goes that quite recently a police captain, I do not recall in what city, submitted a petition in which he decried the fact

that governmental decrees were perishing and that his sacred name was being mentioned in vain. As proof he added to this petition a huge book, some kind of romantic novel, in which every 10 pages the police captain was mentioned and, sometimes, described as being totally drunk."

Today as well such police captains are displeased. For example, proper respect for thus and such a captain may not be shown in a novel. Consequently, the entire institution of police captains is threatened: This is an attempt against the authority, the "sacred name" of the position. But then the tired hand of the police captain would let the book slide, as he falls asleep, and before he manages to open this book, to become insulted, the critic standing on the "high shore" is already on guard and is already asking: Was this worth writing? Do we not have many excellent people who wreck their health for the sake of the people's good? Could it be that one or another among our talented artists has succumbed to the "appearance" of truth?

It may seem improper for literature in a socialist country to play hierarchic games. However, it has played and is playing such games to this day. The question is: Where is the outstanding character of the party worker? Sometimes the destinies of thousands of people are affected by his political and moral principles, his character, knowledge, upbringing and culture. Is this not the truth? It is, naturally, but one writer, who has made the chairman of a city soviet his main character, will diplomatically leave outside his topic the gorkom first secretary (who wants trouble!); another will begin by sending the first secretary of the raykom or obkom somewhere on leave, will retire him, or will assign him somewhere and only then will start telling the story.... Could it be that the habit developed by some managers to be exonerated from control and criticism, which leads to total permissiveness and abuse of power (which was extensively discussed at the January CPSU Central Committee Plenum) and respect for rank, instilled in writers, are interrelated phenomena? Clearly, we must recall something which may seem self-evident: By his very nature the artist "dares" (and is called upon) to develop an absolutely evenhanded attitude toward his characters, be they privates or marshals, workers or ministers, ordinary party member or member of the Central Committee.... Everyone in the eyes of the artist is equal; it is only under this condition that the truth and righteousness can triumph and everyone can receive his proper due.

Gyorgy Lukacz wrote: "However strongly our daily life was imbued with socially sanctioned fetishism, the practice of art (but not necessarily the conscious outlook of the artist) uses its own means in struggling against trends which lead to schematism and thus deaden the sensory and spiritual world of man." Furthermore, "art, with its naive self-evidence, can struggle much more profoundly and decisively against stagnant fetishized features of life than can contemporary science of philosophy."

One could be insulted on behalf of science and philosophy, claiming that the influence and potential of art have been exaggerated. However, it is precisely the literature of the 1960s and 1970s that focused on the artistic world of the "ordinary person" or the "simple man" it had created, or else, which is one and the same, the man of the people. In other words, it addressed that which in philosophy is described as the "problem of man," reminding us that everything begins with this problem and that this problem is the yardstick of all other important problems. The social and historical destiny of man and the extent to which he can realize his best forces and opportunities and his true spiritual and moral condition under real circumstances of the past and the present was what was offered to us by our best prose of the 1960s and 1970s. Literature tried to answer the natural and old yet aggravated questions: How did the people live after the revolution, between the 1920s and the 1940s? What happened to those people? Or else, what were the destinies of those for whose sake, actually, the revolution was made? People such as, for example, the former farmhands Stapanid and Petrok in Bykov's novel "Znak Bedy" [Sign of Trouble]?

The answers given by literature are by no means conciliatory for the reason alone, perhaps, that by their nature they are specific. Literature, as we know, does not count people in the thousands or the millions but only in units.... It cannot provide a synchronous translation from the language of percentages of overfulfillment of the plan to the language of human happiness. Literature feels that in such a case there is a distance which cannot be expressed in economic and material terms.

In the summer of 1930, the accountability reports to the 16th Party Congress stated that the 5-year program for building kolkhozes had been overfulfilled by more than 50 percent in only 2 years. "The 5-year plan in 2 years" and with interest! This was what this event meant to the then mass political consciousness. But what about our contemporary artistic awareness and imagination? (Variants of the artistic perception of that event at that time are found in "Yuvenilnoye More" [Juvenile Sea] and "Kotlovan" [Trench] by A. Platonov). What kind of faces, houses, and actions arise in front of our eyes, what voices come alive from the distance of this emotionally surfeited political statistics? They come alive in that same Mozhayev in "peasant men and women," and while some historians are seeking their beloved "golden middle," literature is offering its own answers which, although not impeccable and sometimes tendentious, take us back with historical objectivity to the realities of "places and times" and to their human obstinate content, before it has been summed and included in its own fashion in that solemn summertime result of 1930.

The answers of literature are a reflection of the complex and conflicting process of the establishment of the young state and the unparalleled involvement of man in this process. There is nothing odd in the fact that life consists of the closest possible links between and conflict among

what is necessary and arbitrary, what is class-oriented and universal, what is voluntary and coercive, what is legitimate and illegitimate, what is tragic and farcical.... At the same time—the response of literature—there is the growing, the experienced awareness of the immeasurable value of human life. It may seem that this awareness offers nothing special: usual humaneness and even excessive compassion and tearfulness of literature but, in fact, standing behind them are artistic memory of the losses suffered by the people on the fierce roads of the 20th century and the refusal of the artist to become accustomed to them and to forget them.

The best works of our multinational literature in the 1960s and 1970s, which rejected the spirit of social "patronage" and "petty supervision" ("we think for you and you listen, we do this for you and you must thank us!"), alien to democracy and socialism, asserted the wealth, health and independence of the people's thoughts, the dignity and the self-sufficiency of the toiling man, not some kind of obedient puppet handled by powerful hands, and not the smallest possible cog in an organized social mechanism, but a consciously acting character in history. Subsequently, this was to be described as the "human factor," i.e., that which inspires the entire state, its entire economic and industrial power, as its source and only true objective and internal meaning. However, it would be erroneous to say that the depiction of man in his relations with historical circumstances, society and the state became ordinary and that the socially active character, who dared to have his own views, began to predominate. Criticism "from the high shore" seemed to have forgiven the "rural prose" for its characters—ordinary village people, with the simple and eternal range of their concerns. These characters did not include a single outstanding kolkhoz chairman or outstanding frontranker nor any zealous police captain who would cast aspersions on the entire managerial and supervisory apparatus. This means that the emphasis on social conflict and on social choice was either absent or dulled. Increasingly, the literary characters concentrated on man who was suffering his destiny and patiently reacting to vicissitudes, socially identified and socially independent. Some people even liked this, citing the age-old people's wisdom, the old Russian need for a firm autocratic hand.... The impact of growing confusion in the face of reality and its increasing number of contradictions and long habit to compromise and "understand everything," fraught with ordinary time-serving was being felt....

Sometimes we like to compare the literary process to a river which is deviated from its bed by natural or man-made obstacles but which sticks to its own familiar course. The comparison is inaccurate: Literature always contains some kind of strong inflexible element. Nonetheless, did a variety of obstacles not influence the literary movement of the last 30 years we are discussing? The critics noted all its zigzags and turns perfectly: Yesterday there was talk of civic-mindedness and daring in poetry, the loyalty and fearlessness of social analysis in

essays and prose, the elimination of the consequences of the cult of personality, the extremes of criticism and objectivism ("defaming" and "trench truth"); today we are speaking exclusively about morality, the soul, the spirit and the conscience, the advantages of "quiet" compared to "loud" poetry, of civic poetry, the eternal questions of life, the sources of popular wisdom; tomorrow we shall speak of the protection of rivers and lakes, problems of ecology and more ecology, the harmfulness of drunkenness, good and evil, spirituality and lack of spirituality, or the prevalence of publicism over artistic interpretation. Part of these changes was the consequence of sensitively detected needs of real life by literature and the influence of real life; part was due to an effort to cut through hastily erected embankments or to surmount the hard rocks along the way....

There is something sobering and normal in present-day literature. The dams which for many years blocked those same "undeviating" elements have crumbled (in one of his novels Yuriy Trifonov wrote about the "nondisappearing elements" of decency, honor and spiritual firmness, transmitted from one generation to another. Although he was referring to something else, we find here something in common....). Previously banned and basic and common areas merged. The primacy of publicistic writings over fiction, which critics detected in some popular works of 1985-1986, proved to be not errors of their authors or signs of a new literary stage but rather features of perturbation caused by reality. Perhaps, for the first time, it became so clear that regardless of the number of considerations about the soul, the good and the evil, and the efforts to understand and even to "improve" our contemporaries, this seemingly universal "set of instruments" was not working. Naturally, offering to the reader a series of sad and even disgraceful and horrifying facts, one could shock others and confusingly ask: "What are they doing to us, brothers?!" It suddenly becomes clear, however, that the very indication of concern and puzzlement and the accumulated facts and appeals to be good belong more to the ordinary, the mass, than the artistic mind. Obviously, there was a reason for which in the recent past social vigilance and perspicacity were not honored and the social standard of artistic thoughts were underestimated and were in an obvious state of decline. Unfortunately, some trends which belittled the role and possibilities of reason affected literature as well. Such trends are not new. They tend to be repeated and, albeit modernized, are characteristic of ages of crisis during which, in the words of Thomas Mann, "All kinds of secret knowledge, half knowledge and trickery, obscurantism of sects and base beliefs, gross cheating, superstition and idyllic verbosity" "blossom," proclaimed by some people as being the "revival of culture and the glorious soul of the people." Such elements, which were reflected in the enthusiasm and structure of V. Belov's novel "Vse Vpered!" [All in the Future], strikingly impoverished and narrowed the possibilities of an acknowledged writer. Perhaps the saddest thing of all was that loyalty to life, which is inherent in any major talent, turned out to be obedient to

a doubtful trend, as though the power and the darkness of this force were superior to the righteousness and bright strength of the artist.

The contemporary situation in literature seems somewhat unexpected. Half a century ago Anna Akhmatova's "Requiem" could not be published. For some 20 years the novels of A. Bek, V. Dudintsev and A. Rybakov, and A. Tvardovskiy's poem "By Rights of Memory" were not published. Today such works, like many others which had been "blocked" as being "dangerous" and "harmful" have seen the light. And what happened? Did the ground under our feet collapse? Did the walls tremble? Nothing of the sort; the reader was asked to experience and consider what had not been fully considered and experienced or else something totally unknown to him. Naturally, this irritated some people: Ignorance, semi-ignorance and faith unwillingly yield to knowledge and convictions based on knowledge. The majority, however, would probably agree with the words of a contemporary scientist: "Knowledge is our destiny;" no other path leading into the future is possible. Artistic knowledge is also knowledge: Insufficient knowledge does not make history or politics but molds the life of man in history and politics and human destiny in history and politics. Are we blind to this experience?

What was unexpected turned out to be expected and even expected for a long time. It was as though we were ready for it, not for some specific publications or literary "openness," or the need and urgency of the "new style of thinking." A great many people throughout the country were prepared for this, because the ideas of the October Revolution continued to live within the party, the society and the people: Great revolutions do not simply disappear from the minds and the hearts without a trace. The people were prepared also because the "new style of thinking" was ripening in the best works of our art and literature and in the difficult and contradictory ways of literary criticism. Let us stipulate at this point that when the "truth of the trenches" harshly considered from the "high Shore was on the defensive in its unpromising bottom land, there also was a criticism which displayed the same front line destiny and common understanding of the world or the same measure of social and esthetic responsibility. It was on the side of those whose "trench," "peripheral," "peasant," or "philistine" truths were considered from the height of illusory and abstract concepts of life, as infinitely petty, belittling the greatness of the state and the social system. There will be thorough essays on literary-critical thinking of the 1950s-1970s, which will trace the long, exhausting and occasionally forcefully suppressed and restrained struggle waged by our best critics against arrogant concepts essentially related to the rejection of "inconvenient" reality and against the emasculation of the truly socialist and democratic spirit of art. With increasing frequency socialist realism was being interpreted essentially as "state" realism, the purpose of which was to be consistent with the current requirements and problems of the state. Fortunately, the best critics felt quite sensitively

the closer or more distant relationship between the revolutionary socialist ideal and the state at that precise historical moment, with its requirements toward art... Actually, the critics defended the foundations of the existence of art, resorting to refined and even fantastic artistic forms, nonetheless starting with an opening to reality and its liberation and defetishization. Fear of reality led to concealment and substitution; the "nonaesthetic" and "uninteresting" area was broadened, including anything which spoiled the picture of social well-being and monotony, or cast aspersion on its authors. The "new style of thinking" in literature was sensed and presented as a decisive and fearless turn to reality, today's or yesterday's, on all levels and stages. Works of art may be "mirrors of the revolution" but could they be a mirror of the "table of ranks?" Could they be a mirror of someone's aspiration to remain untouched by social and esthetic assessment? Could they be a mirror of official zeal, making it better, more significant and more necessary and thus, once again, asserting in the eyes of the people the infallibility of some positions and titles? Can we determine now the extent of culpability of the twisted subservient mirrors of art for their cultivation of respect for rank and ostentatiousness, and for supporting the myth, alien to the socialist view on the world, of the "strong and firm hand," of the strong commanding personality without which, allegedly, the peoples of our country could not do? It as though this guilt, diluted, sneaking away and depersonalized, exists and the more it is present the less we find in works descriptions of ordinary human life, the less such human life is considered and the lower its value becomes....

The new way of thinking, whether it is a question of the survival and salvation of mankind or the internal problems of our country, is a thinking based on reality, cleansed from verbal fog and based on knowledge and a clear historical memory and, we believe, on a developed humane imagination and a new sensitivity. The withering away of the old way of thinking, with its stipulation of the active use of power and instincts, will hardly resemble the thawing of the snow in spring. Who would hasten to reject such convenient and tried method according to which if there is force there is no need for reason! Will yesterday's temptations return? Will the new way of thinking become prevalent immediately and everywhere, in everyone's mind?

The new way of thinking developed in a state of confrontation with what hindered and distorted the development of the country and what slowed down the growth of its human forces. The destruction of philosophy and stagnation were inevitable but the trouble was that they turned out to be much costlier than they should have been not because of the high cost of something which was not produced, not improved or not overfulfilled. It was found elsewhere: in the frozen and rejected initiative, the depreciation of knowledge and talent, the unrealized human opportunities, and the bitterness which people who did not live to see the present carried with them to

their graves. Equally important to art is the confidence in the triumph of the mind, serving the mind, and the bitterness which can equally not be forgotten.

The new way of thinking in literature is not only the fierce political journalism of Ales Adamovich, which literally shrieks at every one of us that "There is nothing more important" than the struggle for saving mankind from the nuclear threat; it is not only the novels, stories and poems which somebody did not dare to publish for many years and which are now made available to the readers, restoring to society the fullness of concepts on the true ideological-artistic range of Soviet literature; it is not only this entire new and hopeful literature of our daily life, with its atmosphere of openness and democratic rejection of home-grown "command" but, perhaps, more than all that, the awareness of the possibility and even the need to write to the full extent of one's talent and civic and artistic responsibility, with the knowledge that there no longer are any "forbidden" topics, "undesirable" conflicts or "uninteresting" characters. There is also an increased awareness of standards, of the naturalness and inevitability of what is taking place in literature, art and life. In reading novels or newspaper articles we catch ourselves thinking: How could it be otherwise, for in a socialist country nothing else is possible, all other things can only be shameful and socially and morally impossible....

The only thing which can never be "removed" or rejected, like some burden or lack of freedom, is the responsibility of the artist, that same responsibility familiar to Pushkin and Tolstoy, Dostoyevskiy and Chekhov and other beautiful and immortal names, scattered and spread throughout the earth!...

At one point Vitaliy Semin wrote about the "opposition" which the artist must surmount in order truly to prove himself. It would be ridiculous to hope that the time of such surmounting, the courage, the dedicated work and artistic risk will ever be something of the past. Nor can such a time ever be "removed." Naturally, however, in the case of individuals one can set it successfully behind oneself.

"Is it necessary to remember..., do we have to...?" remember the bitter question which Yuriy Trifonov asked?

Life's answer was not immediate but was firm: Yes, we must. The "blank spots" in history are the same as the blank spots on a map: If they are not filled, the traveler risks once again to fall into those same cracks and be lost in that same forest....

The recently published novels, which take us back to the 1920s-1950s, are unanimous in the main thing: in their aspiration to fill the gaps in the historical and moral upbringing of the people. One could consider that to a certain extent the artfulness of these works may have

been "harmed," for the role which previously inaccessible historical information and details play is excessive. But then someone should speak of what was not spoken about, what was not completely described, what was interrupted.... This is a highly natural occupation for literature and history. It turns out, however, that this is most natural for literature, with its eternal and unquestionable starting point, which is man, a peasant from Ryazan, a Moscow student, a child in a home, persecuted geneticists, etc.

At the risk of repeating myself let me say that the new way of thinking means also a new sensitivity, a new degree of humaneness; it has not been computed but experienced. Let us recall Ch. Aytmatov's "Plakhu" [To the Executioner's Block], G. Matevosyan's "Tashkent," S. Zalygin's "Komissiyu" [To the Commission], or O. Gonchar's "Sobor" [The Council], books which surreptitiously "restructured" the mind and feelings of society. Are we not affected by thoughts about the fate of the individual in the flow of history, in the whirlpool of politics, about the happiness of man and his misfortunes, and about what was and what was not?

I believe that never before has the defense of human life and human individuality, and the presence of a lofty and daring reason and open and fearless view on reality, the free choice of characters and conflicts, and the growing interest of anything which happened in our post-revolutionary history been so typical.

In some cases novels, the publication of which was "held back" are described as "expository," and accused of excessive "negativism." However, we should complain more not about what exists in literature but about what occurred in real life. In these books the difficult experience is being surmounted by understanding its social mechanics. Not everyone should be forgiven: Should we forgive criminals? But when something is understood confusion disappears and the concept of the revolution is cleansed.

A long time ago A.A. Timiryazev wrote that his book "Nauka i Demokratiya" [Science and Democracy] (1920) deals with the "common aspiration toward scientific truth and toward ethical, socio-ethical and socialist truth."

This may be old-fashioned but, despite all difficulties and disappointments experienced in this imperfect world, has not our Soviet literature been able to preserve the aspiration toward artistic and that same socialist truth?

The idea, obviously expressed as self-criticism, that literature and, in particular, playwriting have fully responded to restructuring, was heard at the July meeting of the Central Committee general secretary with the

heads of mass information media and creative associations. In his answer, possibly unexpectedly, M.S. Gorbachev noted that if "they begin to respond to the tremendous project we have undertaken without interpreting it, responding with dullness, we do not need such a response." Works which "having read them once or seen them will be remembered by us," which will "remain with us and give us guidelines for many years into the future," will not appear in a philosophy and psychology based on hasty "response."

Restructuring, which is based on a new way of thinking, needs less its singers and musicians than like-minded supportive artists, artists in the area of objective and honest writing, who have realized that restructuring is a historical choice made by the party, the people and the country and is their own choice. To use a metaphor, this means not swimming along the current, yielding to its will and power, but creating the current ourselves, becoming one of its guiding spiritual and moral forces.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

KOMMUNIST Roundtable: Basic Stages in the Development of Soviet Society

180200181 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 66-79

[Text] As we approach the 70th landmark of our socialist history, with increasing frequency and ever more closely we consider the path already covered by the country. We study the essence of events and, guided by the laws of truth, try accurately to assess achievements and errors. "Each generation of Soviet people has made its contribution to the development, strengthening and defense of the gains of the October Revolution," M.S. Gorbachev noted at the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. "We are justifiably proud of our history and look at the future with confidence."

The history of the socialist fatherland is an inexhaustible area of research. A great deal has been accomplished here. However, many questions have accumulated in the field of historiography and there still exist "blank spots" and undeserved neglect of events and personalities. Gradually, the science of history is abandoning impartial "descriptiveness" and repetition of schemes and stereotypes. The urgent need arises more profoundly to interpret historical experience and to enrich it with the help of present social practice. A great deal is being said and argued by the scientists today, by no means historians exclusively. A great variety of views are being expressed. These were precisely the circumstances that motivated the editors to invite scientists specializing in problems of domestic history of the Soviet period to exchange views in a roundtable meeting and to answer questions.

Participating in the discussion were USSR Academy of Sciences academicians I.I. Mints, M.P. Kim, and A.M. Samsonov; USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding Member Yu.A. Polyakov, Doctor of Historical Sciences V.Z. Drobizhev and Candidate of Historical Sciences V.A. Kozlov.

KOMMUNIST editors S. Kolesnikov and S. Khizhnyakov prepared the materials of the roundtable meeting for publication.

The October Revolution and Restructuring

Today we shall discuss the similarity between October 1917 and the present, which is a time of restructuring and revolutionary renovation. What is the similarity between these periods and historical situations and continuity and what are their differences and specific features? As we emphasize the revolutionary nature of the changes occurring within society, we must consider the processes underway from the viewpoint of historicism and the accurate interpretation of historical experience. V.I. Lenin deemed necessary to distinguish in the lessons of the past "two legacies:" that which we shall take with us tomorrow and that which we shall abandon. How is this problem being solved in terms of the recent decades of our socialist history?

I.I. Mints

In reading the CPSU Central Committee appeal to the Soviet people, I unwittingly recalled Lenin's appeal "To the Citizens of Russia!" of 25 October 1917. Seventy years have passed since and what could the connection between the two be? I believe it is one of the closest. Vladimir Ilich proclaimed at that time a conversion to building socialism and described the rough stages in its development. Today's Central Committee appeal, as is clearly stated, pertains to the restoration and perfecting precisely the Leninist aspect of socialism and the Leninist principles governing its development. I see a similarity here through continuity. We are continuing, something which is equally being emphasized in the Central Committee appeal, our October Revolution in our present-day concerns.

Naturally, there also are major differences between the situations, for 70 years have passed since that time. The main difference is that in October 1917 we came to power, i.e., that power passed into the hands of the new class. This was the main feature of the revolution. Today it is not a question of power but of methods, forms and approaches to the solution of the variety of social problems, which are equally revolutionary.

The Central Committee appeal proudly states that in no way do we reject what we have accomplished in the course of 7 decades. To us this remains inviolable. We do not destroy in the least but restructure. That is why we take from the past everything which improves, which accelerates our work, which moves us ahead. However,

we are rejecting the negative encrustations, existing erroneous concepts, subjectivistic assessments, shortcomings and errors or, in short, all that hinders us from strengthening socialist society. We preserve the main thing in building and developing socialism, i.e., our forward movement.

Yu.A. Polyakov

In comparing 1917 with 1987, naturally we must not take the path of formal analogies which are always arbitrary. The tasks are different and the age is entirely different and the forms, means and actions of the masses are also different. Continuity is what truly matters. This implies a continuity of the revolutionary gains and the implementation of the revolutionary objectives of the October Revolution. I would say the following: In 1917 we had to take the path of socialist change in battle. We followed an untrodden path. The difficulties were obvious. Although we have accomplished a great deal, the pace has slowed down and very serious breakdowns have appeared. Today, once again, we are advancing, changing a great deal radically and gathering speed. We can compare 1917 with 1987 by comparing the scale of objectives and tasks. The main thing here is the activeness of the broad masses. The victory of the October Revolution would have been impossible without the energetic and dedicated actions of workers, soldiers and peasants. The success of restructuring is impossible without the most energetic efforts of workers, intellectuals and peasants. In the October Revolution the main task, as Lenin emphasized, was to lift the "lowest classes to historical creativity." Today the main thing is to enhance the human factor.

V.A. Kozlov

Life today demands of us, even in terms of the history of the October Revolution, which may look like ancient history, a somewhat different view. What do I mean by this? A revolutionary leap always has some kind of common, basic laws. It also has its psychological aspect. Usually, under conditions of revolutionary change utopian forms of awareness become enhanced. There is an orientation toward direct action, and so on. We had this after the October Revolution and we are noticing the extent to which this is occurring in the mass awareness of the people today. How does it happen and why? Could historians answer this question? No, they cannot. We cannot answer but can only formulate it.

In his time Lenin discussed the difficulties of a conversion from the period of "holding meetings" to daily work. Why is this always so difficult? Why is it that the reconstruction on the psychological level, subsequent to the April Plenum, had a good start and there was a general upsurge in the moral-psychological area? And why is it so difficult to convert it to the level of practical accomplishments? This could have been made clear by

taking the October Revolution into consideration, through the application of the general sociological mechanism. Did we do this? We did not.

Furthermore, the most crucial problem is that of the psychology of the change, which frequently accompanies revolutionary action. Do we know anything about this type of psychology other than a most general idea, other than quotations from the works of Lenin, who cautioned us against the danger of this? We are unfamiliar with the sociopsychological and sociological laws governing such phenomena.

We are familiar with Engels' concept that a revolution is the most authoritarian thing in the world. What does this mean if we take our revolution, our restructuring into consideration? Where does the problem of authority end and, shall we say, the problem of "leadership" in the transitional period begin? What does authority mean in terms of the current restructuring? This, in my view, is a matter of leadership on the level of the individual collective.

I would like to mention yet another problem in connection with the experience of the revolution and its significance in terms of today. A series of very interesting organizational-economic findings, the meaning of which we have been underestimating so far, became apparent during the very first years after the October Revolution. They included, for example, Larin's familiar plan for collective worker supplies, which was introduced on an experimental basis in 1921. Eventually, this entire experiment was frustrated although it yielded economic results. Yet the plan for collective worker supplies, if converted to its monetary aspect of wages (at that time wages were paid in physical objects), is essentially the initial form of the collective contracting system in which shares were issued depending not on the number of workers but on end results, on the implementation of the production program. The idea began to be implemented along with the introduction of the NEP and...was not pursued. The question is why?

There is a view according to which during the initial years of the Soviet system true cost accounting was applied in state industry. Honestly speaking, few studies have been made of this program. Personally, judging by publications, I believe that this applied to the so-called "trust" type of cost accounting, which means that it did not reach the individual workplace or even the individual enterprise.

When we assess the NEP we take one aspect of Lenin's concept to the effect that it is based not directly on enthusiasm but on cost accounting, on personal interest. But what does enthusiasm as an element of economic management under the NEP mean? Neither historians nor economists can provide an answer to this question.

M.P. Kim

The continuity between the October period and today is found, naturally, not in the fact that we have a situation similar to the one which prevailed during the period of the October Revolution. In this case there is no comparison whatsoever in terms of the situation and the reality. It is a question of the fact that the spirit of the October Revolution and Lenin's understanding of the tasks and ideas of October and the spirit of creativity are consistent with our approach to the present tasks, to the tasks of radical restructuring. In terms of its spirit, this is a revolutionary and creative restructuring. Here as well we find a direct continuation of what took place in October and in the period after October, during the stage in which Lenin directly participated in the life of our party. This was the most fruitful and powerful stage on the creative level. After Lenin the creative thinking in our party and the creative development of Marxism-Leninism were not given the necessary scope and, I would even say, they experienced a certain decline. This is due to the fact that Leninism was understood somewhat peculiarly and that we did not recall everything which Lenin formulated and promoted; some things we ignored and even distorted, abandoned and violated. That is why today we must restore the Leninist creative spirit in our thinking and in our historical studies.

In reference to what we should abandon and what we should continue, naturally, we should continue with everything achieved through the creativity of the popular masses under the party's leadership and abandon the negative phenomena which are taking place in our life.

I believe that the reinterpretation of what occurred is an entirely natural phenomenon in terms of the science of history, for history must return precisely to assessments of past tasks after a certain period of time. This is necessary, first of all, because life itself brings to light new consequences of past events and, secondly, because our knowledge about society has become, unfortunately, axiomatic in many respects. In my view, our discussion on this level is of importance to historians for today we must become more active in our efforts and contribute something new to our science.

Let me re-emphasize that we must get rid of all encrustations which distort Leninism and the Leninist spirit and pursue that which is inherent in Leninism as a live and creative doctrine.

Question: What specifically would you include among such encrustations?

M.P. Kim

Generally speaking, many things could be included in them. Lenin believed that the study of history should be objectively historical. We must take into consideration that our country was the first socialist country. Let us take as an example the question of the correlation between the universal and the class factors and the pitting capitalism against socialism. So far we have

considered this matter somewhat simplistically. Lenin emphasized that there is an internal link between what is universal and what is socialist: The universal has something which socialism should adopt and continue, relieving it from anything determined by the class-exploiting ideology and system prevailing in antagonistic formations. A somewhat abstract pitting of socialism against the universal led to the fact that we somewhat weakened the position of socialism in the struggle for a global civilization and in terms of links which have been valuable in the entire development of mankind.

When we undertook to make a revolution we essentially rejected capitalism. Our task was a destructive one. After we won, we had to solve the question of what to borrow from capitalism and how to use anything valuable which it contained as an extension of human civilization, accepting, applying and multiplying it. For example, Lenin spoke of the fact that Taylorism had to be used to its fullest extent in order to develop the production forces of our society. Yet we showed obvious scorn for bourgeois technology and bourgeois science! It was such an abstract pitting of socialism against capitalism that brought about a weakening of our positions and a belittling of the historical potential which could have been that of the working class and socialism with a proper, a critical mastery of anything valuable found in capitalism.

Lenin taught us to study history objectively and as historians: neither to embellish nor worsen it. As we know, this is something which has always been repeated. However, to repeat something is one thing and to do it is another. In reality, abandoning the interpretation of history on the basis of Lenin's concepts, we took a selective approach to events and facts. In other words, there were facts which had to be studied, interpreted and praised, and others which failed to reflect the triumphant advance and success. These were ignored and bypassed. Such a selective approach to research problems is one of the most essential shortcomings in our historical research. That is the reason for which some problems have been left totally unstudied or have been inaccurately assessed.

Consider the problem of the noncapitalist development of the individual peoples in our country! We depicted this process in a romantic light, exclusively as a great accomplishment of the revolution, as a "plus" of the revolutionary process. Nonetheless, this was a very complex problem which hindered in some ways our development and occasionally triggered major conflicts and contradictions in our social, national above all, relations. We are saying today that in Central Asia and some other republics we are pursuing a policy related to the elimination of the consequences of tribalism, such as the principle of promoting cadres on the basis of kinship or nepotism—on the basis of family, place of birth and other similar relations. However, did tribalism develop in our country only in the 70s? Did tribal relations not influence the deployment of cadres and their promotion

and utilization long before the 1970s? We bypassed these problems. We did not discuss them. We considered them to be related to some features of national culture and way of life and tended to think that all of these were tasks of the bourgeois-democratic not the socialist revolution. However, the nature of a revolution is determined not by what is being denied but by what is changed. Whereas we reorganize prebourgeois relations into socialist relations, this applies to socialist tasks and not to bourgeois-democratic ones. Lack of attention to this problem led to major gaps in our historical studies.

In general, we depicted history somewhat schematically, simplistically, for which reason the consequences were quite serious. The history of collectivization is an example. The fact that collectivization had to be completed faster could be somehow explained by considering the threat from the outside, the danger of the approaching war. However, within the limits of this overall accelerated time collectivization could have taken place less painfully, in accordance with the full observance of Leninist requirements and the Leninist principles of rallying the peasants in large collective farms, in accordance with the principles of voluntary participation and after proper organizational preparations. In general, there were very few people like Sholokhov's Davydovs, and we did not train the type of people who could immediately manage large farms and kolkhozes. Nor was the necessary material and technical base available. Psychologically as well we had not prepared the peasantry for this to a sufficient extent. Therefore, the history of collectivization as well should be subjected to a serious study.

V.Z. Drobizhev

What legacy are we rejecting? A great deal was mentioned here. I believe that we should also abandon the rather unpleasant legacy such as the "nonperson" [figura umolchaniya]. We have become accustomed to belittle what happened in the past. I believe that the "nonperson" is characteristic of our activities to this day. This view developed with the repressions during the period of the cult of personality: If someone was stricken off the list of the living he was also deleted from history. But what is taking place now? We live as though N.S. Khrushchev or L.I. Brezhnev had not headed the party's Central Committee for a number of years. We have no right to approach our own past in this manner. We must not transform our history into an uninterrupted chain of errors and crimes. Reading some works of a publicistic nature, unwittingly we ask ourselves: How did the country from backward become progressive? This is the result of 70 years of the heroic history of our people.

For example, I believe that we must not consider the activities of N.S. Khrushchev in strictly negative terms. We have become accustomed to color everything in black or white. Life is much more complex and polychromatic. Consider the reform of the 1960s. We are familiar with the debates which were initiated in *Pravda* in 1961.

The concept was very interesting. Why was it abandoned? If we start acting like judges and color everything in black, in my view we can never recreate history and enhance the prestige of historical science.

It seems to me that the main prerequisite for success in the development of our science is to abandon the "non-person" concept and undertake a comprehensive study of facts without swinging from one side to another.

Stages in Socialist History

As we look back at the 70-year-long way covered by the land of the soviets and as we distance ourselves from its beginning—October 1917—we can see more clearly the ascent of society on the path of social progress and the establishment of the communist system. We are continuously refining our knowledge of this process. How accurate is the correlation between the universally accepted logical system of basic stages in the development of socialism in the USSR and the real logic of historical facts, the interpretation of which is taking place today on a new higher level? The party asks for the elimination of "blank spots" and unwarranted silences from the post-October history of the country and the party. What is the view of historians on "lacunae" in our historiography and on unstudied or understudied problems?

M.P. Kim

In this connection let me say the following: We must develop a scientific periodization of the history of Soviet society. Naturally, this is not the main task of historical science. However, there can be no scientific history without scientific periodization. The periodization which has existed so far is totally unscientific. Unfortunately, it became universally widespread because it was included in the textbook on party history which in the initial stage played a positive role but which subsequently, particularly in chapters which dealt with contemporary history, was no longer consistent with the real logic of the facts. Consider the periodization as presented in the 1985 edition of the textbook. You will see there the end of the transitional period and the beginning of a period of completing the building of a socialist society and a gradual conversion to communism. By your leave, this period even today lies in the future. The textbook is based on the fact that this was entered in the resolution of the 18th Party Congress. This, however, violently contradicts reality and life and on this basis alone we have rejected the idea of the advent of the stage of building communism in its expanded variety, which determined the periodization of history from the end of the 1950s to the mid-1960s. After that, in accordance with the then accepted periodization, the history of developed socialism began with the start of the 1960s. This too was anticipatory.

I believe that today we must provide a new periodization. We must begin by singling out within the past 70 years the most important landmarks; for the history of our country, a history saturated with a real content and pace and in terms of what we experienced and accomplished, 70 years is quite a long time. It is only after long periods or ages that we can identify individual stages.

I believe that we should single out three major stages in the 70-year old history of Soviet society, the history of the establishment and development of socialism. The first is the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, in the course of which a process of development of socialism took place (or of laying the foundations for socialism or building socialism in its essential lines). This was followed by a period of completing the building of socialism in which we single out the stage of its full and definitive victory. In my view, this period begins with the Great Patriotic War and ends in 1985. The new, the third stage is unquestionably the present period, the current turn, restructuring, which will mark the beginning of a new major age in the history of the further development of socialism and the gradual transition to communism.

Someone may object to the fact that I extend the transitional period up to the beginning of the war. If you and I consider the war a landmark, a second "point of reckoning" after the October Revolution, everything which occurred before the war should be classified with the preceding period, the period of transition. The following is proof of the fact that the war indicates the second major landmark which also marks the beginning of a new major period: Whereas the October Revolution meant struggle, the civil war waged by the working class and the peasantry against landowners and capitalists within the country, for socialism, in the latter case socialism, already built, has clashed with imperialism, with its assault force. I believe that it is as important to defend existing socialism as to build it.

Here is another quite important external aspect: In periodization the second period should be related to the establishment of the global socialist system. That is why on the international level and on the level of the history of the destinies of world socialism and the development of our country the war marks, naturally, the beginning of a new stage (1945-1985), a stage which I would describe as one of the full and definitive victory of socialism.

As to the contemporary period, I believe that for the time being it is difficult to provide a comprehensive assessment of it. Reality is already indicating, however, how serious this turning point in the level of our society is.

Within the framework of these three major periods a number of internal stages could be singled out. They include the October Revolution and the civil war and, also in connection with the fact that during these years a specific economic policy—war communism—was being implemented, it too should be considered separately. I then single out the first or initial stage of the NEP (1921-1927). Someone may object that if we speak of the initial period we should also speak of those which follow it. The point, however, is that in my view the NEP operated in the spirit in which Lenin understood it only until 1927. It was on the basis of the economic relations of interaction between the working class and the peasantry that this policy functioned, admitting initially capitalism and state capitalism and subsequently, starting with 1928, after we undertook the reconstruction of the national economy and converted to the expanded building of socialism and mounted an offensive along the entire front that the NEP became strongly misshaped. It stopped to exist within the limits, framework and standards stipulated by Lenin. The method of economic interaction between the peasantry and the working class was replaced by the method of directives and administrative orders. The economic instruments used to influence this alliance were eliminated. I then single out the period between 1928 and 1941, which was the stage of expanded socialist building, which ended with the building of socialism in our country.

Question: You defined the 1921-1927 period as the first stage of the NEP. The line of demarcation separating 1927 from 1928 is quite accurate. But you based it on the conversion to the expanded building of socialism, i.e., on an entirely objective and fully substantiated process. Is it possible, nonetheless, to reduce the reasons for changes in the economic policy, which indeed took place and were initiated in 1928, only to the objectively substantiated reasons or were there some kind of subjectivistic deviations?

M.P. Kim

At this point we must bear in mind not only the interrelationship between peasantry and working class, although this is the main problem, but other problems as well, such as industrialization and wages. We started by saying that after 1928 economic incentive and economic factors were replaced by noneconomic factors, almost like a restoration of the tax in kind during the period of war communism and a barter economy. However, no barter economy developed in industry. The wage system was not abolished and war communism, tax in kind and bartering, in connection with the mandatory state procurements by kolkhozes, are nonetheless different things. I believe, therefore, that to speak of a total restoration to the period of the tax in kind and war communism would be unnecessary. The NEP exhausted its possibilities, in my view at the beginning of the 1930s, in

1932-1933, bearing in mind the Leninist concept to the effect that the purpose of the NEP is the socialist reorganization of the peasantry and laying the foundations of a socialist economy.

I.I. Mints

How accurate is it to correlate the universally accepted logical system of the basic stages of development and the real logic of historical facts? I would approach the answer to this question differently, i.e., we achieved tremendous successes. We have eliminated the exploitation of man by man and the exploitation of one nation by another; there is no unemployment, etc. We are offering to the entire world an alternative, a solution to the dead end into which imperialism is taking mankind. It seems to me that this is the viewpoint which should guide us in reviewing the periodization in the writing of new history textbooks. A discussion on this topic has been initiated in our USSR History Institute. However, I would like to emphasize that priority should be given to problems of our reality, our building. I would divide all Soviet history into three major periods: the first is the victory of socialism in the USSR; the second is the conversion of socialism into a world system (which would include the Great Patriotic War); the third period is our contemporaneity as an extension of what was started with the October Revolution.

Now as to the "blank spots" in the history of our country. Naturally, they are numerous. However, we must distinguish between the "blank spots" which developed because of lack of material or interest in it and "blank spots" created as a result of the deliberate deletion or omission of individual problems. Naturally, the first cannot be filled "in one fell swoop." At this point we should consider the following: Whatever we may have been saying or referring to, this is a lengthy process. The second are those which are the result of a deliberate principle, based on political events in our country. These must be reviewed as well but exceptionally cautiously. I would formulate the following question: Our opponents today are writing essentially about the history of the Soviet system of the end of the 1930s, thoroughly avoiding what preceded them. They write about nothing but this! We must answer, we must prove that the history of the Soviet system does not begin with the 1930s but in 1917. They raise the question of names: It is accurate that we must bring back names but merely mentioning them does not mean that we must justify all of them. We shall exonerate only those who were falsely accused. Could we delete from history the harm caused by Trotsky, not only during the Brest period but also through his subsequent activities?

Yu.A. Polyakov

The question of filling the "blank spots" is quite complex. However, we must be specific: As was pointed out here, there are differences among "blank spots." There are closed areas which could not be studied. This was

one. Nor were researchers given the proper documents. For example, the topic of the struggle against bureaucratism may seem simple. Yet this topic was considered virtually closed, despite the entire danger presented by bureaucratic distortions in terms of the normal activities of the party and society. There also are problems, which could be classified as "blank spots" also, which were studied superficially and one-sidedly, for which reason they became "blank spots" and turned into a scientific "vacuums." Finally, there are problems which were considered axiomatic but which actually must be reviewed. They too could be classified as "blank spots."

V.Z. Drobizhev

In my view, we have an inordinately large number of "blank spots." Let me list a few of them. The first is the 1930s, which we have virtually left unstudied. Yet this is a stage in the country's history when not only our achievements but many of the subsequent negative trends in our development took place and had an aftermath. The 1930s have remained outside our pale of research. We have become so greatly accustomed to "storming" and to "storms," although the second 5-year plan included neither storming nor storms, and although other problems arose in the prewar years, that we simply ignored period of the 1930s.

The second problem is that of the history of the theoretical thinking of our party. It was said here that theoretical thinking and its development were frustrated. Unquestionably, I agree with this. Nonetheless, a great deal of interesting developments existed as well. However, having deleted from history V.M. Molotov and N.S. Khrushchev, without deleting yet without studying suitably the works of S.M. Kirov, F.E. Dzerzhinskiy and N.A. Voznesenskiy, we conceived of theoretical thinking as a set of a few concepts. Who specifically took part in the formulation of one problem or another? How was theoretical knowledge accumulated? What mechanism was followed in the formulation of party decisions? All of this remained beyond the scope of historical research.

In my view, the social dynamics of Soviet society is one of the very essential problems. Thousands of words have been written in our country on the subject of the working class and the peasantry and little about the intelligentsia. However, in the works on the working class I cannot name a single one which has drawn the attention of the mass public. Unfortunately, the multiple-volume history of the Soviet working class, which is being prepared by the USSR History Institute, is being published in miserably small editions and we fail to understand to whom it is addressed. In other words, this is not a definitive monograph or a comprehensive study of sociopolitical importance. Yet in this area a tremendous amount of problems have piled up. One of them is that of the boundaries of the working class. As in the past, we classify as members of the working class industrial workers only, i.e., something which is not in the least the case in the contemporary world. The question of the

interconnection between the working class and the peasantry has been reduced in our works to the problem of the sponsorship of workers over the countryside. Relatively speaking, only the history of the trade unions would be even more boring. Such books are extremely uninteresting. Yet, this is an inordinately grave problem which has assumed a new meaning today. The working class has changed in terms of structure. Millions of people from the countryside have been added to it. Who came from the countryside? How did the countryside influence the city? Should we not seek the social roots of the cult of personality in the petit bourgeois element which flooded the town? It was not only the toiling peasants who came to the towns but also peasants frequently angered by the errors which were made during the period of collectivization.

Another question I would like to raise is that of democracy and bureaucratism. How was bureaucratism established on the soil of Soviet democracy? This is an exceptionally interesting question. We are currently studying the structure of soviets and of delegates to the congresses of local soviets. Some curious observations have been made. In the 1920s the replaceability of soviets was minimal. It drastically increased in the 1930s. On the surface, this is quite democratic: The congresses of soviets are renewed by one-third of the membership, but at what expense? At the expense of workers and peasants, workers at the work bench and peasants behind the plow. However, the mechanism guiding the congresses of soviets—members of the central executive committee, the people's commissariats, and the members of the collegiums of people's commissariats, were always the same. It is thus that a mechanism of divide and rule was established. This is a very curious process.

A.M. Samsonov

I would like to draw attention to the overall topic of our meeting: The main stages in the development of Soviet society. It is my opinion that problems of periodization play a subordinate role in the study of the historical process. Although such problems are very important, it is not they which determine in the final account the success or failure of a study. Variants of periodization for the period from 1917 to the present have already been suggested here. My personal belief is that the periodization may consist of three basic periods: the October Revolution and the civil war, followed by the period of building socialism and, finally, the Great Patriotic War and the postwar period. Each one of them should be respectively divided into stages. Other variants are possible as well. The problem is the presentation of the history of the past in Soviet historiography, its achievements, shortcomings and faults, and what hinders the successful development of historical science.

I believe that we must not forget self-criticism. So far no one here has mentioned that our historical science, like the other social sciences, was subjected to rather harsh

and quite just criticism. History has fallen behind the tasks of society and we feel this directly in our work. We must mention shortcomings. That is why now, when a restructuring, a revolutionary restructuring of society is taking place, it is precisely in this area that I see the similarity between the present and the period of the October Revolution: I see it in the revolutionary approach to the solution of the problems which face the people and scientists and, in particular, in going beyond frozen forms and stereotypes. We must speak out and state boldly the facts.

The following question arises here: What is it that triggers phenomena such as, for example, the "Memory" society? Naturally, the people, young people in particular and society in general, have a tremendous need to understand what is taking and what took place. It is bad if only good things find their way into the hands of political extremists. We must satisfy the healthy needs of the people to know and understand their own history. We must speak most firmly and openly, without fearing what will be thought about us abroad, shall we say, or used to criticize us. I believe, therefore, that the most important problem which faces us under the conditions of restructuring is historical truth.

V.A. Kozlov

We must define some principles for periodization within which this science can continue to advance. Everything here is clear. However, another mood prevails as well, quite widespread among historians, who suggest the following: Let us set up a commission, let us draft a periodization and let us formulate specific recommendations. After that, dogmatically thinking historians will find it easy to write this history. But what to do with those who try to write this history creatively? Here is an example. A book on problems of expedient activities of people under the conditions of building socialism has been written. In the course of the work on this book some critical aspects in Soviet history were brought to light, which do not fit any kind of periodization. I fear that we shall find among historians a "Procrustean," who will apply the natural "Procrustean" method—surgery: He will delete facts which cannot be periodized.

For that reason we decided that our entire problem is to provide a new assessment. However, not once did we raise the question of the foundations of and approaches to such assessments. The traditional system of historical summation, from an academic multiple-volume work to a school textbook, has become catastrophically obsolete and no cosmetic efforts to repair it could help. This system developed in the 1930s, when certain priorities in the development of society existed in our country (industrialization above all, etc.). It was this that determined the very organization of the material. Today we say that a certain type of new approach should be sought. *Kommunist* justifiably wrote that such approaches must be sought in relation to people. This means that we must seek a different form of organization and presentation of

data. Metaphorically speaking, we applied the national-historical approach; today we need the active approach, i.e., a depiction of history as seen through the purposeful activities of the people. At that point, it is my profound conviction, that our book will be published not in 2,000 but in 200,000 copies, for there is nothing more interesting to a person than the person himself. And if the living person with his mentality, interest, hopes, concerns, prejudices and errors makes his appearance in history, such a history will become entirely different. Our system does not take any of this into consideration.

In particular, we fear to deal with the problems of transition to comprehensive collectivization, for we do not know how to analyze alternative situations and processes of elaboration of political decisions. We, historians, consider political decisions as a given and subsequently, we discuss their implementation as though dictated by providence. Yet the source of motion appears at the time of the formulation of decisions, when changes are being made. We thus lose this source of dynamics, which finds itself stuck between periods and, in general, we do not let dialectics work.

M.P. Kim

Let me answer the considerations expressed by V.A. Kozlov. I detect in them a somewhat nihilistic attitude toward periodization itself. The historical process must be considered in terms of human activities, without any particular stages or periods, for they could fetter an objective historical study of events. Differences may exist here between the general periodization of the entire history of society and the periodization of history in individual areas. Each area and each trend may have their own pace and deadlines. However, this does not exclude the fact that nonetheless a general periodization must be provided, bearing in mind the pivotal and essential features of this process: the production method, interrelationship among classes, etc. Although partial deviations in individual areas may exist they are no hindrance.

V.A. Kozlov

Periodization is needed but it should be the result of new research and not set within some kind of framework in which we put ourselves. There is a specific historiographic background on which the discussion on periodization is based, a background which could lead to a deformation of the accurate ideas you have suggested. That is what I fear.

M.P. Kim

In frequent cases differences of opinion on problems of periodization are explained by the tendency to consider the year 1956 as marking the end of the transitional period, relating this to the exposure of the cult of personality and the familiar Central Committee decree. Naturally, to a certain extent, when we are dealing with

problems of, shall we say, the role of the individual, the violation of the Leninist norms of life and their restoration, this is admissible. However, the history of Soviet society as a whole provides no scientific grounds for considering 1956 as marking the end of the transitional period. Therefore, although in some areas we can find specific stages of periodization, we nonetheless need an overall periodization in the history of society, based on changes in the production method, the class structure of the society, politics, and so on.

Yu.A. Polyakov

Today we must solve general problems rather than focus on some limited matters.

A.M. Samsonov

Are the repressions of the 1930s a limited matter?

V.Z. Drobizhev

I support Maksim Pavlovich's persistence in the discussion on periodization. To us periodization is not simply a result but also a tool for studies. The research process itself is hindered without periodization. Furthermore, if the personnel of an academic institution can postpone solving the problem of periodization we, teachers, cannot do so. Starting with next year, we are converting to the new curriculum. That is why this problem is very important from the scientific and teaching viewpoints.

I would like to express a few ideas on the matter of periodization. One way or another, I would preserve the transitional period as we have considered it in the past: stopping at the mid-1930s. This is because both the party decisions and all factual data and the study of the economics and social structure of the society indicate that we had already built socialism in its essential lines by the mid-1930s which, obviously, is also the completion of the transitional period. I support comrades who suggest that the mid-1950s be considered the end of a period. It was then that in terms of its economic and social structure the working class reached 50 percent of the employed population and major changes occurred in the structure of the peasantry and the intelligentsia; politically, this is a very essential line. Starting with the mid-1950s I would consider this to be the third period which lasted through 1985. A truly new stage, the stage of the struggle for the renovation of socialism, began in 1986.

There are reasons for periodization within these periods. However, this is a different topic. As a whole, it seems to me that today the problem of periodization requires a comprehensive discussion but not the way this was done in the course of the elaboration of the program on party history, when everything was being decided and programs were being formulated behind closed doors. Today the training process is based on the periodization approved by the Minvuz.

History and Historians

Today historical science is undergoing a complex and important period in its development. What should be done to raise historical research to a qualitatively new level?

Yu.A. Polyakov

Everything seems to indicate that the main future debates in historical science will include the question of the full and definitive victory of socialism, a question to which, as is the case with many others, we shall return. Today, however, we must deal with today's matters. The main thing is that we must write and work. This, however, requires extensive time and we cannot create works instantaneously. It is time to convert from agitation to work. Prose writer Yuriy Polyakov, my namesake, accurately said at the 20th Komsomol Congress that our support of restructuring must be manifested not by "raising our hand" but behind the desk. What must be done now to enhance the level of historical science?

To us it has already become axiomatic that we must write the truth, that we must not avoid sharp angles. Although we have always said this, we must make it specific. I would formulate it as follows: Our art must be freed from the influence of circumstances. The question was raised here of the correlation between science and politics and it is obvious that we shall come across this problem of tremendous complexity frequently. However, somehow we must surmount the influence of circumstances. We must surmount shifts from unrestrained praise and quotation mongering to total silence.

We must focus our history on people. Yet the "nonperson" has become all too widespread and to this day we seem to turn many leaders of the past into invisible men. We must not simply enumerate historical personalities but describe living people, party and state figures, men of science and the arts, with all their doubts, errors, failures, emotions, accomplishments, victories and failures. In other words, we must describe them in their full dimensions and not in formal terms. We must also depict the simple people with their thoughts and their views. We must more fully describe their spiritual world and way of life. We must know, although perhaps this is a primarily ethnographic task, the way they looked and the way they dressed in order to see them not only at work but in their daily life.

Our methodology is accurate and we must not allow for Marxist methodology to be denigrated or accused of preventing us from discovering the truth. This methodology enables us to surmount many difficulties in the development of science and, in frequent cases, to look into the depth of the historical process. In terms of its spirit, our methodology requires creativity. Yet we have begun to accept it as catechism. Once again today we

must be guided by the fact that our methodology is a compass which helps us to chart the proper way and not a map on which our itinerary to the final objective has been plotted in advance.

We must maintain high professional standards. We frequently ignore this fact. The view prevails that it is simple to deal with history, that anyone can do it. That is why, incidentally, our cadres largely developed in a variety of ways and there are many people working in history without adequate professional training. We must be able to write and pay particular attention to this aspect of the work. We must write and argue and prove not on the basis of quotations but of living thoughts. That is the level which we must attain.

Finally, we must reach high standards in literary skills in order to avoid tormenting clichés and embellishments, to eliminate the innumerable clichés, stereotypes and conventionalisms, see the face of the author and develop an individual approach in writing and style. Also important is the question of publishing, for frequently it is precisely the editors who tend to polish everything.

If in the course of our practical work to a certain extent we can secure perhaps what I pointed out, the quality standards of historical research would unquestionably improve.

V.A. Kozlov

We have problems on the subject of which the masses turn to historians with increasing frequency. They include the problem of the cult of personality, intraparty differences and collectivization. So far, however, we must admit that we are unable to answer any one of them. We have no ready answers and it would be naive to expect such answers today, when the historians have undertaken to put everything in its proper place. However, if in the course of our considerations we limit ourselves to noting the fact that the cult of personality must be studied, that we must study the problem of intraparty differences and repeat once again that there should be no "blank spots" in history, in all likelihood the readers will not understand us.

The question, when we study problems of the 1930s, is not one of having access to archives. We are hindered not by the scarcity of archival documents but by the obvious insufficiency of general sociological ideas and approaches which would lead us out of the dead end street in this matter. It seems to me that before going to the archives we should have a clear research program which would include not only the belief that the cult of personality is bad. There are no differences among us on this matter. Therefore, let us consider from the viewpoint of such a research program what is happening today in our political journalism. In my view, a typical preference may be noted here for an approach which was outlined in Lenin's "Letter to the Congress" and is reduced to Stalin's personality features. However, Lenin

also issued a very profound forecast-warning in his March 1922 letter to Molotov on the subject of party ranks. He wrote that the proletarian structure of the party is determined at that time by a "very thin stratum" of revolutionaries who could be described as the old party guard. Any division within this "very thin stratum" could bring about a loss of its authority, as a result of which it will no longer be able to make decisions.

Unfortunately, subsequent events concurred with this prognosis: There was division, there was internal party struggle and, consequently, this led to the fact that essentially decisions did not longer depend on the old party guard. In my view, such is the approach which we must develop, i.e., a sociological approach, for pressure exerted on the party by the petit bourgeois element, by the bearers of the "leadership" mentality, indeed occurred; the party was unable to counter this with the unity of the old party guard, which could have solved the problems. In my view, this is the area to be studied, rather than the features of Stalin's personality, although they too should not be ignored, naturally. In this case we use a shortcut, as a result of which instead of explanations and clarifications, we frequently plunge into philippics or lamentations on this subject. This, in my view, is something a historian must never do.

The right to pass moral judgment over the past is, unquestionably, a problem of historical knowledge. However, in the language of the science of history we have not even learned how to raise moral questions: What is good and evil as it applies to the past in general? Ordinary concepts must not be applied in the assessment of historical processes. We have not raised such a question which, however, should be raised. Something else. We apply a strange shortcut in assessing problems related to the repressions of the 1930s: The old party guard is depicted above all as the victim. However, it became the victim precisely because these people were above all fighters against the cult of Stalin's personality, which was gathering strength. This was a real phenomenon which was reflected even in the historical sources at our disposal. So far, however, this problem has remained unstudied. Yet this is a problem of preserving the Leninist tradition within the party, a tradition which, in the final account, led to the 20th Party Congress, as well as an explanation of why democratization has developed inconsistently after the 20th Congress. In the final account, the struggle which the old party guard waged for the Leninist principles and its efforts to counter the implantation of a regime of individual power are what lead us to an understanding of the present restructuring. It is precisely such a consideration of the problems of the cult of personality that, I believe, would be the most fruitful.

Something else. After 1956 something strange happened in our country in terms of the use of the concept itself. We concealed the problems of the prewar period behind the term "cult of personality," and it was as though this had freed us from the need to study it. Since this was

taking place "under the conditions of the cult of personality" what good could it contain? As a whole, we did not undertake to increase our knowledge. I may be wrong but it seems to me that today we are returning to the level reached in our work by the turn of the 1960s. We can start with this level. Let us move ahead in our understanding of the phenomenon itself. Psychologically it is even difficult to study, for it is suppressed by the "emotional" background. Nonetheless, such a study is necessary.

We must examine each historical study from the viewpoint of whether we find in it Marxism only in terms of ritual phraseology or as a true "working" method for the study of historical processes, and whether or not it uses the dialectical method. It is precisely this type of evaluations of what has already been accomplished that we lack. Without it, however, we cannot suitably determine the situation in which we find ourselves and how to get out of it.

Here is an example. I offered a publishing house a booklet on the 1960s-1980s. I did not receive an out-and-out rejection but I was given to understand that it would be preferable if I did not "push," for "no definitive evaluation has been made as yet." But then who should formulate such evaluations? General evaluations do exist but there also are some specific historical problems which we must solve.

A.M. Samsonov

Let me mention the mechanisms of obstruction which truly hinder a proper restructuring in the realm of the science of history, starting with scientific collectives.

The view has prevailed among us that only one viewpoint should exist in science. I shall not cite examples, for they are well-known. Someone makes a study and it suddenly becomes apparent that the author's viewpoint is different from that of other historians. That is all that it takes for the publishing house to reject the work. Why? On the one hand, we say, we need debates; on the other, we consider inadmissible any kind of debatable topics in our research. Debates should not take place only in journals in which, incidentally, they are quite rare. They must appear in books as well.

Totally unjustified criteria have been established in our scientific institutes in judging works on history. How is the research process organized? Topics are listed, and titles, size and completion deadlines are set, after which the public and the management see to it that both deadlines and size are observed. The work is completed and approved for publication and that is all. However, it is precisely at this point that we should study the life of the book. What kind of research did it involve? On what was it based? How much interest did it generate? Or else, conversely, did it generate any interest at all? We never ask whether the book by a given historian is requested in a library or how good was the sale of a small edition. We

do not bother to study the life of a book. I believe, therefore, that the time has come to revise our criteria in assessing the work of historians and to be guided not by quantity, by "gross output" in historical science but by the efficiency of our studies.

The difficulties which arise in submitting our manuscripts to publishing houses were mentioned here. The approach is simple and the traditional question of the editor to the author is the following: Where else has this been published or mentioned? But what kind of research is this if something on the same subject has already been printed or said? The author should say and create something new. That is why in our plan for restructuring we must reread pages from the past, which carry the mark of subjectivism, of glossing reality over and of one-sidedness. It is on the basis of the study of documents which were previously inaccessible (it is important to see to it that they become accessible) that we must objectively interpret events, particularly those of the 1930s, the period of the Great Patriotic War, the history of the 1960s and 1970s, and so on.

A researcher who tries to study the past outside already accepted formulas and stereotypes immediately encounters difficulties. Names were mentioned here. Naturally, a variety of colors must be used to paint the portrait of one historical figure or another. However, we must see to it that this portrait is consistent with historical realities. If we consider that history is a creative science (something which is occasionally questioned) no area should be closed to it. Yet such forbidden areas do exist. Perhaps the time has not come as yet for a historian to write a monograph on Stalin. Nonetheless, such a time must come. This is already being done in literary-artistic journals and other publications. In connection with my writings I receive many letters expressing different opinions. This too is very interesting. Some of them are simply difficult to read because of the fierceness with which their authors object to my views. I must point out, however, that most of the letters support criticism of the cult of Stalin, based on specific historical data. This has truly become a relevant topic.

It is asked sometimes whether there was a cult of Khrushchev and Brezhnev? For example, a similar question was asked on television of a philosopher, who answered: No, there was no such cult. I believe that the answer was correct. However, we must not move on but point out that during some periods there were manifestations of voluntarism and a weakening of collective leadership and a substitution of ostentatiousness for true democracy in the activities of both Khrushchev and Brezhnev. We know the eventual results of all this. That is why we should emphasize the fact that, as we study the positive and negative experience of the Soviet state during the different stages in its development, it is important to indicate how shortcomings were surmounted and problems of tremendous historical significance resolved successfully. Therefore, the positive principle should be the main line to be followed in our

studies. Let us recall how backward our country was initially and that now it is a great power. However, this does not mean in the least that we must ignore everything negative which took place along our way. I believe that we must truly undertake to restructure, starting with ourselves.

A tremendous interest has now been generated in our periodicals and in our daily press! The people are attracted not only by the sharp tone of the publications but also by the fact that the truth is being published. Frequently the press is as frank as one could wish. It is extremely frank. However, we have still not extended the principle of telling the truth, the full truth and nothing but the truth, to our historical science. Writers speak out and can prove that they at least had made a start. How many years have gone by since A. Rybakov started to write "Deti Arbata" [The Children of Arbat], or the completion of "Zubra" [The Diehards] by D. Granin or "Belyye Odezhdy" [White Clothing] by V. Dudintsev? Nonetheless, those people wrote, even as they knew that they will not be published and, incidentally, many of them died before the time when they could publish arrived. Are there similar manuscripts written by historians? That is what concerns us. We must see to it that the historians develop both the aspiration and understanding of the fact that they must write about history the way it was and see to it that such information becomes accessible to the readers.

Question: It is precisely this that is mentioned in letters to the editors. Here is an excerpt from one such letter: "Historians avoid to discuss the moral consequences of the cult of personality, the class nature of the cult in our conditions and its petit-bourgeois nature. When will historians involve themselves in that which is being done by literary workers, not without a certain emotional pressure? They are working on this, however." Is actually the science of history catching up with literature?

A.M. Samsonov

We must master whatever restructuring demands of us. Initially the USSR Academy of Sciences History Department worked on comprehensive problems, which was greatly needed. Then it began to formulate long-term programs, which was also necessary. Today convincing arguments are being cited on the importance of the periodization of our history. This is unquestionable. However, we dealt with this some 10 or 20 years ago, including problems of periodization. Nonetheless, this is not the main task. Are writers or historians more important? Whose authority is greater? That is not the problem. What matters is the way every one of us will do his duty, historians in particular. I believe that we have fallen greatly behind.

Is history any less attractive than, shall we say, fiction? We must admit self-critically that we have fallen greatly behind both in the professional and civic sense. There is little interest in historical books. This must be taken into consideration and we must eliminate anything which is hindering us.

For example, for a long time I have called for the publication of the full text of Order No 227, dated 28 July 1942, which was read to all frontline troops. I sent a letter to the higher military authorities on this matter but have received no answer. This is merely one example. In the past I studied Supreme Headquarters materials, and discussions with the various fronts. The materials were extremely interesting! All of this, however, is classified. A few documents are being declassified now but, judging by all available information, this is done on a halfway basis.

We need, therefore, access to documents, first of all. Second, we must solve the problem of who decides on questions of science: Is it the editor in the publishing house or the scientist and the scientific collective? For the time being, it is the editor and the entire operational system of the publishing house is so structured that the editor is given a bonus if no "difficult" situations arise. That is precisely why the hands of scientists are tied. However, we must not assume an expectant position but struggle so that we could write interestingly and in such a way as to satisfy the readers.

I.I. Mints

Let me say a few words on the subject of the letter an excerpt of which was read here. Yes, in some cases fiction writers are ahead of historians. However, in some novels, for example, the debauchery of Catherine the Great is described as "governmental activities." Or else, in another book, masons are presented as the motive forces of the revolution. No actual facts can support such theories. It seems to me that the struggle against such legends could become more effective if historians would be more active in their work.

Anything which has to do with restructuring is directly and immediately related to our work, starting with the struggle for discipline and for the observance and assertion of our standards. Equally applicable to us are openness, criticism and self-criticism. For the science of history, in my view, the characteristic feature of restructuring could be reduced to the following questions: What problems should we be dealing with now? Should we reject everything old or should we formulate new questions? I would not reject the past, for it retains its validity. However, new topics arise as well. For example, our program for building socialism is being persistently criticized in the West and the October Revolution is presented as an alternative. There were no alternatives to the October Revolution, for at that time the salvation of Russia was possible only through the establishment of a new system—the power of the workers and the peasants. The people rejected all other parties, including those which favored conciliation, and took the side of the Bolsheviks.

Let us consider the questions of the civil war and the intervention. One may think that this is a closed historical page. However, when we hear that a film on the

"seizure" of this country by the Bolsheviks has been made in the United States, and when the President himself has repeatedly threatened with an anticommunist "crusade," and with calls for "dumping socialism in the garbage can," you begin to realize that today once again we must discuss the topic of intervention, perhaps from a different viewpoint. So far we have spoken about it essentially from the viewpoint of the history of diplomacy, etc. This no longer suffices. We must depict the actual participation of the individual capitalist countries in the intervention.

V.Z. Drobizhev

What is hindering us today? It seems to me, most of all not the censorship of publishing houses but our own censorship. For many years we were trained in such a way that it is difficult for us to abandon deeply rooted stereotypes. Recently I started an article on worker self-government and started thinking that I was commenting on the latest decisions in this connection, although the history of worker self-government is by no means simple or one-dimensional. Or else the following: Today we are beginning to mention a return to the principle of the tax in kind. We have not turned to the principle of tax in kind mechanically but in practical terms we are rediscovering, we are developing the socialist political economy. The historical circumstances and times today are entirely different. In developing the NEP system, Lenin had the transitional period and not the period of built socialism in mind.

The second prerequisite, it seems to me, in our own restructuring is the enhanced level of professional skill. It is no secret that many talented people have switched from the history of Soviet society and of the party to other areas of historical science and that the influx of capable young people has almost dried out.

At one point I was assigned to review a book published by Izdatelstvo Mysl. I wrote that this was not a professionally written book. The author came to me to thank me: "I am pleased that you did not accuse me of political error. As to the rest, I can change it quickly, just tell me which pages." The lack of professionalism is manifested in the fact that we are unable to analyze the totality of the facts which have reached us. We select a specific little fact and make it fit a familiar structure.

The third prerequisite is the development of publishing. We are not publishing documents. We stopped doing this. Unfortunately, that is what happened. We welcomed the 40th anniversary of the October Revolution with a tremendous series of documentary publications. Some of them were based on files—the most valuable and the most interesting; we noted the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution only with a few basic publications; preparations for the 70th anniversary have been extremely few. For example, we are not publishing the minutes of the congresses of soviets (the proceedings). Documents related to several soviet congresses are kept

at the Lenin Library, in the rare books division. They were published in miserably small editions. They have become both obsolete and bibliographic rarities. Yet this is a most valuable historical source! We have fallen very much behind in publishing.

M.P. Kim

Why do we write commentaries? Because this has become traditional. The 22d Congress proclaimed that we had entered the period of the developed building of communism. On one occasion I tried to object to the promotion of the slogan of "Let Us Make Moscow a Model Communist City!" I said: What is all this talk about communism, let us begin by turning the capital city into a model socialist city and only then into a communist one. So, Moscow will enter communism while the rest of the country will still have to do with socialism? I also objected to the view that starting with 1961 ours was a developed socialist society. It became necessary to suggest another choice: We still do not have any developed socialism and the very building of it, the process of entering this stage would be lengthy (I extended it to 18 years). Had I openly objected, I would have simply not been published. Therefore, today we must offer scientists the opportunity—the way to implement it, naturally, should be sought—of speaking out not only against the errors of the past but also on the subject of some current concepts, if they disagree with them. Otherwise, once again history will repeat itself and 10 years later we would be asked, what was the matter with you, there were errors and you kept silent, you merely agreed and commented? So that let us now not only comment but also critically think, suggest and help to find optimal decisions.

In order to raise historical studies to a new quality standard, we must do what the imperative of the new style of thinking mandates. This involves a creative approach to all problems; freeing our minds from dogmatic encrustations and a primitive understanding of our functions, which have been merely to comment on authoritatively expressed assessments and documents, and taking the road of independent creative thinking. In the field of historical sciences this cannot be accomplished so quickly as, for example, in fiction.

The historian cannot select isolated bits of someone's biography or from a short historical period, as writers do in such cases, and include in a character the part he understands. The historian must consider history as a whole in strict chronological sequence of its individual stages, which makes his task all the more complex. This is no excuse whatsoever for historians. We are restructuring ourselves all too slowly. However, in this case we must display a particularly thoughtful attitude to the task compared to literary workers or artists. In my view, today the formula which dominates the thinking of some writers and political journalists is the following: What was bad in the past is now good and what was good is now bad. This is a rather scathing formula which may

tempt those whose assessments are based on emotions. It seems to me that a more serious study is necessary to restore the truth of the historical process, the process of establishment and development of real socialism in our country. That makes fully accurate the stipulation of the party and its leadership that our history must recreate and comprehensively interpret both negative and positive features, comprehensively rather than one-sidedly.

From the editors:

The changes, the tremendous work of restructuring, the harsh lessons in truth taught by the 27th Party Congress and the revival of public interest in our past urgently demand of historians the innovative and fearless analysis of the past decades, and historical research free from recurrences of the old ills such as bookishness, formalism, suppressions and moods influenced by circumstances.

Unquestionably, the questions of the scientific periodization of the history of Soviet society, extensively discussed by the participants in the roundtable meeting, are important. Periodization helps us to study more profoundly the content of the historical process and to define the historical framework of individual development stages. It is a methodological tool for knowledge. Of course, this problem cannot be considered central and self-seeking within the range of the scientific interests of historians. Naturally, the task of the discussions could not be the elaboration of some kind of definitive variant of periodization. This will be the work of scientific collectives in the course of the initiated debate.

In our studies it is particularly important to rely on a fundamental historical approach, on the dialectical principle of historicism. V.I. Lenin frequently called for this, demanding that in the course of the study of social processes "not to forget the basic historical connection, to look at each problem from the viewpoint of the way a historical phenomenon developed, what were the main stages which this phenomenon crossed in its development and, from the viewpoint of this development, to determine what this object has now become" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 39, p 67). This Leninist methodological stipulation is of tremendous importance in the study of the history of Soviet society and the history of developing socialism. It is precisely on this basis that we must bring to light and interpret the events of the October Revolution, the conversion to the new economic policy, the subjective and objective grounds for the processes of the country's industrialization and agricultural collectivization, the dialectics of establishment of socialist culture and the development of national and political relations. This type of objective and sober study of the past helps us to solve the question of what to reject from the experience we have acquired and how to reject it; what to accept and how to accept it; what to do and what not to do to avoid a repetition of errors. For the dialectics of continuity and innovation in terms of historical and social experience

lies precisely in the fact that in each specific case we must solve this problem extremely specifically; on each occasion we must consider the present within the context of history and in connection with the general trends in the dynamics of a society advancing toward higher forms of organization.

A number of problems arise in this connection. The historical process is indivisible. "That which is occurring with increasing speed under our very eyes is also history" (V.I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 3, p 632). In the science of history it is important not to fall behind this accelerating movement but to write the true history of our time which, naturally, cannot be reduced to simply commenting on documents, thus allowing us to "trace" the trends of social development, to look ahead and to anticipate the future. For the time being, this skill, which is basically and methodologically substantiated in the classical historical works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, is obviously in short supply among us.

The other problem is the approach to the "blank spots" in our recent history. These historiographic "gaps" are related, as a rule, not simply to the "nonpersons" but most frequently to misrepresentations in the interpretation of one historical event or another. At this point it would be pertinent to recall the Marxist stipulation that "In the final account...erroneous concepts are erroneous views on right facts. The facts remain even if the concepts about such facts are false" (K. Marx and F. Engels "Soch." [Works], vol 20, p 476). It is a question of determining, on the basis of a wide range of sources, the real nature of events and to formulate a maximally complete picture and clarify historical truth. This should be helped by an easier access to archives, the increased publication of documents and the lifting of unjustified restrictions imposed on research.

There is yet another important aspect related to assessing the events of the past. Sometimes in this case emotions prevail over reason; scientific analysis is replaced by narrow moralizing and individuals and entire periods in history are depicted in monochromatic—light or dark—colors. History is complex and multicolored and moral evaluations must be firmly based on historicism. Equally harmful to the knowledge of historical truth is haste, sensationalism and the aspiration to "anticipate progress," which can be sensed in a number of publications. It is important to study the past on the basis of systematic Marxist-Leninist class-oriented positions, arranging everything according to priority. We must not yield to any type of one-sided concepts and moods. We cannot build our attitude toward everything which occurred after the October Revolution on such concepts.

In addressing the 20th Komsomol Congress, M.S. Gorbachev pointed out the importance which V.I. Lenin ascribed to shaping a historical awareness. The history of the socialist fatherland must generously nurture a feeling of civic duty in every Soviet person. This must be an honest, courageous and interesting history which would

not bypass the dramatic nature of events and human destinies, so that the heroic path of the country and the party—the path of the October Revolution and of the pioneers—may be depicted in its fullness and grandeur.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

Restructuring and the Trade Unions

18020018m Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 80-90

[Article by Marat Viktorovich Baglay, doctor of juridical sciences, professor]

[Text] The party's course toward a qualitatively new status in society, based on the acceleration of its socio-economic development, set the trade unions important tasks. The 27th CPSU Congress and the party program provided the necessary impetus for their restructuring and renovation not only of forms and methods but also of the content of their entire activities. Such a mass social force (today the trade unions have 140 million members) can make a major contribution to the upsurge of the economy, the development of socialist democracy, the advancement of social relations and the solution of many sociocultural problems. Radical changes in the work of the trade unions and the determination of their place in the tremendous changes which have spread throughout the country are still greatly hindered by routine approaches to organizational work and the scarcity of original thinking consistent with today's tasks. The new role of the trade unions was mentioned in M.S. Gorbachev's speech at the 18th congress of Soviet trade unions and in the congress' resolutions. The congress armed the trade unions with a program for restructuring and made them reassess their role in social life. This is further encouraged by the resolutions of the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which became a most important event in the restructuring of economic management in the country.

Becoming a School of Restructuring

V.I. Lenin noted that after the victory of the revolution the trade unions "become the main builder of the new society, for it is only the multi-million strong masses that can build this society" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 37, p 451). Lenin's theory of the trade unions as active participants in building socialism defined their role and position within the political system. The trade unions are an organization which rallies the broad toiling masses actively participating in building a new society under the leadership of the Communist Party. They are doing extensive work for the implementation of the party's social program and for improving the working and living conditions of the working people.

However, we cannot fail to see that during a certain period the concept of developed socialism, which was understood by many trade union personalities as totally excluding social disproportions and indicating the solution of all social contradictions, was grounds for claiming that what was taking place was just about an automatic enhancement of the importance of the trade unions, the growth of their reputation among labor collectives and their increased influence on the economy and the social sphere. However, this was inconsistent with reality and simply prevented them from seeing their shortcomings in trade union activities. Although the trade unions were criticized in party congresses held at that time, no reaction followed. As a result, the situation remained unchanged and phenomena of stagnation accumulated.

A clear understanding is necessary of the fact that the important role which the trade unions play in the life of socialist society does not in the least automatically stem from the nature of socialism, although the power in such a society is fully in the hands of the working people. Socialism merely creates the necessary conditions for the unhindered and extensive work of the trade unions and for enhancing their social significance. Their role in life can become important and noticeable only depending on the standard of leadership of the masses, loyalty to their objectives and readiness to struggle for the interests of the working people. Today it is urgently necessary to surmount the substitution of concepts which took place in the past, according to which the role of the trade unions was considered identical to their major tasks. A role is not a task, however, regardless of how important it may be.

The negative trends which developed led to the loss of dynamism, a gap between words and actions, and lowered activeness, initiative and intolerance of shortcomings among the people. V.I. Lenin cautioned that "It must be understood that the trade unions are not a department such as the people's commissariats but represent the entire united proletariat, that they are a special department..." (op. cit., vol 32, p 247). Meanwhile, the system applied in managing the trade unions, which are autonomous organizations by virtue of their nature, began to acquire the features of an economic ministry with its widespread vertical structure, system of orders, accountability and one-man command. Bureaucratism, paper shuffling and formalism developed in the work of the trade unions and their leadership.

All of this must be mentioned openly in order to learn lessons and avoid a repetition of past errors. The process of deformation of trade union activities was a reflection of a number of economic, political, social and ideological factors which fettered the discovery of the advantages of socialism and, above all, the participation of the working people in production management. It is important to understand today that the mechanism which obstructed our development, existing in the trade unions, has not been eliminated, for it is part of the experience, customs

and mentality of a large percentage of trade union personnel, even among those who have accepted restructuring and are doing everything possible to promote it. However, there also are those who simply simulate such acceptance. The AUCCTU has already passed a number of serious resolutions on restructuring, the implementation of which, however, is obstructed by this mechanism. That is why we must discuss structural problems and a new approach to the very role of the trade unions under present circumstances, rather than simply the matter of "correcting shortcomings."

The role of the trade unions in socialist society is defined with Lenin's formula: to be a school of management, a school of economic management, a school of communism. In our time this formula covers the entire period of transition to communism. It acquires a new content in the light of the tasks related to restructuring the country's social life and accelerating its socioeconomic development. This presumes reorganization, autonomous activities and self-government by the working people. The trade unions, which have a tremendous, one could say a total potential (706,000 primary trade union organizations, 636,000 shop committees and trade union bureaus and 3.8 million trade union groups) must become a true school for everyone's restructuring.

Above all, however, it is necessary to eliminate shortcomings in our own work. V.I. Lenin considered red tape, slackness, bureaucratism, and sluggishness in trade union authorities absolutely inadmissible. In his letter to the AUCCTU and to the communist faction in that agency, he indignantly said: "I never doubted that in our commissariats a great deal of bureaucratism remains. However, I did not expect that there would be an equal amount of bureaucratism in trade unions. This is the greatest possible disgrace" (op. cit., vol 51, p 120).

This illness has not been cured to this day. The press has published a great deal of data on major shortcomings in the social work of many enterprises. A general neglect in such work has been noted, as a result of the attitude toward it as being a "residual factor" in production. What about the trade union organizations? By no means have they always proved their decisiveness and applied to the fullest extent their rights and met their obligations. The system of relations among trade union authorities is still such that on a number of matters subordinate organization frequently prefers to wait for instructions "from above" instead of promoting the activity of the masses on the basis of party decisions. Unfortunately, their role in the struggle against bureaucratism is poor.

This raises the question of strengthening the autonomy of the trade unions. Although guiding the trade unions, the party has always emphasized their organizational independence and has opposed petty supervision over them. The firm legal guarantees of the trade unions may have seemed to be protected from administrative interference in their internal life and in the implementation

of their functions. Nonetheless, incompetent "approved" managers were frequently recommended for leading trade union positions and promoted without any real electivity, thus weakening trade union activities. Another trend is noticeable: that of "strengthening" the trade union organizations by transferring to them economic managers. However, V.I. Lenin spoke of the opposite, of the fact that the trade unions should be a "reservoir" of state power and must train people for leading work. Was the neglect of this Leninist behest not the reason for the fact that many economic managers, who did not learn how to work with the masses, do not have a serious attitude toward trade union activities? In practice, for example, rare are those who take into consideration the view of the trade union committee in appointing people to leading economic positions in enterprises, establishments and organizations, although this is stipulated in the Regulation on the Rights of the Trade Union Committee, a regulation which has the power of law.

The 27th CPSU Congress noted that the initiative of many public organizations remains inadequate. In frequent cases they try to act above all through the regular apparatus, bureaucratically, and poorly relying on the masses. In other words, the popular, creative and independent nature of public organizations are by no means fully used. This applies to the trade unions as well. Today the trade unions which rally the labor collectives are in the center of restructuring, sensing, as though from within, through the lives of the people, the entire difficulty and conflicting nature of the process of acceleration of socioeconomic development. However, such mass organizations can perform their role only if, relying on the initiative of the masses, they are able to fully manifest themselves as autonomous organizations.

The question of the relationship between trade unions and state organizations is, unquestionably, complex. Politically, it was resolved a long time ago on the basis of Lenin's instructions on the unity of the social foundations of these two forms of organizations. We neither have nor could have any kind of basic differences in the policies of the state and the trade unions which, together with the state, work for the sake of the common objectives of the party's guidance. This is the most important factor for the stability of our social system and the strength of our political system.

In practical life, however, their cooperation is no simple matter. The old disease of the trade unions of being less real than "convenient" partners of administrations, has not been cured. Objective nonantagonistic contradictions between economic and social problems are a reality which no one has the right to ignore. If approached simplistically, if all decisions yield to the priority of economic objectives to the detriment of the social, as was the case, for example, in the recent past, the result is a lagging in the development of the social sphere. However, the functions of the trade unions in the area of

social change, if implemented independently and consistently, could greatly improve the situation, for essentially the trade unions can veto any socioeconomic step taken in the life of an enterprise. By virtue of their nature the trade unions must "balance" the ruling power of managers of socialist enterprises and act as a counterweight to technocratic efforts in the economy, which is particularly important in connection with the conversion of the economy to intensive development and the introduction of self-financing, self-support and full cost accounting. In this case what is harmful is not conflicts but, conversely, the illusion of a conflict-free situation and an apparent clear sky in relations between trade union and economic organizations, the "dance" which, as M.S. Gorbachev said, trade union workers perform with economic managers.

It may seem that a great deal has already been said about this recently, in the course of the restructuring which has started in the country. Alas, the roots of "agreement" as one can see, are deep. We merely began to convert to two- and three-shift work and, once again, the bureaucratic approach to this most important step became apparent. Once again the trade union organizations are by no means everywhere on the level, having corrected economic managers and displayed proper attention to the needs of the people.

Some of the factors which are hindering the development of trade union autonomy and initiative include their excessive organization, which is quite convenient in formal management but which unquestionably hinders live contacts between trade union authorities and the masses. We have 31 sectorial unions and some 25,000 committees in republics, krays, oblasts, cities and rayons which are directly related to the primary organizations. We also have intersectorial management authorities—more than 170 trade union councils on the scale of the country and the individual republics, krays and oblasts. However, in frequent cases there is no organization and clear demarcation of functions among these lines of management, particularly in their middle levels. At the same time, bureaucracy in the middle level creates a great deal of difficulties: Major decisions made by the central authorities reach the trade union committees with delays; frequently their meaning is lost as a result of their "processing" on that level. Such a situation today, during restructuring, is particularly inadmissible. To the detriment of their territorial tasks, the trade union councils quite frequently take over the functions of trade union committees. As a result, the managers of trade union committees in enterprises and associations complain that, with such double jurisdiction, they are literally drowned in instructions from above. Virtually all of their initiatives and actions require innumerable coordinations, sanctions and permissions. Furthermore, in frequent cases territorial and sectorial trade union authorities duplicate each other's functions, demand double accountability, and so on. After the 18th Congress major steps were taken to correct the situation. The AUCCTU substantially reduced statistical and financial

accountability in trade unions; some central committees of sectorial trade unions have abolished the middle level and established direct contacts with enterprise trade union committees. We believe that under the new circumstances the structure of the trade unions should become more flexible in order to react more accurately and efficiently to the forthcoming restructuring in economic management.

It would be no exaggeration to point out that the workload of any trade union authority or committee at an enterprise is extremely heavy. As the saying goes, the trade union workers "must deal with everything." This formula has a profound democratic meaning. However, its literal observance would scatter the forces of the apparatus and the *aktiv*. Such difficulties are most typical of trade union committees which, sometimes, ignoring their main task, which is to protect the rights of the working people and to be concerned with their social interests (for which they simply have not enough time), plunge into a variety of matters which, in some cases, are totally extraneous to them, wasting time in meetings and paper shuffling. Is it not time to study this problem and to eliminate even some important duties of trade union committees for the sake of enabling them to perform their main functions? Should they not be given greater freedom in solving their own problems, including the wages of their own personnel within the limits of the wage fund?

Historically, the development of the functions of our trade unions was that of their expansion, which included the assumption of some governmental functions. Thus, starting with the 1930s, the trade unions have handled the state social security system; starting with the 1960s, they assumed jurisdiction over sanatoriums and rest homes, tourism and excursions. They are in charge of state control over labor safety and the observance of labor legislation. We believe that this is justified when it pertains to functions which are social in terms of their nature, i.e., functions which can be carried out with the help of a broad *aktiv* of working people. The functions of the paid apparatus, however, are something entirely different. For example, resorts and tourism have developed as major independent sectors: Their development requires significant capital investments, the organization of construction and the running of facilities, and the training of professional cadres. Under these circumstances the distinction between social and state management methods is lost and it is not state functions that become public but the public organizations that begin to duplicate economic work methods. In practical terms this lowers the efficiency and quality of management from the viewpoint of national interests and to a loss of control by society.

All of this leads us to the question whether we should not change the nature of management of resorts and tourism and convert the respective central councils of trade unions into state-social authorities? In our view, such a solution would enable us clearly to demarcate between

social and state functions (in the case, for example, of allocating travel vouchers and construction); it would increase responsibility for the solution of many important problems pertaining to said sectors.

Another question is that of the function of trade unions in managing state social security. Such management has largely become formal, for the main operations are performed by the state authorities. We should study the experience of a number of fraternal socialist countries in which in recent years the trade unions have surrendered this function to the state.

Socialism needs strong trade unions. In the course of restructuring their work we must proceed from the fact that this is a profoundly democratic process and an important aspect in the overall democratization of our society and the objectively determined enhancement of the role of the working class and all working people in social life. This approach faces the party organizations with new tasks. They must systematically promote the autonomous role and initiative of trade union committees and the renovation of their workstyle under new circumstances. The party leadership of the trade unions, above all in solving personnel problems, must be based on greater trust in the trade unions.

Labor Collective Self-Government and Trade Union Functions

The organic combination of producers with the means of production, the shaping of a truly proprietary attitude of the workers toward socialist property and the development of self-government by labor collectives should drastically change the production-mass work of the trade unions. In the course of restructuring economic management the role of the general meetings is enhanced; councils of labor collectives (STK) are created, which make decisions on basic economic and social problems of enterprise life. In this connection, the following question arises: How will the appearance of the new agencies influence the role of the trade unions and would it not lead to weakening their participation in production management? This is a question which concerns a number of trade union workers who, although aware of the changes which are taking place, frequently fail to understand the nature of their specific jobs. As the experience of the development of cost accounting brigades in our country indicates, self-government on this level includes a number of questions which have been traditionally within the range of competence of trade union organizations. The Law on the Labor Collectives, which was passed in 1983, triggered in some trade union workers fear and even confusion. The central trade union authorities did not provide their primary units with the necessary methodical aid or solve organizationally the questions which had appeared. Was this not the reason for which in the course of several years no mechanism was found which would clearly define the obligations respectively stemming from the competences of trade union

committees and of the law? However, today this problem arises in connection with the adoption of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association).

Nonetheless, despite their complexity, the problems which arise in this case are totally soluble. The CPSU program notes that the task of the trade union organizations is to participate ever more accurately in the development of the socialist self-government by the people and to assist in the exercise of the rights of labor collectives. The work of the trade unions in involving the masses in production management is an organic part of the self-government of labor collectives. In practical terms the subjects of these two forms of social activeness are the same people. Therefore, it would be erroneous to try to present the trade unions and other forms of self-government as parallel units within the system of socialist democracy. Success depends precisely on their unity and interaction. Self-government does not free the trade unions from their obligation of providing comprehensively conditions for the enhancement of the management activities by the individual workers. Consequently, they must help to organize the work of the agencies of the labor collective.

Naturally, however, it is necessary strictly to observe the range of competence of each of these forms of social activeness, preventing parallelism and duplication. Thus, we must clearly distinguish among the functions of the general meeting of the labor collective and the trade union meeting, and between those of the labor collective council and the trade union committee. The trend of increasing the number of measures which are being undertaken presents a certain threat. The trade union committees, without being deprived of their functions in the least and without weakening their activeness, must nonetheless remember that now the working people themselves, through the general meetings and labor collective councils, will begin increasingly to make final decisions on problems of production and labor organization and the development of the social sphere. Under these circumstances, specific production situations could sometimes trigger clashes between self-government and one-man command and create certain contradictions between expediency and legality and between democracy and discipline. We must not forget that the new economic mechanism is based on true creativity and the search for optimal means of solving economic and social problems, including labor organization. Under these circumstances the role of the trade unions as guarantors in observing the rights of the working people and ensuring unity between personal and social interests is enhanced.

In discussing the conversion of state enterprises to cost accounting, V.I. Lenin cautioned that "This circumstance, considering the urgent need to upgrade labor productivity and to achieve the profitability of all state enterprises, in connection with inevitable departmental interests and exaggerated departmental zeal, inevitably creates a certain conflict in the interests of the working

mass and the directors and managers of state enterprises or their departments" (op. cit., vol 44, p 343). Under these circumstances, he pointed out, the trade unions have the obligation to protect the interests of the working people (ibid.).

It is obvious that in the present circumstances as well this objective trend must be taken fully into consideration in order to avoid a simplistic understanding of the nature and consequences of the major shifts in production relations which are currently taking place. Here as well it would be dangerous to ignore certain differences which arise in a number of cases between the interests of the working masses and the directors. Contradictions must be seen, for under the conditions of socialism they can be solved by the mechanism of people's rule, headed by the party, and with the extensive participation of the trade unions.

One of the most important requirements facing the trade unions under the new circumstances is the elimination of formalism in their production work. This chronic shortcoming, which was intolerable in the past, can today hinder particularly gravely the acceleration of economic development. Naturally, matters could be presented as though any production process affects the interests of the working people and, therefore, is of social and educational significance. Nonetheless, it is necessary clearly and sensibly to define the areas of application of forces and avoid any kind of formal "presence." Under socialist conditions, the trade unions are profoundly interested in the upsurge of the production process on which they base their entire work. However, they can truly influence production primarily by enhancing social factors, engaging in explanatory and educational work among the masses and defending the interests of the working people, something which is particularly necessary under the conditions of economic reconstruction and intensification.

Pursuit of volume on paper, which applies, above all, to the socialist competition, causes great harm to real projects. We must not allow it today to follow in the old ruts. Yet unresolved problems in this area are numerous. The mass development of competition is hindered by a deep-seated formalism, which is the sworn enemy of any creative work. A competition booster such as rivalry has been largely lost. Progressive experience is being poorly disseminated. Such work is frequently reduced to approving initiatives which, in frequent cases, are immediately forgotten. Taking the specific nature of an enterprise under consideration in establishing competition indicators, adopting a serious approach to the formulation of different indicators and eliminating the multiplicity of types of competitions and initiatives are most important requirements without the implementation of which the very idea of the competition under the new circumstances could become distorted. According to trade union statistics, 115 million people in our country are competing. However, does this mean that every

single one of them is fighting for improving the production process? It has not been a secret for a long time that the adoption of "photostated" obligations means an artificial increase in the number of competitors (particularly in the nonproduction area), that competition incentives are weak and motivations are shallow and frequently totally absent. The accountability system must be structured not on inflated figures but on real competition results.

Restructuring the competition is a problem of prime importance. Its three main factors, listed by M.S. Gorbachev, are the indicators of quality, resource conservation and strict implementation of contractual procurements. The reorientation of the competition is needed in order to promote worker creativity, initiative, mental competitiveness, talent, the art of organization and mastery of progressive experience. The competition must be not between pieces of people but among people.

Unfortunately, formalism has penetrated other forms of mass production work of trade unions as well, particularly in managing the movement for a communist attitude toward labor. The paradox is that 78 million people are participating in this movement (36 million shock workers alone); yet for many years we have been mentioning the need for strengthening labor discipline, bringing order, etc. The reason is that quite frequently matters are reduced to awarding titles and presenting awards to many collectives, whose real contribution to the solution of economic problems is very small. Here restructuring has been initiated in the right direction, by surmounting excessive organization. It is important, however, that the useful initiative of the masses everywhere is given suitable support.

Today we must change the content and upgrade the efficiency of collective contracts. It makes no sense to duplicate in them ordinary obligations (let us not forget that the labor collectives assume other and separate social obligations), and repeat basic stipulations concerning labor and wages. The contracts should specifically include steps to improve working and living conditions and protecting the working people from all types of "risk" under the conditions of reconstructing production facilities.

The new approach to production activities is also based on the development of the brigade cost accounting system. This form of labor organization must create and, practical experience is already confirming this, a true conversion in the mass awareness, in attitude toward labor and in the social activeness of millions of working people. However, ostentation and formalism have not been outlived in the work of many trade union organizations. They are becoming not simply an ordinary shortcoming but a major hindrance to the establishment of cost accounting units. In frequent cases the brigades do not even know what the end results of their work should be, and what are the cost accounting standards, comprehensive norms and ratings. Shop foremen and

managers interfere in the apportionment of earnings among brigade members. Yet all of this directly affects the vital interests of the working people, who must always remain in the sight of the trade unions. This is particularly important in particular because one of the elements of the intensification of economic growth is the justified increase of labor intensiveness.

Under socialist conditions the process of intensification develops for the sake of man and by man himself. The socialist ownership of means of production and the planned economic management system can ensure the firm unity between individual and public interests, enabling us systematically and without grave conflicts to eliminate difficulties as they arise. Nonetheless, the manifestation of new problems here is inevitable, for it is a question of a profound structural reorganization of the economy which, in particular, demands a more efficient allocation and utilization of manpower, cadre professional-technical training and retraining (particularly in connection with the future release of some personnel as a result of the installation of new equipment and technology), etc. This requires a thoughtful and timely search for solutions which can ensure unity between general and specific individual interests. For example, the trade unions must show concern for placing or retraining every worker in accordance with his interests. They must actively control the involvement of the masses in a continuing education system. They must develop differentiated methods in protecting the interests of the various social groups in the production and nonproduction areas. In short, this is one of the key sectors in which the trade unions must display their new role, consistent with the concept of acceleration. Their new role, however, cannot be performed with the old methods.

The Turn to Social Policy

The concept formulated at the 27th Party Congress for pursuing a strong social policy and giving priority to the development of the social sphere determined the main trend in restructuring trade union work. The CPSU Central Committee political report to the congress noted that "To the trade unions social policy and the interests of the working people must always assume priority. Actually, this is the main purpose of their activities."

What is it that prevents many trade union organizations from becoming fully active in this most important project? Could they be short of rights or funds? No, they have adequate amounts of both. It is true that some of their rights have not been quite clearly formulated and are reduced to "participation," "coordination," and "voicing opinions." The main thing, however, is the lack of purposefulness and competence. Another hindrance is the bureaucratic workstyle which fetters the initiative and creativity, and waiting for instructions. For example, having the right to demand the replacement of economic managers who ignore the social concerns of the working people, the trade unions make use of this right relatively infrequently. They are not always capable

of forcing (yes, precisely forcing!) careless administrators to include in collective contracts stipulations on improving working and living conditions on which the working people insist. Finally, the trade unions are very timidly participating in drafting the social parts of the plan and rarely formulate their own alternative suggestions.

In his address to the 18th trade union congress, M.S. Gorbachev emphasized that the trade unions could make broader use of their right to initiate legislation, i.e., to draft social protection laws and local legal regulations, the role of which, as the autonomy of enterprises increases, will become greater. The new legal acts on the trade unions, the need for which was emphasized at the congress, should, I believe, juridically strengthen their rights in protecting the interests of the working people and broaden their independence in solving the social problems of our society.

The rich potential of the trade unions as a factor in asserting social justice is becoming apparent. The trade unions must firmly struggle against any deviations from this principle. They must promote the fullest possible consistency between the labor contribution of the individual worker and his wage and the uprooting of unearned income as well as equalization. They must irreconcilably oppose those who violate social order and discipline.

Problems of wages, of increasing the income of the working people, must become the focal point of the efforts to ensure social justice. We know that in connection with the increased autonomy of enterprises a significant share of such problems will be solved on their own level with the immediate participation of the labor collectives. This is stipulated in the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU decree "On Improving the Organization of Wages and Introducing New Wage Rates and Salaries for Workers in Production Sectors in the National Economy."

To the trade unions, this is a most important matter, for it is a question of the vital interests of 75 million workers in production sectors, whose interests can be secured only through their own active participation. Such work has already been initiated and in a number of enterprises has brought about major changes in the attitude toward labor and its organization. However, alarming symptoms of a formalistic approach to the work are apparent. The trade unions are not engaged in providing the necessary explanatory work. They are not opposing arbitrary decisions made by some administrators. As a result, many workers and specialists do not have a sufficiently clear idea of the meaning and tasks of the wage rate reform; once again the notorious equalization comes to the surface and certification is being distorted. Naturally, this is due to a set of reasons many of which are temporary and reflect the difficulty of restructuring the mentality of cadres. However, a high percentage of them are related to the traditionally weak attention

which the trade unions pay to problems of wages. However, that which could be somehow understood under the conditions of a strictly centralized control is unforgivable today, when particular social maturity and responsibility is demanded of the trade unions.

We should not ignore the fact that strengthening the autonomy of enterprises and labor collectives and ensuring progress in the main thing, which is correlating wages with results, could also trigger a negative trend—the subjectivism of individual administrators, and settling private scores with workers they find inconvenient. The converse reaction could be an aspiration toward a misunderstood equality. This is a major contradiction in the area of labor and distribution relations, which was mentioned at the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. However, there also exists a feature counteracting this instrument! According to our laws no single problem related to wages can be solved without trade union participation. Therefore, the "visa" stamped by the trade union committee must assume its legitimate force in each individual case in order energetically to rebuff efforts on the part of economic authorities to infringe on the prerogatives of labor collectives.

In connection with improvements in the entire set of distribution relations, the social functions of the trade unions must be broadened. They must become strong partners of the state in the implementation of social programs and ensure a comprehensive consideration of social factors in solving problems of housing, price setting, urban construction, health care, optimization of ecological systems, development of transportation, and so on. Without this their constructive participation in solving respective problems and ensuring the efficient protection of the interests of the working people are inconceivable.

Today broadening the autonomy of the social activities of trade unions becomes tremendously important. No one can replace them, for example, in the area of preventing violations of labor legislation and of labor safety and safety equipment since sanatoriums and rest homes have been entrusted to the trade unions, and there is no reason to wait for someone else to undertake to bring order in this area. The qualitative improvement in the work of clubs and of the entire network of cultural and educational institutions is the direct obligation of the trade unions. Finally, it is time to show some imagination in the area of services, to develop their cooperatives, and to offer trade union members a variety of benefits and services. Clearly, this will require a change in the way of thinking of trade union leaders.

Unquestionably, the concept of playing a "new role" includes a new attitude on the part of the trade unions toward protecting the interests of the working people and defending social justice. Unfortunately, we must acknowledge that in this area many trade union committees have remained somehow in the rear line of restructuring. It may seem that there is nothing particularly new

in this matter, for our trade unions have always known of the existence of such an obligation on their part. It would be unfair to blame them for the fact that they have done nothing in this respect. The fact, however, remains a fact: The working people do not have the proper confidence in the effectiveness of many trade union organizations. Otherwise there would not have been such a large number of appeals to courts and complaints to superior organizations.

The situation today is changing: A different sociopsychological atmosphere is being established in the country; the working people are unwilling to display their former tolerance toward arbitrariness and red tape in the consideration of labor disputes and complaints; they do not wish to tolerate equalization and other manifestations of social injustice, and the boorishness and rudeness of some managers. They oppose the suppression of criticism and favor openness and democracy. In V.I. Lenin's words, the trade unions must teach the working people (and help them) to "struggle for their rights in accordance with all the rules... to wage a war for their rights" (op. cit., vol 53, p 149).

In solving problems related to strengthening the autonomy and the restructuring of the trade unions it would be useful to take into consideration the experience of the fraternal socialist countries. Many of them have taken steps to enhance the role of these organizations in the formulation and exercise of economic policy and plans for socioeconomic development. Meetings are held between heads of trade unions and the government, at which the course of plan implementation is considered and the necessary steps are taken; the trade unions try to influence the policy in the price area. The new labor code which was recently adopted in Bulgaria significantly enhances the independent role of the trade unions and strengthens their position as guarantors of the social interests and rights of the working people, giving the trade unions the right to make mandatory decisions and to submit their own drafts of solutions for discussion by economic councils of enterprises. In Hungary the trade unions have been given "veto" rights, which allow them to block any decision by an economic manager which, in the view of the trade unions, conflicts with the standards of socialist morality or violates the interests of individual groups and categories of working people. Such steps contribute to the enhancement of the trade unions and to upgrading their responsibility for the implementation of their obligations in the production and social areas.

The restructuring has begun. Today the tasks of the trade unions can no longer be described in the usual terms of "intensifying," "upgrading," or "broadening" their role. It is a question of a radical turn in all activities of these most widespread organizations which must become a real factor in the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development and the intensification of socialist democracy.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

History and Religion

18010018n Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 91-98

[Article by Aleksandr Ilich Klibanov, leading scientific associate, USSR History Institute, doctor of historical sciences, USSR State Prize laureate, and Lev Nikolayevich Mitrokhin, leading scientific associate, USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers Movement, doctor of philosophical sciences]

[Text] **Interest in the past of our homeland—the distant and the not so distant periods in domestic history and its crucial stages—is increasing.**

On the occasion of the approaching 1,000th anniversary of the accepted date of the acceptance of Christianity in Russia as the religion of the state, letters to the editors ask about the historical significance of the "baptism of Rus," the current situation with atheistic education, and the situation related to the teaching of religion. Many of them express the opinion that it is an essential task for the scientists to provide a profound interpretation of the influence of religion as a form of social awareness on the social activities of people, past and present.

As the materials which follow indicate, these problems are also drawing the attention of scientists. The authors of the articles work in various areas of science. For a number of years historian A.I. Klibanov and philosopher L.N. Mitrokhin have studied professionally the problems of religious teachings and scientific atheism. Academician B.V. Raushenbakh is a specialist in the areas of mechanics, the theory of combustion, and guidance of space apparatus. He was one S.P. Korolev's closest associates in the preparations for the first space flights. He is also doing successful work in the area of the humanities. He is the author of the monograph "Prostranstvennyye Postroyeniya v Drevnerusskoy Zhivopisi" [Space Structures in Ancient Russian Paintings] (1975), the article "Iconography as a Means of Presenting Philosophical Concepts" in the collection "Problemy Izucheniya Kulturnogo Naslediya" [Problems of the Study of the Cultural Legacy] (1985) and others.

This article and the one which follows it answer a number of readers' questions. The introduction of Christianity in Kiev Rus is considered by their authors less a religious than a sociopolitical event which had a significant impact on the shaping and development of statehood and of our country's economy and culture.

The comprehensive study of the dialectics of the material and spiritual areas under socialist conditions, the mechanisms and means of shaping the individual and his convictions, moral guidelines and values, and ways of

struggling against stagnation and vestiges of the past in the mind and behavior of the people assume particular importance today. In this connection, the systematic study of religion, its place in history, spiritual life and the social practices of our time, is of great theoretical and ideological importance.

We know that the Marxist-Leninist classics considered religion a serious opponent of a scientific outlook and constantly emphasized the need for convincingly criticizing it. A widespread system of antireligious education was developed from the very start of the Soviet system, which yielded substantial results: the Soviet Union became the first country in history to practice mass atheism. This effort, however, took place not without difficulties and errors. Occasionally, in the past superficial and unrealistic views were expressed on the ways and prospects for the elimination of religious concepts. There were cases of bureaucratic administration. The level of atheistic publications left something better to be desired. To this day, without belittling in the least the tremendous successes achieved in anti-religious activities, we must note that many believers remain, whose ideas, with rare exceptions, took shape after the October Revolution, despite atheistically oriented training and upbringing. The very nature of believers has changed substantially. By no means are they always illiterate or people unfamiliar with scientific data, who believe only by habit. Some of them have secondary or even higher training and are aware of arguments concerning atheistic and religious outlooks.

Such facts cannot be explained exclusively by reducing religion merely to a set of "primitive" or "ignorant" concepts, replacing the specific analysis of the reasons with abstract considerations concerning the "lagging of awareness behind life," or references to the "birthmarks of capitalism." Religious convictions do not automatically migrate from one age to another. Every single time they develop as a summation, albeit inadequate or "wrong," of one's personal and social experience. Therefore, in order to explain their real roots, we must take a sober look at the objective contradictions of socialist community life and the variety of forms of their reflection in the mind.

We must acknowledge that facts of deformation of the standards and principles of socialist community life in the past, such as bureaucratism, corruption, incompetent solution of problems which affect the interests of all citizens, a significant disparity between the world of daily realities and that of ostentatious well-being, cases of abuse or even crime committed by people endowed with party or state power, and so on, inevitably undermine faith in socialist morality and in a materialistic outlook. This was clearly mentioned in the reports submitted at the January and June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenums. This inevitably created nutritive grounds for the influence exerted by and reproduction of religious concepts.

Life is always more complex than ordinary systems and the changes in contemporary religious awareness today do not fit the simplistic picture of the confrontation between "light and darkness." For example, there has been an increase in the number of non-clerical sectarian groups, increased activities by extremist groups, the appearance of Islamic structures "paralleling" the official ones, a revival of religious-moral searches, and the fashion of practicing a variety, including "Eastern," variants of neomysticism. Said processes do not mandatorily indicate an increase in the influence of specifically religious ideas. They are frequently presented as indirect echoes of the interest shown in the history of domestic and world culture and a reaction to its superficial interpretation in a number of atheistic publications, and to facts of ignorant and irresponsible attitude toward the monuments of culture, as manifestations of dissatisfaction with the primitive nature of the reasoning of some authors who claim to interpret problems related to the meaning of life ("existentialism").

Of late the public has shown greater interest in assessing the role of the Orthodox church in domestic history and culture, in connection with the approaching millennium of the introduction of Christianity in Rus. It is only a scientific study of this serious and multidimensional problem can eliminate the unhealthy stir encouraged by both Church supporters and foreign indiscriminate amateurs, who on the service of Western subversive ideological centers.

The need to enhance the scientific standard of the studies of religion and religious awareness is urgently dictated also by international events. Despite all obvious (and irrecoverable) losses suffered by religion in the last 100 years, it remains an influential component in the political and spiritual life of nonsocialist countries. Furthermore, it is frequently impossible to understand and forecast many important sociopolitical processes without taking the religious factor into consideration. The anti-Shah revolution in Iran, the bloody clashes in the Middle East, the conflict in Northern Ireland, and the terrorism of Sikh extremists are merely individual confirmations of this fact. Also active within the framework of a religious awareness are some mass social movements in the West.

In our view, priority today is assumed by the development of key theoretical-methodological problems and the summation of the variety of historical experience on the basis of consistent dialectical-materialistic positions and the creative mastery of the atheistic legacy of Marx, Engels and Lenin, which is "working" under today's circumstances.

The attitude toward religion has long become an arena of sharp ideological confrontation based, in the final account, on class contradictions. Naturally, priority is assumed by the reasons for the appearance and reproduction of a widespread belief in a special transcendental and supernatural world. Religion, Engels noted, "is most

distant from material life and may appear to be most alien to it." In this case "the link between concepts and their material conditions for existence becomes increasingly confused and diluted by intermediary links. Nonetheless, it exists" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 21, pp 313,312. Subsequent references to the works of K. Marx and F. Engels will indicate volume and page only). The change which Marxism made in the understanding of religion was the fact that a scientific consistency was applied in identifying these "intermediary links," and in bringing to light the complex and multiple-stage mechanism of the dependence of the nature of religious ideas on their "earthly" base. This created the opportunity for a precise and comprehensive evaluation of their sociohistorical nature and place in human history. It is this that turned the study of religion into a science.

Invariably, theologians have rejected from the start the idea of the earthly, the natural roots of the appearance of religion, interpreting its content as having a "celestial," a divine origin. In turn, entire generations of atheists in the past have categorically asserted the purely human origin of religious concepts. However, they were unable to identify the real nature of these "intermediary links." Furthermore, the polemics of bourgeois atheists arguing against theologians developed within that same area which could not identify the social nature of the way religion reflected reality. Actually, according to the theologians, religion is the pivot of all human culture for it "ennobles" mores, gives people a conscience and discloses the meaning of human life. No, its opponents said, conversely it "distorts" the natural inclination of man to seek the truth and justice, corrupting his moral consciousness. Therefore, essentially these battles were fought on the basis of the same idea, which was that religion remains outside real human history. Hence the irreconcilable opponents willy-nilly shared that same moralizing approach to the interpretation of history, an approach which Marx rated as notoriously unscientific.

Therefore, the merit of Marx and Engels does not end in the least with the fact that they provided an "accurate" resolution of the argument between atheists and theologians. They introduced previously unfamiliar concepts, categories and specific formations and heuristic systems which alone could express the essential features of religion. This approach was clearly detected in the "Theses on Feuerbach." Marx criticized Feuerbach's anthropologism and his view on religion as the creation of an abstract, a nonsocial individual, and formulated as a fundamental principle the task of explaining its manifestation on an earthly "self-destroying and self-contradictory" foundation (see vol 3, p 2).

This was a truly brilliant guess which marked a qualitatively new stage in the understanding of religion. At that time, however, Marx had not as yet developed a specific historical and philosophical method for explaining this dependence. This method was comprehensively developed only in "Das Kapital" in the study of the so-called

commodity fetishism. This is a full presentation of the dialectical-materialistic method used in the interpretation of nonscientific imaginary concepts which Marx did not base on the condition of the mind, selfish motivations, errors, lack of knowledge, and so on, but which he considered a legitimate offspring of social relations.

In speaking of the dependence of ideological structures on material living conditions, the Marxist classics always emphasized that this dependence is complex and indirect (the existing cultural and historical systems are an example) and that the ideologues themselves entirely failed to realize the real motivations for their activities. The true social nature of religion could be decoded ("derived") only as a result of the study of the specific historical conditions of the establishment and effect of the conditions of material life on an already extant spiritual and mental content.

This is a key aspect in Marx's understanding of religion. Its methodological fruitfulness becomes particularly great and understood today, when domestic researchers are increasingly concentrating on the so-called cultural level, considering individual forms of social awareness not separately but as part of the entire spiritual context of the "age" and "civilization."

Actually, if we proceed from the concept of "religion" in general and transfer its content to previous stages in history, it appears as something external, lifeless in terms of the true history of education, invariably playing a conservative and reactionary role. In this case we inevitably lose the opportunity of understanding the specific historical needs of society, which determined the existence of religious concepts, the means through which such needs were satisfied and the "live" and comprehensive relationship between religion and other forms of social consciousness and types of social activities.

Many scientific concepts and socioethical categories and values were initially expressed in an understandable form through the language of religion. This cover was historically logical and necessary to the spiritual history of mankind. That is precisely why in the middle ages a religious outlook became prevalent. Religion is the product and agent of sociohistorical development and its ideological role is complex. It was and is used by the ruling classes as an instrument for spiritual oppression and a promoter of their selfish interests. At the same time, it could operate as a means of the ideological shaping of social protest and of the struggle waged by the oppressed classes.

Marxism bases its critical interpretation of the role of religion in history not on the view that there is a "total" conflict between "earthly" and "religious" aspects, for in the final account such a contra-position is a reproduction of a theological concept (either directly or in its secular, educational variant). Conversely, the dialectical-materialistic method leads us toward the elimination of this contradiction, toward understanding religion as the

internal product of history, as a "link in the real world." The "celestial" and "religious" factors are those same "earthly" laic factors in their converted, mystified form, and the study of the historical pattern and historical limitations of such a conversion is the task of scientific research.

The key to it is found in Marx's superb formula: "...religious life is a life of imperfection..." (vol 1, p 388). In specific socioeconomic systems religion has been a natural and historically surmountable phase in the development of the spiritual culture of mankind. The Marxist methodology applied in the study of religion is the theoretical foundation in understanding specific problems which are the subject of the study of religion. One of them is the "acceptance" of Christianity in Rus as a sociohistorical phenomenon.

Christianity, which has long been divided into Western and Eastern, represented by two churches—Catholic and Orthodox—has a common ideological feature despite regional characteristics. Such characteristics are manifested within the overall version of Christianity as a global religion. The fate of Eastern Christianity, above all its spreading and establishment in the ancient Russian state, is of particular interest. In 1988 the Orthodox Church will be celebrating the millennium of the "baptism of Rus." But did the history of Christianity in Rus truly begin 10 centuries ago? Or else does this anniversary date refer to the history of Christianity as a state religion, i.e., a religion which served the interests of the ruling classes and was a tool of their internal and foreign policy? If such is the case, then what is the importance of Christianity in the history of social life outside the framework of specifically Church history?

Christianity made its appearance within the limited, although quite broad boundaries of the Roman Empire and within the sphere of its political and cultural influence. It appeared not as a regional but as a global religion, for it addressed itself to all peoples, regardless of their national, confessional or social affiliation, to every individual, not asking him about his "kit and kin," his beliefs, whether he was a free man or a slave or, in short, to man as such. Christianity with its "cult of the abstract man," as Marx said (vol 23, p 89) offered a new system of spiritual values and orientations, which asserted direct and inverse relations between God and man, granting a certain amount of freedom to a believer in the spiritual world and sanctioning the appearance of individuality within the person. It was only a vector of spiritual freedom but not the freedom itself for a positive manifestation of the personality.

However, the early mass movements which adopted a Christian aspect, whether Paulism (named after the Apostle Paul), which appeared in the Eastern part of the Byzantine Empire in the 7th century, or the Bogomili, who originated in the Balkans in the middle of the 10th century, movements which became widespread beyond Byzantium as well, emphasized precisely the vector of

spiritual freedom and, on this basis, struggled for social freedom. It was under the same slogans that the lower strata in Western and Eastern Europe struggled throughout the Middle Ages against the laic and spiritual feudal lords. This particularly is the element of progress which at one point was the contribution of Christianity to the spiritual history of mankind.

In turn, the cultural legacy (literacy, literature, graphic and applied arts, architecture, and so on), genetically related to and mediated by medieval Christianity, was the result of this element. The high examples of medieval art marked an age in the development of world culture and were a unique gift to all subsequent generations, whether we are referring to Gothic art in Western Europe or ancient Russian art.

Faith, the "strong faith of the Middle Ages" which, according to Engels, "unquestionably instilled in that entire age a significant amount of energy but an energy which had come not from the outside but which had been rooted in the very nature of man, although in a subconscious, in an underdeveloped state" (vol 1, p 590) was the source of inspiration of the great masters of the Middle Ages and the only language accessible to the wide range of consumers of culture of that period.

Any other interpretation is based on the concept of the world of man as complete, once and for all, and of Christianity as something given forever, i.e., of man and Christianity outside history, and, particularly, Christianity as an exclusively clerical phenomenon, identified with the spiritual dictatorship of the Church as an instrument of class domination. Yet, as it acquired the status of a state religion, the Church itself became the "Procrustean bed" of Christianity, as confirmed by the age-old practical experience of popular anticlerical movements. In the course of historical developments, including our time, the accuracy of Engels' view is made clear in its entire depth, totality and persuasiveness: "One cannot put an end to religion such as Christianity exclusively through mockery or attacks. It must be surmounted scientifically as well, i.e., explained historically..." (vol 18, p 578; see also vol 19, p 307).

The study of the historical conditions under which Christianity from a "possible universal religion" (Engels) indeed became such brings to light the uneven, gradual and contradictory nature of this process which has involved the use of coercion. Between the 5th and the 12th centuries the area of dissemination of Christianity covered the Germanic and Slavic peoples and the majority of the Scandinavian population. In the 13th and 14th centuries it predominated among the other peoples of the northwestern parts of Europe.

Therefore, the configuration of the European area of Christianity was determined in the course of more than 1,000 years. It developed under the historical conditions of a crucial process in the life of the European peoples (tribes, tribal alliances) ranging from a pre-class—in its

last stage—society to a class-oriented society. This was not only a simultaneous but also a polyvariant process based on the real level of development of social relations within each of the so-called barbaric nations and their relations with the Roman Empire which, by the end of the 4th century, broke down into Western and Eastern (Byzantium), on relations among them and on the specific features of their material and spiritual cultures.

This crucial process was of universal historical significance, for it marked a conversion from the "primary" and most lengthy system in the history of mankind, based on communal ownership, to a "secondary" system based on private ownership, which included a number of societies based on the exploitation of the direct producers. The transitional link from the "primary" to the "secondary" system was the landowning community which combined collective with individual principles.

"...The private home, the parcel, the cultivation of the land and the private appropriation of its results," Marx wrote, "allow the development of an individual incompatible with the conditions of more ancient communities" (vol 19, p 404). The rigid set of regulations, the absorption of the individual by the collective, the more or less beehive way of life, which was once vitally necessary and which, within its limits, contributed to the development of production forces, became obstructions to subsequent progress. Thus, in the transitional link from the "primary" to the "secondary" system we find the beginning of class-forming and, with them, state-forming processes and the initial identification of the person as an individual, included within such processes. This system still looks at external standardizing guidelines but is no longer satisfied with them and seeks moral-value guidelines in order to implement the need for initiative, naturally, within its historically determined limits. This included the need for elements of freedom, contained within Christianity with its emphasized individualistic aspect.

The molding of the individual on the basis of the new principles (in terms of the individual in archaic communities) was a rather lengthy and complex process in the course of which Christianity patiently waited for the time to come for each nation, a time which took almost 1,000 years in Europe (from the 4th-5th to the 13th-14th centuries). However, even when the "hour of Christianity" struck in all nations without exception, it became necessary to adapt it to local conditions and folk traditions and beliefs. This was a "break in the continuity" of the spiritual life of the European peoples. It was not revolutionary, as had been the case in the past in the Roman Empire, when its bearers were the protesting lower social strata. Nor, however, was it imposed from above, in the interest of the ruling class, decreed and introduced by state coercion, although the sword and the fire were put to full use. Christianity in the feudalizing and already feudal societies actually met the interests of the feudal lords. However, the objective prerequisite for its efficiency as an instrument of class domination was

the existence of the roots of Christianity in the social system itself. These roots included social oppression and the "power of the land." However impeccable this concept was, it left unanswered the following question: why is it that "the manifestation of the true wretchedness and the protest against this true wretchedness," as Marx described religion (vol 1, p 415) among the European nations were ideologically expressed precisely through Christianity?

The Eastern Slavic tribes did not remain outside the great historical change which occurred among the European peoples. In the 6th to the 9th centuries the main form of social organization in the Slavic tribes was the community, which acted as a territorial-economic unit and which made collective use of grassland, forests and rivers. The combined socioeconomic organism, which is what the ancient community was, split in the course of time, for within it an individual-group (in the course of the evolution from a patriarchal to a small family) and a simply individual ownership of the land, labor tools and labor products developed. The community continued to function under the conditions of intensifying economic inequality paralleled by the rise of tribal nobility—princes, military leaders and professional military. It is within this conflicting form that production forces were enhanced in farming, crafts and industries. The nobility had at its disposal household slaves, recruited as a rule among prisoners of war. The Slavic communities, however, had no slaves used as direct producers. The stratification of the Slavic community led not to a slave-owning system but to feudalism.

Urbanization processes—from pre-urban settlements to large towns—took place in the 6th to the 9th centuries. The tribes listed in the "Tale of Time"—Drevlyane, Polyane, Severyane, most likely Dregovichi and Volynyan—had developed as tribal federations. The ethnic consolidation processes among the Eastern Slavs were completed in the 8th and 9th centuries with the formation of the ancient Rus nationality, which shared common features of material and spiritual culture and language. It is they which led to the appearance of the ancient Russian state of Kiev Rus. In terms of its socioeconomic structure this was an early feudal state similar to the early feudal Merovingian and Karolingian states.

The invasion of the Roman Empire by Germanic tribes in the 4th to the 7th centuries and their settling on the conquered territories (the great migration of the peoples) contributed to the blending of two conflicting and interacting worlds—the Roman and the Germanic ("barbarian"). The invasion of the Byzantine Empire by the Slavic tribes and the settling of many of its territories in the 6th to the 8th centuries completed the great migration of the peoples and resulted in a typologically similar historical synthesis. This was the concluding act of social development, internally related to a great historical turn.

This was also a reciprocal stimulation of processes. It concluded the age-old time of "birth pains of the new civilization" (Engels): the European civilization.

Nor did the Eastern Slavic tribes remain on the margin of the ideological consequences of the great historical turn. Christianity, which became the state religion of ancient Rus only at the end of the 10th century, in turn became the religious, the ideological ferment of the "new civilization."

The universal religions (Christianity, Buddhism, Islam) paralleled this historical turn which took different paths in its implementation in the Western and Eastern theaters of the historical process. It is this that determines also the characteristic demarcation of the areas where their influence was prevalent. The common feature of all universal religions is their function as efficient agents of state-forming (or state-transforming) processes. The common feature of universal religions is their personality aspect, their turning to the "abstract man." However, within each circle of the real world this "abstract man" assumed his specific characteristics.

The legend of the "choice of religion" by Kiev Prince Vladimir (among Orthodoxy, Catholicism, Islam and Judaism), as has long been pointed out by researchers, is similar to Scandinavian, Bulgarian and Khazar legends. This stereotype is similar to the legend of the calling of the Varyagi, which has made the rounds of the historical chronicles of several European nations. This is not to say that the problem of "choosing a religion" never faced high-placed "choosers," for all three world religions had organized missionary systems. The "choice" of Christianity by Vladimir, however, was objectively predetermined by the fact that ancient Rus (and, before that, the large East Slavic tribal federations) was affiliated with European civilization. It was not Christianity that "involved" ancient Rus with European civilization but the spreading of Christianity in ancient Rus and its adoption as a state religion that marked the ideological completion of the process of the shaping of this civilization. The problem of the "choice" was, above all, one of establishing a preference between the Orthodox or Catholic versions of Christianity, between one of two churches—the Roman Catholic or the Greek Orthodox, the Byzantine. As a result, Vladimir "chose" the latter. This was not simply an act of state will, although, naturally, the final and definitive word was that of the Kiev throne. By the time Christianity was introduced in Rus, Byzantium had outstripped Western Europe in terms of the development of spiritual and material culture. It was the center of cultural attraction for Sicily and Southern Italy and the Balkan, North Caucasian and Transcaucasian nations.

In the middle of the 11th century the Christian church definitively split into Catholic and Orthodox. Within the Christian "circle of lands" the correlation of forces between the two churches was unstable. In Byzantium

the Orthodox church supported the state and was supported by it, laying no claim to autonomy. "In the Byzantine Empire the state and the church were so closely interwoven it was impossible to describe the former without the latter," Marx wrote (vol 10, pp 130-131). The hierarchical structure of the Byzantine church was not so strictly graduated and crowned by the supremacy of the Papacy, as was the case with the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore, it was a "model" which suited the ancient Rus state better than that of the Catholic Church.

The need for religious changes which, under the conditions of a feudalizing society, was equivalent to changes in the ideological superstructure and servicing institutions, increasingly faced the leadership of ancient Russian society as a state task. It was difficult by virtue of domestic and foreign political circumstances. First of all, pagan religions, which were practiced by the overwhelming population majority, could not be ignored. Such beliefs were shared also by many members of the upper crust. Secondly, political and diplomatic maneuvering skills had to be applied to avoid the negative consequences of Christianizing in terms of the independence and autonomy of the ancient Russian state. Historically, an orientation toward Eastern Christianity had surreptitiously developed, despite the numerous clashes between Rus and Byzantium, which frequently resulted in military operations.

On Russian initiative, trade relations had been established and diplomatic relations were being organized with Byzantium in the 9th century. As we know, Kiev Prince Vladimir was baptized in the year 988, which was a condition for marrying the sister of Basil II, the emperor of Byzantium. Apparently, the marriage took place in the summer of 989, after which, with the participation of the higher Byzantine hierarchy, Vladimir undertook the broad action of "baptizing Rus."

The sanctioning of Christianity by the government and the inclusion of the Church within the sociopolitical structure contributed to the enhancement of the prestige and influence of the Kiev state in Western Europe. This was further strengthened by subsequent dynastic marriages contracted by Vladimir's successors with the royal families of Europe.

The dissemination of biblical and patristic publications, church instructions, medieval orthodox encyclopedias, and so on began with the adoption of Christianity as the dominant religion. This conflicting yet, for its time, progressive phenomenon was, however, of a class nature: the values of culture were aimed at the clerical and laic elite and were used for its interests.

The dissemination of Christianity in Rus under Vladimir and his successors, regardless of the conflicts and excesses which this created, "Putyata baptized by the sword and Dobrynya by the fire," was not a religious war waged by the Kiev throne and the local nobility on their

own population. Nor could the structuring of the church institution be the work of Byzantine and Bulgarian clergy alone, for the reason alone that there were very few of them and they were unfamiliar with the language, customs and traditions of the Christianized population. The Christianizing of the wide areas covered by ancient Rus and the structure of the primary (parochial) church organizations would have been impossible to begin with without the participation of the peasant population. The imposition of Christianity in Rus from above was encouraged by what could be described as the spontaneous preparation for the acceptance of Christianity and the existence, albeit small (perhaps not all that small) number of followers of Christianity long before it became the religion of the state. The culture of the ancient Rus state had profound historical roots and traditions.

The "baptism" had been prepared by the entire course of the economic, sociopolitical and spiritual development of the ancient Russian society, however small the number of Christians within it had been. It influenced somewhat the state act which marked the beginning of the history of state Christianity and which contributed to its wide spreading among the population.

The 1,000-year history of the Orthodox Church is one of serving the ruling class despite the different role it may have played at different stages in socioeconomic, state-political and cultural development. It is a history of one of the bulwarks of serfdom and autocracy. "What makes the object of worship of Orthodoxy all the more precious is that it teaches the uncomplaining acceptance of sorrow! How suitable is this object of worship to the ruling classes!" (V.I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 6, p 265).

It is entirely natural, therefore, that one of the first legislative acts of the Soviet government after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution was the Decree on the Separation of the Church from the State. The draft of the decree, which was written by a special commission set up on the basis of a regulation issued by the Sovnarkom, was edited by Lenin who drafted personally some of its articles.

The decree on the separation of the church from the state, adopted by the Sovnarkom on 20 January (2 February) 1918 drew the bottom line under the nearly 1,000-year old history of Orthodoxy as the ruling church. This led to the appearance of a new, long-term exceptionally broad and most complex socialist task: the separation of the believing masses from the Church, masses which had been doomed for centuries to neglect, ignorance, prejudice and superstition, in centuries of serfdom and semi-serfdom oppression, and the development of atheistic beliefs in the builders of the new world.

"The party," Lenin wrote, "aspires to the full break of ties between the exploiting classes and the organization of religious propaganda and for the factual liberation of

the toiling masses from religious prejudice, organizing to this effect the broadest possible scientific-educational and antireligious propaganda. In this case, however, it is necessary carefully to avoid any offense of the feelings of the believers, which can only lead to the strengthening of religious fanaticism" (op cit., vol 38, p 118).

Lenin formulated the strictest possible requirements concerning the scientific substantiation of anti-religious propaganda. He sternly cautioned against "boring and dry" "retelling of Marxism," not based on historical fact and frequently distorting it. Lenin considered atheism a sector of science and propaganda within the overall Marxist outlook. Many decades have passed since, marked by most profound changes in the very foundations of human community life. The radical revolutionary processes which developed in the world generated and will continue to generate substantial changes in religious awareness and in the Church and religious organizations. Unquestionably, the decisive factors in this case will be the strengthening of the community of socialist states, the aggravating social contradictions in Western countries and the tempestuous and complex processes taking place in the Third World.

Under contemporary conditions the practice of the ideological manipulation of people, purposeful generating and dissemination of stereotyped values and behavioral standards and standardized political evaluations have become substantially enhanced. To this effect extensive use is being made of religious symbols and topics, on the one hand, as being the most understandable to the ordinary minds of the broad masses and, on the other, as having the unique ability to shape a variety of political slogans in the form of appeals, claiming class selflessness. That is why the range of forces which appeal to the language of religion is quite varied, from extreme right and terrorist regimes to organizations which are struggling for radical social changes.

Substantial changes have occurred in the status of the Church and religion in our society. This must be taken maximally into consideration in ideological education. Let us recall that in speaking of the need to "awaken" the believers from their "religious slumber," Lenin "did not have in mind in the least the still totally underdeveloped masses, among which darkness, ignorance and prejudice" and a primitive, routine religious faith predominated. Naturally, people to whom this description applies could be found to this day. However, the outlook of the bulk of believers has already developed under different historical circumstances, for which reason it has assumed an entire series of new quality features. Sometimes it is as though it is self-understood that exhaustive anti-religious arguments are already available and that the most important thing is to formulate them in an "intelligible" manner. However, regardless of how important role form may be, content remains the decisive factor, for it is not a set of frozen concepts suitable for all times but a system of views which are steadily

developing and which imbue and reshape all that is new in culture and science, no less actively than the "live" perception of people to whom the propagandist addresses himself.

It is important to remember that a person's religious beliefs are by no means mandatorily determined by the direct influence of Church doctrine. They could include an incomparably broader range of religious, idealistic apologetics. That is why it is impossible to conduct successful atheistic work without taking into consideration all the features and aspects of contemporary culture which could indicate and, subsequently, strengthen an interest in religious views among people who have not mastered the habit of independent analysis and of a convincing evaluation of such elements. It is at this point that the elaboration of the key problems of atheism as required by the practices of socialist community life becomes particularly important.

In earmarking ways of improving the criticism of religion, Lenin expressed the confidence that the old atheism and old materialism will be supplemented by "the corrections introduced by Marx and Engels" (op cit., vol 45, p 27). Today we can note that the number and quality of works especially dealing with problems of religion, have increased. However, if we were to compare the level of such publications with the requirements which are now formulated in the light of the domestic and international political situation, the only possible conclusion is that so far such requirements are not being met and the criticism to which the party subjected the social sciences for their dogmatism, sluggishness and neglect of the complex and contradictory processes in the development of our society fully apply to religious studies. An almost paradoxical situation exists: the interest of the public in the laws governing the establishment of the individual and the sources and nature of religious-moral quests has increased while the authority of related views of professional researchers of religion has declined. This is no accident, for occasionally they have been limited only to noting the ideological nature ("God-search," "withdrawal from conceptual principle-mindedness," etc.), not always convincingly explaining the reasons for and negative consequences of the reproduction of religious concepts precisely under contemporary circumstances.

The comprehensive study of religion presumes a wider range of knowledge in "related" disciplines: history, philosophy, sociology, ethnography, psychology and others. However, they are obviously insufficiently taken into consideration in the development of atheistic topics. It is difficult to deny the impression that the study of religion stands aside from the other social sciences and is largely an area for cultural and educational work, oriented above all toward popular publications which do not always meet exacting scientific criteria.

The quality of atheistic propaganda is affected particularly adversely by the scarcity of truly fundamental works which bring to light the wealth of the atheistic

legacy of Marx, Engels and Lenin, which creatively apply in explaining changes in contemporary religion the theoretical and methodological tools developed by the classics of Marxism-Leninism. The shortage of highly skilled specialists in religion is being felt with increasing gravity and concern. There is no coordinating center which would seriously develop a long-term strategy for fundamental research in this area. Another vital problem is that of writing highly skilled textbooks on religion and scientific atheism, for the topic itself calls for an outstanding, interesting and profound presentation.

This is not simply a question of another academic discipline. The state of religion affects not only the destinies of individuals but also quite important social processes. The purposeful study of religion is of tremendous importance also in strengthening the joint activities of Marxists and believers in the struggle for the solution of vital global problems, including the prevention of nuclear catastrophe. That is why a radical restructuring is necessary or, in more specific terms, the creation of a streamlined system for scientific atheistic upbringing, in which the elaboration of key theoretical problems would be properly expressed through mass propaganda work. Atheistic upbringing can be the result only of the profound and competent researchers and propagandists who can organically combine conceptual irreconcilability in the assessment of religion with an attentive and sensitive attitude toward believers who are our fellow citizens and participants in the building of socialism by the whole people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

From the Depth of the Centuries

180200180 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 99-105

[Article by Boris Viktorovich Raushenbach, academician, Lenin Prize winner, full member of the International Astronautics Academy]

[Text] In the year 988, 1,000 years ago, Kiev Rus appeared in the "throng" of European Christian countries. The interest shown in this event both at home and far from its borders is understandable.

In studying the historical monuments of our fatherland, I have frequently heard the descriptions provided by tourist guides. Whenever this involves events related to the introduction of Christianity in Rus I was amazed to note that the guides emphasized the religious aspect of the event and only briefly mentioned the socioeconomic and the political aspects of this process and, above all, the exposure of Russia to European culture. In my view,

however, which was based on the works of Soviet historians, the situation was entirely different. The essence of the 1,000-year old events was the development of Kiev Rus as a state and religion was merely a form of this process.

In order to reinterpret the why's and wherefores of those distant events in Kiev Rus, it would be useful to recall Engels' words which actually referred to the latter age of the Renaissance: "This was a period which the French accurately named the Renaissance, whereas Protestant Europe described it one-sidedly and restrictively as the Reformation" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 20, p 508).

This shows that judging of events on this scale by taking exclusively the religious component into consideration means passing a "one-sided and restricted" judgment. Unfortunately, some supporters of scientific atheism assume a position which conflicts with Engels' profound thought. By seeking merely the "dark sides" of an event which occurred 1,000 years ago we cannot fully appreciate its complexity and contradictoriness and its objective meaning and significance.

For example, the coercive nature of conversion is comprehensively emphasized. It is true that the history of the spreading of Christianity provides some arguments to this effect. Let us consider merely the so-called conversion by the Crusaders of the pagan tribes in the Baltic area. The method was simple: the knights advanced, defeating those who resisted, grabbing land, building their own castles on them, enslaving the free population and ascribing to this piracy a "decent" appearance by baptizing the survivors. Obviously, however, this was not in the least a matter of conversion but of seizing the land, like the Spaniards did with the American aborigines. However, nothing of the kind happened in Rus, where events developed differently and in the opposite direction, if one may say so (more on this later).

That which happened by the end of the 10th century in ancient Rus was an outstanding event in the history of our homeland. The Grand Prince Vladimir carried out a bold state reform with far-reaching consequences, a reform which I would compare to that of Peter the Great. As during Peter's time, a leap was necessary in the country's development and the mastery of the latest achievements of advanced countries of that time. Vladimir's objective was to become equal to the developed feudal monarchies. To this effect, an energetic feudal reform and the profound changes related to it were necessary. The baptism of Rus is frequently "one-sidedly and restrictively" described precisely as a reform.

(In order to avoid a misunderstanding, let me begin by emphasizing that I am discussing the feudal nature of the reform, the state and ancient Russian society as a whole in modern terms. I do not wish in the least to depict

Vladimir as a kind of conscious "theoretician of feudalism." He expressed the objective needs of social development which determined his natural aspiration to create a state which was equal to other monarchies he was familiar with, including Byzantium.)

In order to gain a better understanding of the processes which shaped the lives of our predecessors during those ancient times we must recall, albeit briefly, the events which preceded that century. The initially dispersed Slavic tribes occasionally united and waged military operations against their neighbors, sometimes in the outlying areas of the Byzantine Empire. Toward the end of the 9th century the first major campaign against Byzantium was mounted, which chroniclers relate to Kiev Prince Askold. This was a period of decay of the patriarchal communal system and the birth of feudal relations. At that time their form was primitive—in autumn and winter a unit headed by a prince roamed on its territory to collect taxes; feudal land ownership did not exist as yet. In spring any surplus (furs, wax, and so on) was shipped down the Dnepr to Byzantium and to the more distant Eastern lands. From there items which were not produced in Rus were imported. Askold laid siege to Constantinople, extracted a big ransom and concluded a treaty with Byzantium which, in all likelihood, contained some advantages benefiting the Russian nobility. This was the first clash between Byzantium and the developing country. These were no longer simply "barbarians" who plundered the border provinces but a more serious entity.

By the end of the 9th century Oleg from Novgorod captured Kiev and united Northern with Southern Rus (Novgorod with Kiev). The outlines of the future ancient Rus state appeared. The still weak unification of Rus within a single entity was maintained with the help of constant battles against unruly tribes. A new successful campaign against Byzantium ended with the conclusion of a treaty advantageous to the Russians and the payment of an annual tribute (protection from attack).

The weakness of the unification of Slavic tribes became immediately apparent following Oleg's death (turn of the 10th century). Their union broke down and it fell upon Igor to restore it by the force of arms. Igor was killed during a campaign mounted against the Drevlyani for a second tribute. This was followed by a fierce revenge on the Drevlyani mounted by his wife Olga, who became the ruler, for his son Svyatoslav was still a minor. Sad experience forced Olga to bring order to the tribute paid by and the obligations of the allied tribes. This was a new step in regulating the laws governing the feudal state.

In assuming power, Svyatoslav concentrated his energy on the external enemies of the new state. After routing the Khazar kaghanate, Svyatoslav's troops reached the Northern Caucasus. His campaign against Byzantium was marked by victories (although not always). On his way back from the campaign Svyatoslav was killed in a

battle against the Pechenegs, who had been informed by the Byzantines on his movements. However, the potential enemies of the Russians to the East and the West had become neutralized.

The internecine struggle between brothers after Svyatoslav's death brought to power his son Vladimir in the year 980. What was the legacy which Vladimir received from his predecessors? Briefly, he found himself at the head of an unstable association of Slavic tribes which could be held together by the constant use of military force (or at least the constant threat of its application). In order to strengthen this association, the young prince made two important decisions. First, he settled in Kiev, in order not to abandon the administration of his state for months or years on end (the length of military campaigns of his predecessors). Second, in modern terminology, he tried ideologically to unite the associated Slavic tribes with the help of a common religion.

The conversion to a settled life in the capital was a major step in the feudalizing of the state: the rulers of the kingdoms which existed during Vladimir's time governed their countries from capital cities. K. Marx deemed necessary particularly to single out this aspect of Vladimir's activities. He wrote that prior to Vladimir the country was ruled by princes-conquerors, to whom Russia was merely a staging ground (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Collected Works," vol 15, p 76, Progress publishers, Moscow, 1986). For example, Svyatoslav intended to move his capital to the Danube, bringing it closer to the areas of combat operations of his own military unit. This is confirmed by the chronicles: before Vladimir, the princes thought of "armies" whereas he thought of "the people of the land... and rules of the landholders." Naturally, this is not to say that Vladimir did not conduct military campaigns. However, he never remained in the lands he conquered but always returned to Kiev. His campaigns were not self-seeking but based on the needs of the state.

Having settled in Kiev, Vladimir undertook the building of defense installations east of the city, thus indicating that he intended to reside in the capital permanently and to defend it from nomads. The calm and confident life of the city was another important prerequisite for the success of the profound state reforms.

Initially he tried to solve the second problem, that of the unification of the allied tribes, by "equalization of rights" of all main tribal gods (and, therefore, the influential clergy groups). Anyone who came from distant lands could see that in the capital not only the Kiev gods but also the gods of his own tribe were worshipped. It is thus that a pantheon to six pagan gods was built in Kiev, the ruins of which have been found in our time by archaeologists. Another point of view is that the pantheon included gods which symbolized the main elements of the ancient concept of the world of the Slavs—

the sky, the earth, the sun, etc. Perun, the god of the Grand Prince, was the head of this group. In this case as well, however, the pantheon was of a pan-Slavic, a unifying nature.

Although today we lack direct confirmation, there is no doubt that these steps taken by Prince Vladimir strengthened the ancient Russian state. It soon became clear, however, that the road which he had so successfully followed was actually leading into a dead end. There were two serious reasons for this. First, even after Vladimir's new developments, the pagan religion presumed an ancient way of life. It was suitable for a patriarchal system but greatly hindered the shaping of new production relations born of feudalism. New laws and customs, a new social awareness and new assessments of events were needed. This could not be provided by the old paganism. Yet it was "this" that already existed in Byzantium. The second reason was that Kiev Rus could not become the equal of the progressive countries in Europe and the Orient and, in today's terminology, could not reach "the level of world standards" without borrowing from them crafts, building techniques, science, culture and many others (in the same way that Peter the Great needed later the experience of Western Europe). All of this too was available in Byzantium.

Why Byzantium? In determining which of the then existing countries to take as a model, Vladimir could have been oriented toward either the Muslim East or the Catholic West. Preference, however, was given to Orthodox Byzantium (the formal split of the once-united church into Orthodox and Catholic occurred only in the year 1,054 but in fact these two churches had become independent much earlier. It is this that allows us to apply our terminology.) Vladimir's choice was largely determined by history but also by his wisdom as a statesman. Quite close economic relations had already existed with Byzantium. Byzantium was close by. Bulgaria, which was related to Rus, had adopted Christianity approximately 100 years before Kiev Rus. This was greatly advanced by Kiril and Metodi, who created the Slavic alphabet and who preached Christianity in a Slavic language. Today the Slavic peoples justifiable honor them as outstanding educators (in Bulgaria Kiril and Metodi Day is a national education holiday). Therefore, Vladimir's decision could have been influenced also by the fact that in an Orthodox church, unlike the Catholic, the service could be conducted in an understandable language. It is also worth mentioning that at that time Byzantium was still blossoming; ancient traditions had not disappeared, for Homer and other classics of antiquity were studied in its schools and Plato and Aristotle were still being quoted in philosophical debates.... The Byzantine variant of Christianity met the needs of the feudal society, for which reason it was entirely consistent with Vladimir's plans. This also solved the problem of having all tribes in ancient Rus adopt a single religious cult.

Neither Rus nor Byzantium considered the forthcoming baptism a purely religious act. Simply and very briefly described, Byzantium's viewpoint could be reduced to the following: since Rus was turning to the Orthodox faith and since the Orthodox Church was headed by the Patriarch of Byzantium and the Emperor, automatically Rus became a vassal of Byzantium. However, the growing and already quite powerful ancient Russian state, which had repeatedly and successfully fought Byzantium, was by no means willing to accept such a role. Vladimir and his retinue had a different viewpoint. The baptism and the related borrowing of Byzantine culture and technology did not entail in the least the loss of Rus' independence. According to the prince, Rus would become a state which was friendly with Byzantium but entirely sovereign. As a friend of Byzantium it would give it military assistance if necessary. To say the least, the conversion was substantially hindered by such a major disparity in the views on its consequences.

However, fate was on Vladimir's side. In 986 the Byzantine emperor Basil II suffered a major defeat in war and barely saved his life; in 987 Varda Foka, the mutilated Byzantine military commander marched on Constantinople and proclaimed himself emperor. Finding himself in a hopeless situation, Basil II asked Kiev Prince Vladimir for help. The latter agreed to provide military assistance and thus protect Basil II's throne. His conditions, however, were strict:

The baptism of Rus would take place, metaphorically speaking, "by the Kiev scenario;"

Vladimir would marry the emperor's sister and thus become one of the supreme rulers of Europe.

The emperor was forced to agree. This was a great diplomatic victory for Vladimir. His army (6,000 men) helped to defeat Foka and Basil II retained his throne.

The year 988 was approaching, and so was the baptism of Rus. However, Basil II broke his word by delaying the arrival of his sister Anna to Kiev. Vladimir took decisive action: he laid siege on Korsun (the modern Kherones in the Crimea), which was an important Byzantine stronghold on the Black Sea.

A.K. Tolstoy, who had an excellent sense of humor, described the besieged Byzantines as follows:

"The Greeks saw ships in the bay and men of war around their walls. The talk which went back and forth was 'there is trouble for the Christians, Vladimir has come to be baptized!'"

Korsun surrendered. Vladimir threatened to shift military operations to Byzantine territory. It was now the turn of Basil II to capitulate. Anna's fate was bemoaned in Constantinople for an entire week and one can easily imagine what she thought on her way to meet Vladimir.

Those who like to speak of "baptism by force" can indeed see that force was applied. In the spirit of A.K. Tolstoy's words, one could ironically add that, having defeated the Byzantines, the ancient Rus troops forced the Byzantines to baptize them.

Before addressing ourselves to the feudal reform, let us consider the religious aspect of the matter. It may seem initially that the social role of any religion is always the same, for all religions accept the existence of some kind of mystical force which governs events in the world. In reality, naturally, things are more complex. Religions have their complex history and, in particular, the conversion of Kiev Rus from paganism to Christianity should be assessed in a positive light, as a progressive process, as a transition to a "civilized" religion. For example, human sacrifice was a mandatory element of the pagan cults of many European tribes. Such sacrifice was made on a variety of occasions, including some holidays of the annual cycle. When a rich person died his personal slave was killed and, sometimes, even a few other men and women slaves. Sometimes, on the eve of battle, a soldier was sacrificed. Also known have been cases of human sacrifice related to thanksgiving services.

The natural question is the following: how did Christianity spread? Did this process encounter opposition? Let us reemphasize that it was an internal affair of Kiev Rus. Changes were made on the instructions of the Grand Prince and his immediate retinue, a kind of "government." The country was not subjected to any external pressure. Furthermore, the population was familiar with Christianity: for a number of years small Christian communities, which had appeared during the rule of Princess Olga, Vladimir's grandmother, had existed; she was the first of the supreme rulers of Kiev Rus to accept Christianity (unless we believe the legend of Askold's conversion). This too contributed to the establishment of the new religion.

As is the case with any radical change, the new and progressive features clashed against the opposition of the old, the obsolete ones. That is why it would be useful to see who found such changes to his advantage.

The prince could only benefit, for whereas previously he was simply the head of a tribal alliance, now his power had become sanctified, "given by God." Vladimir's immediate retinue suffered no property or any other loss. The same could be said of the military. Those who traded with Byzantium found new opportunities with the reform. Whereas previously in the markets overseas they were classified as "barbarians" and "skifs," henceforth in Byzantium and in Europe they were respected correligious and in the Islamic East they were representatives of one of the world's religions. The ordinary members of communities were equally not particularly harmed, for the feudalizing process had not gathered strength as yet. Christianity promised freedom to the slaves. As we know, in ancient Rus slavery was restricted to domestic servants. Slaves were not used in industry

although they accounted for a substantial social stratum. The slave trade, however, was widespread. To this day, in English, German and French, the concept of "slave" is expressed with the word "slav," for Slav slaves were greatly valued on the slave markets. Slavery was not inherent in feudalism and the Church was greatly opposed to it, particularly to the slave traders who sold their fellow tribal members into slavery.

Those who lost everything were the pagan priests. All of a sudden the influential priesthood became totally superfluous. Under these conditions the pagan priests resorted to two essentially different tactics: first, "going into clandestinity," continuing to serve idols, conduct magic ceremonies, and so on, in the peripheral areas and wherever else that was possible; second, mounting an open (even armed) resistance to the entire system of Vladimir's reforms.

Vladimir's reaction to these two tactics was different. He paid virtually no attention to the "clandestine" pagan priests, for they did not threaten the main thing: the feudal reform. This is one of the roots of the so-called twin faith. Vladimir believed that these elements of paganism would gradually disappear as a result of the activities of the Christian clergy. Considering the scale of the reform, it would have been unwise to demand immediate changes in everything (even Peter the Great did not demand of the indentured peasants to wear Dutch clothing).

The reaction to the opposition to the system of feudal reforms was different. In this area Vladimir displayed firmness and mercilessness and, if necessary, used military force. What matters to us, however, is that "the fire and the sword" were not used simply to introduce the new religion but to create a centralized feudal state.

The process of Christianizing developed gradually and, according to contemporary estimates, took approximately a century. Considering the dimensions of the country, this was a very short time: Sweden and Norway, which adopted Christianity virtually at the same time, required, respectively, 250 and 150 years.

Vladimir's state reform appeared gradually to release the potential which had accumulated in ancient Russian society. It marked the beginning of a tempestuous and headlong development of the country, which indicates the timeliness of the reform.

Master builders hired in Byzantium built stone buildings and temples, painted them, and decorated them with frescos, mosaics and icons. Side by side with them worked Russians who learned a previously unknown craft. The next generation would already erect complex structures in the Russian cities virtually without the help of foreigners. Agriculture as well changed and truck gardening appeared in Russia.

The newly arrived clergy not only provided religious services in the new temples but also trained "national cadres" for the Church, as a result of which knowledge and literacy spread. Schools were opened in which, as their mothers cried, Vladimir gathered the children of the upper strata (a method which was subsequently to be used by Peter); young people were sent to study abroad. Records began to be kept. Like any developed country, Kiev Rus began to mint gold coins.

Gradually, ancient Rus became a state with a new high culture. However, we should not think that in pagan times it did not have its own variety of advanced culture. This popular pagan culture would linger a long time and would give ancient Russian art its original and unique features. In speaking of the new culture, I am referring essentially to the large amount of knowledge (from the works of Aristotle to means of building a stone arch) which was then part of world culture.

Strangely enough, chronicles written during Vladimir's time tell virtually nothing about him. This may have been related to the fact that they had been written by the newly arrived Byzantines who, unquestionably, wished for different results from the conversion of the country. Vladimir was not obedient to his spiritual fathers whenever their advice could benefit Constantinople alone and conflicted with the needs of Kiev. It was not the clergy that "commanded" Vladimir but the opposite.

However, whereas the chronicles say nothing about Vladimir, folklore enthusiastically praises him and this is the highest accolade for a political figure of that time. Beautiful Sun Vladimir has been remembered forever in the memory of the people. This is no accident. At all times the people have aspired to make the present better than the past and the future better than the present. The higher the pace of a continuous improvement of life, the happier the person becomes. During the period of Vladimir's reform, the pace of renovation of all aspects of life in ancient Russian society was truly overwhelming. Only yesterday the people of Kiev looked at the wonders of Constantinople with amazement; the next day he saw something similar in Kiev. All of this made them proud of their country and confident in its great future.

As aptly defined by Professor V.V. Mavrodin, at that time "everything was swaddled in optimism, the type of optimism which had been inherent in the early Christianity of Kiev Rus." At first Christianity in Rus was a happy event, which did not deny earthly passions and was alien to monastic asceticism. During Vladimir's time, Rus had no monks or monasteries. All of this was quite natural, for if a person would feel the need to join a monastery, he would have been raised since childhood in the spirit of Christian concepts and ideals. This, however, requires time. Furthermore, first-generation Russian Christians considered the very fact of baptism such a major exploit in personal piety that it made unnecessary the additional feat of leading a monastic

life. Most valued among the virtues preached by Christianity was love for one's neighbor, which was manifested, among others, in the practice of feasts and alms to the poor.

Princely feasts had taken place during pagan times as well. Vladimir kept this custom to which he gave a new meaning. It was during such feasts that "current policies" were freely discussed between the military and the tribal nobility. This helped to unify the feudal class. As to alms to the poor, the people of Kiev could eat for free in the Prince's court. By order of Vladimir, food was taken to the homes of the very old and the sick. One type of charity was also the ransoming of prisoners (slaves) who were then set free.

After feudalism had attained a sufficiently full development, the Church undertook to help the ruling class in keeping the oppressed peasants in a state of obedience; furthermore the Church itself would become the biggest feudal lord. All of this, however, was in the future. Meanwhile, Kiev Rus was ruled by the "kindly prince"—Vladimir the Beautiful Sun.

The thoughtful and energetic policy exercised by Vladimir made Russia part of the system of European Christian states. Its international position was strengthened. Rus became "known and heard... throughout the earth." Karl Marx described the age of Vladimir the "culminating point of Gothic (i.e., early medieval—author) Russia" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Collected Works," vol 15, p 76).

The fast pace of change in the age of Vladimir nonetheless was unable to complete the feudal reform during his lifetime. This required more time and the project was completed by his son, Yaroslav the Wise. As reported in the chronicles, Vladimir plowed, Yaroslav sowed and we (i.e., the next generation) will be harvesting the fruit. What was the nature of Yaroslav's "sowing?"

Assuming the Kiev throne after a hard internecine struggle, Yaroslav undertook no less energetically than his father the pursuit of the initiated reform. Like his father, he built fortifications to protect his lands although now, it is true, primarily in the West. Like his father, he saw to it that nothing would prevent the feudal reorganizations. It would be useful in this connection to recall the so-called "mutiny of the Volkhvy."

In the hungry year of 1024, in the then distant outlying area of Kiev Rus, in Suzdal, a mutiny broke out. It appeared that pagans had risen against Christians. The situation, however, was more complex. According to the chronicler, the rebels struck at the "old child." This gives us an idea of the essence of what happened. During that time a process of breakdown of the previously free communal family was taking place. The tribal leadership—"the old children"—was engaged in expropriating communal lands, gradually becoming feudalized; they collected taxes for the prince, naturally not forgetting

themselves. During the hungry years these developing feudal lords hid food stocks meanwhile becoming richer and enslaving their fellow tribesmen. Consequently, the 1024 uprising was a typical action of the enslaved against the oppressors and a prototype of the future peasant uprisings in the history of our country.

It was under those circumstances that the Volkhvy came out of "clandestinity" and tried to use the uprising for their own purposes—for the restoration of paganism. Yaroslav suppressed the uprising. It is interesting to note that while the Suzdal Volkhvy were practicing their pagan ceremonies Yaroslav left them alone. He acted when the anti-prince uprising (which only appeared anti-Christian) broke out. Like Vladimir, he found it important to consolidate the feudal reforms.

Yaroslav pursued his intensive building, obviously in an effort to make Kiev as good as Constantinople. Since Constantinople was famous with its own Cathedral of Saint Sofia, a grandiose Saint Sofia Cathedral was built in Kiev as well; in both cities golden gates decorated the city's fortifications, and so on. Yaroslav worked hard to develop trade: he began to mint not only gold but also silver currency.

However, Yaroslav's main concern was the creation of a Russian intelligentsia (however arbitrary the use of this concept as applicable to that age may seem). Vladimir was unable to solve this problem for lack of time. What was needed was not merely literacy but for Kiev Rus not to need "imports" of Greek clergy and for it to have its own scientists, writers and philosophers and, if necessary, to be able to wage an ideological struggle, in particular against Byzantium's imperial ideology.

The only place where a person was provided with everything necessary and offered the opportunity to practice the sciences in the Middle Ages was the monastery. Monasteries played the role not only of religious centers but of academies of sciences and universities. Here treatises were written on a great variety of topics and new generations of educated people were trained. Princes and kings visited monasteries not only to pray but also to seek advice, for frequently their most knowledgeable compatriots were to be found there. It is natural that under Yaroslav a Russian monastic institution developed and Russian monasteries appeared.

Descriptions dating from the 15th to the 17th centuries (earlier ones have been destroyed) indicate that most books in monastery libraries were not theological but laic. The monasteries stored chronicles, time charts, a variety of works on geography, philosophical and military treatises and classical works such as Josephus Flavius's "History of the Judaic Wars," and others. A learned monk had to be comprehensively educated. This is confirmed, for example, by the opening of the "Tale of Stefan Permskiy," whose author, Yepifaniy Premudryy, a monk at the Troitse-Sergiyev Monastery (15th century), belittles his talents, as was the custom at that time: "I

have not visited Athens in my youth and did not learn from philosophers their clever or wise words; I have not read Plato or Aristotle..." These words describe the ideal of the monk-scientist.

The monasteries kept chronicles (Nestor), wrote works of a polemic nature (frequently with a clear political undertone), transcribed books (it is to these monastic transcriptions that we owe the opportunity to read ancient manuscripts and that the "Tale of the Lay of Igor" has reached us), and painted icons (Alipiy). Monastery physicians provided free medical aid to the population. Equally important is the fact that the monasteries trained Russian clergymen and the higher clergy, thus replacing the Byzantines. Relations with Byzantium alternately improved and worsened. In 1037, using the difficult situation in which Yaroslav had found himself in the struggle against the Pechenegs, Byzantium forced the prince to set up a Russian metropolitan see, headed by a Greek. Officially, the Russian church fell under the rule of Constantinople and as before Byzantium wanted to make Kiev Rus its vassal. When a military conflict broke out somewhat later between Kiev and Constantinople, the Byzantine historian Michael Psell described it as the "uprising of the Russians." It was not an attack but an uprising! He was obviously unwilling to tolerate the idea that Kiev Rus was independent. In 1051, after the death of the Greek metropolitan, something unheard of happened: Yaroslav alone (without the emperor and the patriarch in Constantinople), "summoned the bishops," and for the first time anointed as Metropolitan Ilarion, a Russian priest from the princely village of Berestovo. Once again the Russian church strengthened its independence.

Metropolitan Ilarion was, unquestionably, a highly talented person. He was the author of an outstanding example of ancient Russian literature—"Sermon on Law and Grace." Judging by the title, one may think that this was a classical theological treatise. The apostle Paul himself, in his "Epistle to the Jews" had raised the question of the correlation between the Old Testament (the law given by Moses) and the New Testament (the grace given mankind by Christ). Naturally, the question was solved in favor of grace. In his work, Ilarion gave a new, a politically topical twist to this classical subject.

Since grace stands above the law, it means that in frequent cases the new is superior to the old. But this also means that nations which have converted later than others are as good as the latter and therefore Byzantium's claim to seniority in terms of Rus was unjustified. More specifically, referring to the baptism of Rus, Ilarion particularly emphasized that this was not Byzantium's merit. The Russians converted on their own free will. This was merely a first step and a great future awaited the Russian people. Being even more specific, Ilarion praised Prince Vladimir—the baptizer of Rus—and his policy. He raised the question of Vladimir's sainthood as a "new Constantine." Emperor Constantine who, many centuries ago, had made Christianity the

state religion of the Roman Empire, introduced Christianity in a country in which it had already become widespread. Vladimir introduced it in a pagan country, which was much harder. Therefore, Vladimir deserved more credit than Constantine. Ilarion further described and praised not only Vladimir's "alms" but also his activities as a statesman and paid proper homage to his predecessors, Svyatoslav and Igor, i.e., he praised pagans!

Actually, Ilarion's work was a sharp ideological weapon in the struggle for the independence of Kiev Rus. This was not left unnoticed by Byzantium which at that point refused to canonize Vladimir.

The spreading of literacy and the building of schools (not only in Kiev) continued under Yaroslav. There are records on the opening of a school for 300 children in Novgorod in the year 1030, where they began to "learn from books." Schools were opened for girls as well. Gradually, literacy spread to all classes, as confirmed by ancient birch-bark documents. Yaroslav himself "frequently read books, both at night and during the day," and "collected many writings and translated them from Greek to Slavic and wrote many books..." "The study of books is very useful." The culture of the population of ancient Rus developed rapidly.

Civilized countries cannot exist without written laws and Yaroslav created the "Russian Law" and many other written codes. In short, having completed Vladimir's reform, Yaroslav turned Kiev Rus into a freely developing feudal state as good as any other. Pride in their country and the desire to be independent from Byzantium and equal to it were shared not only by the people around the prince but by the entire nation. Several decades after Yaroslav's death this was confirmed by Father Superior Daniil, who traveled to Palestine, an event which he described in his "Travels." Seeing that in the Temple of the Holy Sepulcher there were numerous oil lamps, including from Byzantium but not from Rus, he appealed to King Baldwin (at that time Palestine was in the hands of the Crusaders) with a request to allow him to put an oil lamp "from the entire land of Rus." Nowhere should Rus stand lower than Byzantium.

What were the results of the reign of Vladimir and Yaroslav? First, Rus was united within a single feudal state. It was united on the basis of a new and at that time progressive culture, written laws and religion. The old tribal division disappeared. The statehood of the single ancient Rus nation was completed, subsequently emerging as Russians, Ukrainians and Belorussians.

Second, as a result of the reform Rus became equal to the rest of the civilized world. It was equal to the other countries in terms of socioeconomic system (feudalism, which continued its development), culture, crafts, and military affairs. The introduction of Christianity, which

became the ideological foundation of the united feudal statehood of ancient Rus, played a progressive role during the early Middle Ages.

The fast blossoming of the ancient Rus state made a tremendous impression throughout the world. A Western chronicler (Adam of Bremen) called Kiev the "jewel of the East" and the "rival of Constantinople." Perhaps the international reputation of Kiev Rus is best seen through the dynastic marriages. Whereas Vladimir acquired a "worthy wife" by the force of arms, under Yaroslav the situation was entirely different. He himself married the daughter of the King of Sweden; his sister married the King of Poland and his three daughters married, respectively, the Kings of Hungary, Norway and France; his son married the sister of the King of Poland and his grandson, the daughter of the King of England; his granddaughter became the wife of Henry IV, the German King and "Holy Roman Empire" Emperor. Was this not a recognition of the international reputation of the ancient Rus state as a progressive and powerful country? It rose from a conglomerate of "barbaric" tribes, in the eyes of an amazed Europe, in the life of two generations. That was how Vladimir had "plowed" and Yaroslav had "sowed!"

Today we can be justifiably proud of the accomplishments of our great ancestors and gratefully remember their dedicated efforts. The event which took place 1,000 years ago (like all dates of its kind, it is, naturally, conventional) was a major step forward on the long path of history.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

Struggle For the Ideological and Organizational Strengthening of the Party

18020018p Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 106-115

[Text] **Our readers have shown a great deal of interest in the processes governing the internal development of the People's Republic of China and the activities of the CPC. The following article is based on materials from the Chinese press, describing some topical problems of CPC intraparty life and, particularly, the efforts to regulate it.**

The last period in the activities of the CPC—one of the largest detachments of the world communist movement—has been marked by important events. The 3rd Plenum of the CPC Central Committee, 11th Convocation, which was held in December 1978, is considered in the PRC a turning point. A decision was made here of shifting the center of gravity of the party and the state to economic building. It was on the basis of this decision that a struggle was launched in the country for the implementation of the "four modernizations:" industry,

agriculture, national defense, and science and technology. The 12th CPC Congress (1982) called for quadrupling the annual industrial and agricultural output between 1980 and the year 2000. This will enable the PRC to emerge in the ranks of the leading countries in the world in terms of the gross output of the main types of such commodities and the volume of its national income.

In aspiring to its objective, the CPC is persistently seeking new ways of building socialism. A broad program for socioeconomic change has been formulated and is being implemented. A profound and comprehensive reform is taking place in the economic system, as a result of which impressive successes have been achieved in the economy and the living standards of the working people has increased significantly. Between 1979 and 1986 the national income of the PRC doubled and so did the real income of the working people. Substantial progress was made in the areas of education, science and culture; sociopolitical life became more active; the activities of the various population strata are intensifying and the role of the democratic principles is growing.

The extensive and complex tasks which the CPC faces today have required a major restructuring and improvement within the party itself, in the activities of which weaknesses, shortcomings and views and moods triggered by the practices of the "cultural revolution" have still not been eliminated. Extensive work must be done to regulate the CPC and ensure its ideological and organizational strengthening.

The decision to regulate was adopted at the 12th CPC Congress in September 1982. The Central Committee accountability reports to the congress indicated that since the "ruinous consequences of the decade of trouble (the "cultural revolution"—editors) had not been entirely eliminated to this day and bearing in mind the increasingly corrupting influence of the ideology of exploiting classes under the new conditions, there are faults... in our party in ideological and organizational aspects and in the work style, and the party style has still not been radically improved" ("12th All-China Congress of the China Communist Party (Documents)," Beijing, 1982, p 84 (in Russian)). Under these circumstances, the report emphasized, the "comprehensive streamlining of the party's style and party ranks" is considered by the CPC "a matter of prime importance, which requires an exceptionally serious approach and most thorough preparations and systematic and consistent implementation" (ibid., p 85).

The CPC planned to implement this project over a 3-year period, starting with the second half of 1983. The "main link" in its successful implementation was to be "the development of a profound, general ideological upbringing within the party." From the organizational viewpoint the streamlining was to take place from the top down: initially in the leading agencies and among leading cadres, going down and ending with the primary

party organizations. At the final stage the party members had to be subject to registration and those "who after educational work with them remained unworthy of the title of communist" were to be expelled.

In October 1983 the Central Committee Plenum adopted a special expanded "CPC Central Committee Resolution on Party Streamlining," according to which the project was to be started in the winter of 1983 (*Renmin Ribao*, 13 October 1983). The resolution noted that under the conditions of expanded relations with foreign countries and the revival of the country's economy, "the influence and corrupting rôle of pernicious bourgeois ideology and feudal vestiges had increased somewhat," and that "here and there the party organizations had become weakened and were even in a state of paralysis." The need for comprehensively upgrading the rôle of the party in the implementation of the program for the socialist modernization of the country was particularly emphasized. In this connection, the demand was formulated of making the party a firm nucleus in guiding socialist modernization. The streamlining of the CPC was described as the "basic prerequisite for the implementation of the great objectives set at the 12th Party Congress—quadrupling by the end of this century gross industrial and agricultural output, while continuously upgrading economic efficiency as a basic prerequisite for making our country a contemporary socialist state with a high cultural standard and highly developed democracy."

Four streamlining aspects were singled out: achieving unity of views, changing the style of activities, strengthening discipline and purging the party organizations.

Unity of views presumes the assertion of the "four basic principles" within the party (defense of the socialist way, democratic dictatorship of the people, leadership by the communist party, Marxism-Leninism and the ideas of Mao Zedong), and the line of socialist modernization.

The essence of streamlining the style of activities was formulated as follows: to develop the revolutionary spirit of dedicated service to the people, to block any attempt at using one's official position for selfish purposes and to struggle against bureaucratism.

The strengthening of discipline meant defending the organizational principles of democratic centralism, the struggle against "patriarchalism, cliquishness, anarchism and liberalism," and eliminating the "helplessness and slackness of the party organizations."

Finally, it was a question of purging the party organizations. This meant "identifying, in accordance with the party statutes, elements who are directly opposed to the party and who harm it, and expel them from the party."

The task was to identify the "three-category individuals," who had appeared during the period of the "cultural revolution," i.e., "supporters of the counterrevolutionary cliques headed by Ling Piao and Jiang Qing, who had become professional rebels; individuals entrapped by the zeal of cliquishness and factionalism; and pogrom-making people."

The decision of the Central Committee concretized the process of party streamlining. In October 1986 the party numbered more than 40 million members, including 9 million cadre workers. The 3-year term set for the implementation of the resolution was subdivided into two periods. During the first, the party organizations of leading central authorities and leading authorities in the provinces, cities under central administration and autonomous areas and the party organizations heading the army party authorities were to be regulated. During the second (which was to begin in the winter of 1984), all other party organizations.

The idea, based on a thorough study of documents and on upgrading the ideological standard, was to promote criticism and self-criticism, to "separate the true from the false, to correct errors and to introduce purity within party ranks." Mandatory works to be studied included "Most Important Documents Since the 3rd Central Committee Plenum, 11th Convocation," the collection "Mao Zedong on the Style of the Party and the Party Organization," and Deng Xiaoping's "Selected Works." A central commission, headed by the CPC Central Committee General Secretary, was established to be in charge of party streamlining.

The streamlining both in terms of content and significance, from the very beginning went far beyond the party's framework, directly affecting all most important areas of social life. The main problem, essentially, was that of the way of China's further long-term development, and defining the specific ways and means of solving problems of economic and cultural building. This was largely determined by the complexity of the ideological situation in which the new movement developed. The Chinese press noted that a certain segment of the population, young people in particular, were indifferent to political events, were unwilling to participate in social activities and did not like to hear about the "great principles." Major negative phenomena were detected within the CPC itself. The decision to streamline the party also mentioned the existence of members who "lack a clear idea concerning the basic principles of the socialist system and its advantages," and who "openly proclaim anti-Marxist and anti-socialist views."

Nonetheless, the sharp struggles on the ideological front were aimed, above all, at extreme-left views triggered by the "cultural revolution." In its 15 March 1984 editorial, *Renmin Ribao* said that the main obstacle on the path to the successful execution of a socialist policy in all areas of social life "remains vestiges of a leftist line and the

influence of leftist views." The editorial also pointed out that those who had remained on the ideological positions of the "cultural revolution" opposed virtually all aspects of the new course.

The regulating process revealed that the supporters of leftist "deviations" held quite strong positions within the party. The party committees reported to the central commission that in the provincial party organizations no more than 20 percent of the party members were "actively supporting the line, course and political stipulations of the party adopted since the 3rd Plenum of the CPC Central Committee, 11th Convocation, while 20 percent had a negative attitude and the others remained passive" (*Renmin Ribao*, 7 January 1984).

With a view to focusing efforts along the main direction, a political campaign was launched in April 1984 to eliminate the consequences of the "cultural revolution." In its 23 April issue *Renmin Ribao* wrote: "Unless we totally reject all that happened during the period of the cultural revolution there will be no line, course and policy as drafted after the 3rd CPC Central Committee Plenum, 11th Convocation." Groups to identify the "individuals from the three categories" were set up in the center, the provinces, areas and districts. These groups were instructed to open files of suspected individuals, based on records and interrogations.

Starting with June 1984 the center of gravity in streamlining the party was shifted to the implementation of economic reforms, which had already been underway for a few years but which, until the middle of 1984, applied essentially to agriculture, where a conversion from a cooperative organization of labor to a family contracting system was made. By that time reform in the cities had merely taken its initial steps. A course of accelerated pace of "urban" reform was adopted at the May 1984 session of the All-China Meeting of People's Representatives. As early as 7 June 1984, the central commission in charge of party streamlining issued a circular in which the party organizations were ordered to concentrate on the reform. The circular indicated the need "to see to it that, on the one hand, the streamlining of the party and, on the other, economic work stimulate each other" (*Renmin Ribao*, 9 June 1984). Priority was given to eliminating obstacles on the path of the reform in the economic system, making activities of establishments and departments consistent with its stipulations and purge leading agencies from people who opposed its implementation (see *Renmin Ribao*, 1 July 1984).

At the same time, the CPC Central Committee passed an important resolution on cadre problems (see *Renmin Ribao*, 30 July 1984). It substantially broadened the rights of primary party organizations and gave them the right to appoint and dismiss middle-level and basic personnel. The number of cadre workers in the Central Committee nomenclature was reduced by two thirds. The Central Committee retained the right to appoint and replace cadre workers on the levels of deputy ministers,

deputy chairmen of provincial governments and higher, and managers of large enterprises, leading schools and scientific research institutions.

The results of the first period of the campaign for streamlining the CPC were summed up in November 1984. The resolution on this matter noted that as a whole an ideological-political and organizational consolidation had been achieved, the influence of leftist ideology was eliminated, support for the main political course was secured, factionalism was eliminated and a purge of "individuals from the three categories" had taken place and the work style had been improved in the party organizations subject to streamlining in the course of the first period (more than 388,000 members of the CPC) (*Renmin Ribao*, 23 December 1984, 27 November 1984). On the basis of these results the party organizations were issued instructions to convert to the final stage: "adoption of organizational steps and registration of party members." They were asked to adopt a cautious approach to the purge, to display "caution" and to proceed from the fact that "few" were to be expelled from the party.

This was followed by a resolution on initiating the second period of streamlining. It was stipulated that in the winter of 1984 and throughout 1985 the necessary work would be done on the regional and district levels and at enterprises, VUZs, scientific research institutes and other establishments on this level, which numbered more than 13.5 million CPC members (*Renmin Ribao*, 23 December 1984). Streamlining in the remaining organizations was conducted from the winter of 1985 to the end of 1986 (*Renmin Ribao*, 27 November 1984).

In October 1984 the 3rd CPC Central Committee Plenum, 12th Convocation, passed a "CPC Central Committee Resolution on the Reform of the Economic System," which called for "accelerating the pace of the reform of the entire economic system with emphasis on the cities in the interest of developing an even better, a new situation on the front of socialist modernization." The direction of the reform, its nature, its main course and the political concepts were defined (*Renmin Ribao*, 21 October 1984). Since then the streamlining has been concentrated essentially on attaining the objectives earmarked at the plenum, which was directly mentioned in the resolution itself. The resolution calls for training and appointing to leading positions in the economy "a tremendous number" of cadre workers who actively support the reform and who can ensure its systematic implementation. The prime importance of this requirement was emphasized in the speeches of CPC leaders. Deng Xiaoping characterized the solution of the cadre problem as the key which will determine the success or the failure of the reform (*Renmin Ribao*, 24 October 1984).

The new tasks made it necessary to adopt a stricter approach to summing up the results of regulating in the party organizations during the first period. In January

1984, having accepted the conclusion that ideological-political and organizational unity in these party organizations had been strengthened, the central commission indicated that it will be a question of settling only the most urgent problems and that a great deal more time will be required before the situation on this level of the CPC could be made consistent with the charted political course. The commission called for a repeated checking and summing up the work which had been done. It also emphasized that "it is necessary to block the appearance of ideas according to which with the completion of the streamlining there could be a "breathing spell and a "slackening." The current streamlining of the party must become the new starting point and we must continue to intensify party building in the ideological and organizational areas and in the workstyle and discipline" (*Renmin Ribao*, 9 January 1985).

This formulation of the problem was related to the fact that at the end of 1984 and, particularly, the beginning of 1985 the struggle against a variety of abuses in economic activities, which had taken place in the course of the reform of the economic system, had assumed a serious nature. The harm such abuses had caused amounted to several billion yuans in 1984. Some cadre workers began to interpret the reform as a means of efficient and fast satisfaction of group and personal interests by all possible ways and means, and as an opportunity for violating the norms and principles of party life.

This led to a loss of understanding of the essence of the reform and its basic objectives (*Renmin Ribao*, 8 June 1985; *Jingji Ribao*, 20 June and 2 July 1985). Bribery, use of official position for selfish purposes, the creation of private enterprise establishments by party and administrative authorities and their leading personnel, speculating in scarce materials, illegal price increases, and so on became widespread. These phenomena began to be described as a "new improper style." In explaining the reasons for its appearance, Zhao Ling, member of the central commission of CPC advisors wrote: "Cadre workers who are party members do not have a clear idea of the objectives and the guiding thought of the reform. The main objective is to develop social production forces. In all of their aspects they presume the satisfaction of the interests of the state and the people. However, some cadre party members have a superficial idea of this objective... for which reason they are doing everything possible to gain advantages for themselves personally and for small groups, harming the state and the people" (*Hongqi*, No 6, 1985).

The CPC leadership identified quickly the negative trends which had developed within the party and reacted to them most decisively. As early as the end of 1984 the PRC State Council and the CPC Central Committee issued a number of directives on correcting "the new improper style." The struggle against it was proclaimed the "center of gravity" during the second period of streamlining. An important role was assigned to it also in completing the streamlining of the party organizations

during the first period. It was emphasized that in no case did this struggle indicate the abandoning of the reforms and a "turn back." On the contrary, it was subordinated to the objectives of "securing and stimulating the reform" (*Renmin Ribao*, 9, 13, and 14 March 1985). Energetic steps to improve the situation were taken by the provincial party committees. Enterprises which had been set up by party and administrative authorities and their managers for purposes of enriching some groups of people, were closed down or reorganized. Severe penalties were imposed on CPC members who supported the "new improper style."

Ideological and political education work increased explanations to the effect that the reforms are a means of building socialism. Addresses by party leaders and articles in the press persistently emphasized the need "to combine the reform of the economic system with the great ideals of communism," substantiating the conclusion according to which the reforms "serve the cause of developing the socialist economy and socialism and, in the final account, the cause of communism" (*Renmin Ribao*, 19 February, 9 March, 13 April and 20 June 1985; *Hongqi*, No 21, 1985).

At the same time, attention was drawn once again to the close link between streamlining the party and the implementation of economic reforms. The urgency with which the question was formulated can be judged by the proceedings of the conference which considered the state of affairs during the second period of streamlining the CPC, in July 1985. Hu Qili, CPC Central Committee Secretariat member, said at the conference that "if separated from the reform, which is the central task of the party and the state at the present time, party streamlining may lose its practical objective and significance." On the other hand, he pointed out, "unless party streamlining can ensure the reform, however good the plans for reform may be they cannot be successfully implemented and could even be distorted and lead to chaos" (*Renmin Ribao*, 27 July 1985).

In surmounting the difficulties related to the appearance of the "new improper style," the party's leadership continued to broaden the framework of streamlining. In November 1985 the central commission adopted a resolution on the procedure and tasks related to streamlining the rural party organizations, which was to take place from the winter of 1985 to the spring of 1987 and affect more than 22 million CPC members. As in the towns, here the emphasis was on preventing abuses in economic activities, surmounting vestiges of leftist moods and, on this basis, consolidating the results of the reform in the countryside. It was recommended that streamlining take place through education and persuasion. The inadmissibility of creating obstructions in production activities was emphasized (*Renmin Ribao*, 25 November 1985).

Three large regional conferences were held in May-June 1986, at which the results of the streamlining of the party organizations on the level of the rural districts and

municipalities were summed up. It was noted that the work which had been done had contributed to enhancing the level of party leadership and to improving intraparty life. It was pointed out, nonetheless, that streamlining had been "uneven" and of a formal nature in a number of organizations. Streamlining was to be continued and complacency and "demobilization moods" were not to be allowed.

The decision was also made to undertake preparations for streamlining at the primary level—the rural party organizations. Its purpose was to intensify the role of party members in mobilizing the peasants and upgrading their production activities. Regulating work groups were set up comprehensively, totaling 550,000 cadre workers. The managements of more than 100,000 party cells were replaced in a single month.

In November 1986 the streamlining of the rural party organizations assumed countrywide scale. It brought to light numerous difficulties and shortcomings of the economic reform in the countryside. The inertia of the barter peasant farm was surmounted sluggishly; production diversification and specialization were being hindered; no sufficient persistence was displayed in organizing trade and industrial activities in the villages; transformations aimed at developing a commodity-based economy were being indecisively carried out. The CPC central commission in charge of regulating considered such problems repeatedly.

Great importance was ascribed to strengthening the cadre party personnel in the course of streamlining the CPC. A separate chapter on "Party Cadres" was added to the new CPC statutes adopted at the 12th Congress, stipulating that the party "strives to achieve the comprehensive revolutionizing of the army of cadres and its rejuvenation and arming with general and specialized knowledge" ("12th All-China Congress of the China Communist Party (Documents)." Beijing, 1982, p 129 (in Russian).

The active involvement of the intelligentsia in the CPC is an essential part of perfecting intraparty life. This task was defined as primary in the work on expanding party ranks, at a conference held by the CPC Central Committee Organizational Department in November 1984 (*Renmin Ribao*, 20 November 1984). Its urgency was explained by a lagging in the general educational level of the overwhelming majority of CPC members behind the requirements of the time. No more than 20 percent of them are with higher or secondary training, the balance being with only primary training or else remaining totally illiterate (*Hongqi*, No 10, 1986). A considerable number of party cadres lack satisfactory cultural, general educational and professional training. Of the 22 million cadre workers, including CPC members, no more than 21 percent have higher training; 42 percent have secondary and secondary specialized training and 37 percent have incomplete secondary or lesser training (*Lilun Yuekan*, No 2, 1985). Under these circumstances, the

party's ability to "play a leading role in modernizing the country," party materials noted, directly depends on increasing the stratum of the intelligentsia in the CPC and within its apparatus (*Renmin Ribao*, 21 November 1984). That is why party reinforcements consisting of members of the scientific and technical intelligentsia accounted for more than 40 percent in the first half of 1984 (*Guanming Ribao*, 17 November 1984).

Lowering the age of the leading personnel on all levels and taking moral and practical criteria into consideration, is an important aspect of CPC streamlining. The process was initiated in February 1982, when the CPC Central Committee passed a resolution on introducing a system for pensioning off the old cadres, which abolished the system of holding leading positions for a lifetime. As was reported at the 18 September 1985 All-China CPC Conference, subsequent to this resolution, two major reshufflings in the leadership, at the top and the bottom, took place: the first was prior to the 12th CPC Congress (September 1982) and the second, from January to September 1985 (*Renmin Ribao*, 19 September 1985).

Both campaigns involved radical changes in the membership of the leading party authorities. Thus, as a result of the second reshuffling, 16 people, or nearly 70 percent of the 23 first secretaries of party committees on the provincial level, were replaced. The average age of party committee members of permanent committees dropped from 58.1 to 51.6 years and the share of individuals with higher training increased from 38.6 to 68.2 percent (respective data for 10 and 6 administrative units).

Major changes in the central leading party authorities were carried out at the September 1985 All-China Party Conference, with a view to rejuvenating and upgrading the professional and general educational standards of their personnel. More than 26 percent of the CPC Central Committee members were replaced. Delegates to the conference noted that this of tremendous importance in maintaining the party and state leadership whatever their grade on the level of the requirements of socialist modernization and ensuring consistency in CPC policy (*Renmin Ribao*, 19 September 1985).

The "CPC Central Committee Resolution on the Leading Course in Building a Socialist Spiritual Culture" (*Renmin Ribao*, 29 September 1986) called for reaching a new level in party ideological work. It defined the main guidelines and tasks in cultural and ideological building. "The common ideal of our multinational people at the present stage," the document read, "is building socialism with Chinese features and converting our country into a contemporary socialist state with a highly developed culture and democracy." The resolution also notes that the working class is the leading class in the country and that, as its vanguard, the China Communist Party is the central force heading socialist modernization.

One of the sections of the resolution deals with the guiding role of Marxism in building a spiritual culture. It points out that "we cannot do without Marxist guidance, without the mastery of Marxist theory in shaping our ideals and aspirations, in moral and cultural building or in asserting the ideas of democracy and legality." In defending the positions of the creative development of Marxism, the plenum criticized both those who consider it an ossified dogma as well as those who reject the fundamental Marxist principles, proclaiming Marxism "obsolete" and showing blind reverence for bourgeois philosophical and social doctrines.

The plenum harshly condemned the deeply rooted standards of feudal morality and legacy of feudalism, such as vestiges of patriarchalism, privilege, arbitrariness, cliquishness and a scornful attitude toward women. It pointed out that feudal ideology is frequently interwoven with the ideology of capitalism, which has also "sunk deep roots," thus requiring difficult and lengthy efforts to surmount them. The party called for persistently asserting and developing the standards of socialist morality, to which greed, parasitism, the beliefs that "money is the most important thing," abuse of power, fraud, and so on are alien; to apply socialist relations of a new type—relations of equality, unity, friendship and mutual aid; comprehensively to encourage the spirit of socialist humanism, respect for the individual and concern for the individual. The resolution particularly emphasized the development of democracy without which, as it points out, "no socialist modernization is possible."

The CPC Central Committee Plenum noted that noticeable successes had been achieved in the course of streamlining in restoring the party style, which must be characterized by combining theory with practice, closely related to the masses and to self-criticism. It also pointed out that the struggle against the "bad epidemics" will be lengthy and must be waged throughout the entire period of the reform, the expansion of foreign relations and modernization.

The relevance of these tasks became particularly clear in December 1986-January 1987, when mass student demonstrations took place in a number of Chinese cities, during which demands of "changing the PRC in the Western model" were raised under the slogan of "reform in the political structure," along with Americanizing China; the communist party was attacked and its leading role was denied.

The CPC firmly condemned this ideological trend, hostile to the cause of socialism, known as "bourgeois liberalization." In describing its essence, *Renmin Ribao* wrote that "preaching bourgeois liberalization means rejecting the socialist system and supporting a capitalist system; the nucleus of bourgeois liberalization is the denial of the party." It was emphasized that the outcome of the struggle against it will "determine the fate of the party and the future of socialism." In exposing the reasons by virtue of which "bourgeois liberalization"

assumed such a dangerous nature, *Renmin Ribao* noted that "compromises were allowed in the struggle against this trend and the approach was not firm. From the Central Committee on down to many districts, a weakening and confusion on some positions developed on the front of political and ideological work, including in propaganda work and in molding public opinion; the party organizations in a number of higher educational institutions were unable to oppose the dissemination of bourgeois liberalization, which precisely created prerequisites for its dissemination" (*Renmin Ribao*, 2 February 1987). Taking the existing situation into consideration, the central commission appointed by the CPC to check the discipline published information which stated that "the struggle against bourgeois liberalization is one of the most important tasks of the party organizations on all levels" (*Renmin Ribao*, 15 January 1987).

The promoters of "bourgeois liberalization" tried to make use of the fact that, as Bo Ibo, chairman of the CPC Central Commission for Regulating the Party, noted, "under the new historical circumstances the implementation of reforms and the policy of open access to the outside world and the revival of the economy within the party and the country's social life some negative trends appeared, some of which serious" (*Renmin Ribao*, 18 January 1987). The documents also emphasized that in no case does the struggle against "bourgeois liberalization" mean any retreat from the line of reform and the course of "open policy." On the contrary, its main objective is precisely to create maximally favorable conditions for the pursuit of this trend and this course.

Major changes in CPC leadership occurred in January 1987. Zhao Ziyang, premier of the PRC State Council, replaced Hu Yaobang, interim party Central Committee general secretary. The expanded session of the CPC Central Committee Politburo, at which this decision was made, called on the party to continue the line of internal and foreign policy pursued by the Central Committee since the 3rd CPC Central Committee Plenum, 11th Convocation. In addition to this, it emphasized the need to oppose "bourgeois liberalization" and to support the "four basic principles," which were described as the main guarantee for China's progress on the path of socialism. Thus, in addition to confirming this line, emphasis on giving it ideological support was made. "This line," Zhao Ziyang said, "has two main aspects: defending the four basic principles and defending the course of reform, the policy of expanding relations with the outside world and revival of the economy. These two aspects are interrelated and indivisible from each other" (*Renmin Ribao*, 3 February 1987).

A conference was held by the end of May 1987 in Beijing, which summed up the results of CPC streamlining. The successful completion of this project was noted. The report submitted by Bo Ibo, permanent deputy chairman of the central commission, on behalf of the CPC Central Committee and the central commission, noted both progress in ideology, style, discipline and

organizational activities of the CPC as well as the value of important experience which had been acquired in 3.5 years in properly settling intraparty contradictions and problems. The report also stated that party construction is a lengthy process of historical development and that the problems within the party cannot be solved exclusively by streamlining the party organizations. The main task in party building is to ensure the implementation of the party line formulated as of the 3rd CPC Central Committee Plenum, 11th Convocation. As Zhao Ziyang, premier of the CPC State Council, interim general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, emphasized at the meeting, in order to ensure its comprehensive and proper understanding and implementation it is important tirelessly to surmount and eliminate the influence and obstructions caused by "bourgeois liberalization" and ideological ossification (*Renmin Ribao*, 28 May 1987).

The streamlining of the CPC was completed on the eve of the 13th Party Congress, which is planned for the autumn of 1987. Preparations for the party forum will, unquestionably, be a new important stage in the complex and comprehensive process of CPC ideological and organizational strengthening.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

India: Forty Years of Independence

18020018q Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 116-123

[Article by Feliks Nikolayevich Yurlov, publicist]

[Text] India, a great country with a most ancient material and original spiritual culture, whose roots go deep into the millennia, a country which has made a tremendous contribution to human civilization, is celebrating the 40th anniversary of its independence and its advance on the path of national renaissance and progress.

For the nearly 200 years which preceded independence, the Indian people were deprived of the possibility of managing their own affairs. The British colonizers proclaimed that the Indians were incapable of historical initiative and were unable to hold the destinies of the country in their own hands. The Indian people never tolerated the role assigned to them by the colonizers as the object of the historical process. This is confirmed by the numerous uprisings against colonial yoke, which shook-up Hindustan throughout the entire 19th century and, above all, by the first war for independence of 1857-1859, light-handedly named by British politicians as the "Sepoy Mutiny." Another confirmation was the struggle for national liberation which developed in the 20th century, on which the Great October Revolution had a more than a small influence, and which reached its apex in the mid-1940s.

The victory over German fascism and Japanese militarism in World War II, to which the Soviet Union made a decisive contribution, brought about a weakening in the positions of imperialism and provided a powerful impetus to the development of the national liberation movement. India was among the first colonial countries to gain political independence. On 15 August 1947 Jawaharlal Nehru, the prime minister of the first government of free India, hoisted the national tricolor over the Red Fort in Delhi. This victory of the Indian people not only marked the advent of a new age in its history but also had a major impact on the anticolonial struggle waged by other countries. In the words of Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, India's independence "rang like the funeral toll for classical colonialism the world over."

The consequences of colonial oppression were truly tragic to this great country. Unrestrained colonial exploitation led to the destruction of its production forces and the impoverishment of millions of people. V.I. Lenin wrote that "there is no end to the violence and plunder described as the system of British administration of India" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 17, p 178).

On the eve of India's independence, its economy was backward and primarily agrarian. Agriculture, on which the survival of more than 75 percent of the population depended, was in a state of extreme decline. In the last 30 years of colonial rule per capita national income had been declining steadily. Hunger and epidemics killed millions of people. In the 1920s the average life span here was no more than some 20 years.

The division of the former colony into two states—India and Pakistan—based on religious-communal characteristics led to the mass migration of Hindus and Sikhs from Pakistan to India and Muslims from India to Pakistan. This migration was accompanied by fratricidal clashes and a drastic aggravation of economic problems.

The Indian people faced gigantic problems after gaining political independence.

The far-sightedness of India's political leadership was manifested above all in the fact that, in planning the future restoration of the country, it took into consideration the features of its historical development as well as the experience of other countries, including the Soviet Union. From the very beginning the Indian government charted a course of democratic social changes, strengthening the economic foundations for independence and achieving self-sufficiency. It was precisely along this way that the young state tried to solve ripe problems of upgrading the well-being of Indian society and ensuring a social renovation. It began to formulate 5-year plans and to promote the country's extensive industrialization.

This policy met with the support of the popular masses. Nonetheless, it also had its opponents. The reactionary circles accused Nehru and the ruling Indian National

Congress Party of allegedly "preparing grounds for communism," and "wishing to put an end to political freedoms and democracy." The Swatantra political party was founded in the second half of the 1950s. It proposed a platform for increasing capitalist enterprise. Although it did not meet with the support of the people and was forced to abandon the political stage soon afterwards, the struggle for the future development of the country went on.

External forces became involved in this struggle. India felt the tremendous pressure of imperialism, American in particular, which was not only dissatisfied with India's independent anti-imperialist and anticolonialist policy, and its key role in the nonaligned movement, but also tried, as it continues to this day, directly to interfere in its internal affairs.

However, the independent Indian state did not submit to dictatorship. The profoundly anti-imperialist nature of the national liberation struggle was logically embodied in the country's internal and foreign policy course. It was precisely on the basis of anticolonialism and anti-imperialism that ideas were generated, followed by the drafting of governmental programs aimed at the independent development of the country and its transformation into a powerful modern state.

Emerging on the high road of independent historical creativity, India achieved impressive successes despite the difficult problems inherited from the colonial past and the efforts made by imperialism and neocolonialism to hinder its efforts. The country's GNP increased by a factor of more than 3.5 and its volume of industrial output by a factor of 7.

India's development on the path of social change is closely related to the creation and strengthening of a state economic sector. State enterprises assumed key positions in the leading industrial sectors. The state sector accounts for more than 20 percent of the country's entire industrial output. Foreign capital was deprived of its command positions and most important levers with which to influence the economy.

As a result of the implementation of the course of industrialization, based on a planned economy, India created a multisectorial industrial complex. It successfully developed the most advanced industrial sectors, such as electronics, nuclear and aerospace. All of this made India an industrially developed state.

Agricultural production in the country is growing steadily. For example, the grain harvest increased from 55 million tons in 1950 to 150 million in 1985 and 1986. This stabilized the food situation, which is a major accomplishment. Today India is among the countries which provides economic aid to developing Asian and African countries.

India achieved noticeable successes in strengthening the unity within its multinational society and the territorial integrity of the state, thanks to major projects carried out in the interest of the peoples inhabiting the country. This includes the establishment of territorial-administrative units based on language, and the development of national languages and cultures. A great role was played in this by the Indian National Congress, and by the left-wing forces which have consistently promoted Indian unification.

It is particularly important to emphasize all of this, for both during the colonial period British and, subsequently, American imperialism extensively encouraged the idea that India is more a "continent" than an integral state. The Indian people proved the groundlessness of such claims. One of the main results of 40 years of the country's independent development was the strengthening of its sovereignty and statehood. Nonetheless, the task of unification remains topical. Suffice it to say that the Sikh separatists in the state of Punjab are causing tremendous harm to the process of consolidation through their subversive activities, which are benefiting from imperialist support, and the support of chauvinistic and divisive forces in many parts of the country. It is no accident that in his first address to the people after becoming prime minister, in January 1985, Rajiv Gandhi emphasized that "Indian unity is of determining significance and everything else takes second priority."

Of late the foreign and domestic reactionary forces have intensified their efforts to destabilize the situation both in the country and around it, focusing on the Gandhi government. However, they are being properly rebuffed by all truly democratic and patriotic forces which proceed from the fact that India's unity and integrity is one of the most important prerequisites for its development on the path of democracy and progress and for its independence and security.

The objective observer cannot fail to note that during the period of their independent development, the Indian people have made great progress in a great variety of economic and social areas. Naturally, however, a great deal has not been accomplished within such a short historical time segment. Many difficult problems are awaiting their solution. One of the gravest is that of employment: more than 25 million people are officially unemployed. They include members of the working class, the intelligentsia and white-collar workers. More than 2 million university graduates are unemployed. According to official statistical data, 37 percent of the population are below the poverty line, i.e., below survival minimum. Meanwhile, the share of the national income appropriated by the big bourgeoisie has quadrupled over the past 25 years.

Many of the difficulties in India's development are the result of the fact that so far the agrarian problem has not been fully solved. Although during the period of independence the feudal form of land ownership has been almost

entirely eliminated, land owners and rich peasants, who are farming essentially on a capitalist basis, have retained a considerable portion of the land (4 percent of big farms account for some 23 percent of land ownership, whereas 75 percent of small and very small land owners account for 25 percent of all arable land).

Added to these and other problems is the tremendous agrarian overpopulation. In 40 years the country's population has increased from 350 million to nearly 800 million. This is due to a lowered mortality rate as a result of positive changes in the health care system and the lengthened span of life to 57 years. The fast growth of the population is creating additional difficulties for the national economy. In this connection, the Indian government is implementing a large-scale program to lower the birthrate. According to the estimates of Indian scientists, however, a stabilization in population size should be expected not before the middle of the 21st century.

Despite remaining difficulties and problems, the people of India look at the future optimistically, for they see that what was achieved in the last 40 years is a strong foundation for surmounting difficulties and ensuring the country's further all-round development.

India, as a great Asian and world power, is a major force of influence in the international arena. Its high reputation was gained by its consistently peaceful policy and tireless opposition to colonialism, imperialism, apartheid and racism, and promotion of equal economic relations between developed and developing countries.

The main principles and ideas guiding India in its foreign policy may be traced to the historical spiritual traditions of the Indian people, which developed in the course of the struggle for national independence, and against colonial oppression and imperialism. The main trends of this policy pursued by the sovereign Indian state were formulated by J. Nehru even before the official proclamation of independence. In particular, he emphasized that free India will work for the sake of a united world, a world in which there will be free cooperation among free peoples and where no single class or group will exploit another one.

From the very first years of its independence, India proclaimed foreign policy principles which subsequently earned broad international recognition. In 1954 India and the PRC formulated the five principles for peaceful coexistence—"Pancha Shila:" mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual nonaggression, noninterference in domestic affairs of the other country, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. These principles, which were supported by many other countries, became the base of the decisions adopted at the Bandung Conference of Asian and African Countries (1955) in the organization of which India played a leading role. The declaration on contribution to universal peace and cooperation, adopted at the conference,

included the 10 "Bandung principles," and earmarked ways for surmounting differences among Asian countries of different social systems and developing cooperation in the interests of peace and international security.

It would be difficult to overestimate India's contribution to the founding of the nonaligned movement. As early as 1947 J. Nehru spoke of the need for a foreign policy which would be free from "separate groups or blocs," emphasizing that India will not join any existing group. He nonetheless pointed out that this has nothing in common with neutrality or a passive stance. J. Nehru also expressed the idea of the creation of an international movement based on these principles.

The First Conference of Nonaligned Countries was held in 1961, sponsored by India and a number of other countries (Yugoslavia, Egypt, Indonesia and Ghana); the conference took place in Belgrade with the participation of 25 countries. Since then the nonaligned movement rapidly grew and by the time of its latest eighth conference, which was held in Harare, the Zimbabwe capital, it numbered more than 100 members. During all the stages in the development of this movement—its struggle for asserting the principles of peaceful coexistence and against imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, imperialist military-bloc policy and cold war, and for establishing a new international economic order based on equality and justice—India played and continues to play a key role, worthy of one of the originators of the doctrine and policy of nonalignment. "Peace cannot be based on the threadbare concepts of imperialism,...on arms race and the threat of weapons, whether thermo-nuclear or conventional," Indira Gandhi said.

In January 1985 the heads of six states and governments (India, Argentina, Greece, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden) issued a declaration in New Delhi with an appeal calling for a comprehensive and tool testing, producing and developing nuclear weapons and delivery systems and preventing an arms race in outer space. This appeal was in harmony with the profoundly humane program of historical scale and significance, formulated by the Soviet Union, for having a nuclear-free world and eliminating all types of mass destruction weapons by the end of the 20th century.

Always and in all circumstances India has invariably confirmed its support of the ideals of peace and security of the peoples, the principles of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries, equality and good neighborly relations. Its activities in the United Nations, at nonaligned conferences, as member of the "Group of Six" and at other international fora, dealing with the most important problems of our time related to the struggle for peace, against the threat of nuclear war and for disarmament, have earned it a deserved reputation in the global community.

In the present difficult situation, filled with terrible dangers, relations between the Soviet Union and India—two great peace-loving countries belonging to different social systems—are of major importance to universal peace and development. They are also fully consistent with the interests of the peoples of both countries.

The Soviet Union and India are linked by stable relations which have a long history and are based on firm traditions. The best minds of Russia followed with warm sympathy the struggle waged by the Indian people against British rule. V.I. Lenin ascribed great importance to intensifying ties with India and the Indians. As early as 1916 he called for making all possible efforts to come "closer" to the peoples of the Orient. A step in that direction was his meeting in November 1918 with a delegation of representatives of the Indian people. The greetings they presented to him included a high appreciation of the "noble and humane principles" proclaimed by the Soviet working people in assuming power.

In colonial India the foundations of friendship between the peoples of our two countries were laid by its national leaders, who struggled for the freedom and independence of their homeland. They warmly greeted the first socialist country which many of them considered a source of inspiration in the struggle against foreign oppression and which strengthened their faith in the future national revival of an ancient great power. "If the future is full of hope," J. Nehru wrote in the 1930s, "this is largely thanks to Soviet Russia, and I am convinced that unless a world catastrophe would prevent it, this new civilization will be firmly established in other countries as well, putting an end to wars and conflicts threatened by capitalism."

The logical result of the growing friendship between the Soviet and Indian peoples was the establishment of official diplomatic relations in April 1947, i.e., several months prior to the formal proclamation of Indian independence.

The very first years of activity of independent India in the international arena proved that its foreign policy course was largely consistent with the peace-loving anti-imperialist aspirations of Soviet policy. An essentially important feature in relations between our countries was the conclusion of the 1971 Peace, Friendship and Cooperation Treaty. With it the USSR and India asserted their firm support of the principles of peaceful coexistence between countries with different political and social systems and declared that in the contemporary world international problems can be solved only through peaceful means and not through conflicts.

The Soviet Union has always supported the Republic of India, both when it was only starting its difficult struggle against consequences of colonial oppression and when it repelled the efforts of the imperialist forces aimed at making it change its independent foreign policy course. At all times relations between our countries have been

those of mutually profitable cooperation among equal, sovereign and independent partners for whom relations of friendship are not the result of political expediency but of historical, ideological and spiritual development.

The Soviet Union and India have no common border. However, they are joined by belonging to the area on earth inhabited by more than two-thirds of mankind and where many of the largest countries in the world are located. More than one-third of Asia is Soviet territory. Traditional sea lanes which link the eastern and western parts of our homeland cross the Indian Ocean. It is natural, therefore, that problems of peace, stability and security in Asia are common to both the Soviet Union and India.

Relations of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and India are an important factor of peace and stability not only in Asia but on a global scale as well. The New Delhi declaration which was initialed by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Gandhi in November 1986 on the principles of a world free from nuclear weapons and violence was an event of tremendous international importance. The 10 principles for such a world listed in the declaration include the acknowledgment of peaceful coexistence as a universal standard for international relations; human life as the highest value and nonviolence as a foundation for the life of the human community. On behalf of more than 1 billion men, women and children, which constitute the population of the two countries, the Soviet Union and India appealed to the nations and leaders of all countries to take immediate action to bring about a world free from mass destruction weapons and wars.

The New Delhi declaration is a document expressing a new style of political thinking, reflecting the main features of the philosophy of survival, consistent with the conditions of our age. It is the quintessence of ideas and practical actions aimed at the preservation of peace. The drafting of this document became possible above all as a result of the high standards maintained in Soviet-Indian relations and the similarity or closeness of views held by our countries on the most vital problems which face mankind today, the main one of which is the prevention of nuclear war and the safeguarding of peace. It is a concentration of the efforts of the USSR and India in the struggle for a world free from nuclear weapons and violence.

The New Delhi declaration met with a broad international response. Its ideas are having a positive impact on the moral and political climate in the world and have become an important factor in the improvement of international relations.

Cooperation between the Soviet Union and India is based on the spiritual and intellectual wealth of our nations and on the best accomplishments of their creative genius. It proceeds from priority of human values

and similarity of approaches to the most important problems of our time. It is imbued with an awareness of deep responsibility for the fate of their own countries and all mankind.

Our friendship with India is not subject to circumstantial changes. Its strength lies in its deep roots, steadily enriching and strengthening. The summit meetings which serve well our states and peoples and have a favorable influence on global developments are particularly important in Soviet-Indian cooperation. As a result of joint purposeful efforts to implement the agreements reached at such meetings, the interaction between our countries has reached a qualitatively new level. "The Soviet Union highly appreciates the peaceful policy of our great southern neighbor," M.S. Gorbachev said during R. Gandhi's recent visit to the USSR. "We are interested in a united, strong and independent India, playing an outstanding role in the nonaligned movement and in the initiatives of the six countries. Such an India is a mandatory and necessary factor of peace and security in Asia and throughout the earth."

Soviet-Indian trade and economic cooperation plays a major role in the system of comprehensive Soviet-Indian relations. In over 30 years, through the joint efforts of Indian and Soviet engineers and workers, more than 60 large industrial and other enterprises have been completed in leading economic sectors in India. They are the foundation of its state economic sector. Another almost 40 Soviet-Indian enterprises are either under construction or planned.

The broadest agreement in the history of Soviet-Indian relations on economic and technical cooperation was concluded in the course of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to India in November 1986. It stipulates the completion of important projects, such as the building of the Teri Hydroelectric Power Complex which will include three hydroelectric power plants generating a total of 2.4 million kilowatts, the reconstruction of converter shops and the updating of the "2000" mill at the Bokaro Metallurgical Plant, the opening of four mines in the State of Bihar, with a total capacity for 8 million tons of coking coal per year, and many others.

All of these projects require major capital outlays, for which purpose the Soviet Union granted a substantial state loan. It is important to note that the loan will be repaid in India rupees with which the Soviet Union will purchase from India goods needed by our national economy. Let us also emphasize that India is promptly repaying all Soviet loans.

The forms and structure of Soviet-Indian trade will be improved. This particularly applies to increasing the share of machinery and equipment. Steps aimed at improving production cooperation between Soviet organizations and Indian companies, both state and private, will be a new essential aspect in trade and economic

relations between the USSR and India. In 1986 representatives of Indian business circles set up an Indian-Soviet chamber of commerce and industry, the purpose of which is substantially to broaden the sale of Indian goods to the Soviet Union and the purchasing of Soviet goods.

Soviet-Indian scientific and technical cooperation has extensive possibilities. The combination of the intellectual potential of our two countries enables us to engage in joint research, master developed technologies and put them to practical use in solving the tremendous problems they face today. Significant experience has already been acquired in this area. Thus, scientific relations in the study of outer space are developing successfully. Three Indian earth satellites of the Bhaskara and Ariabata type were launched with the help of Soviet rockets. Work in this area was crowned by the joint space flight of two Soviet and one Indian cosmonauts.

The main trends of interaction between our countries in science and technology were defined in the course of the joint activities conducted by Soviet and Indian scientists. A firm foundation has been laid for such cooperation for many years into the future, particularly in the area of advanced technology. This is confirmed by the comprehensive long-term program for scientific and technical cooperation which was initiated during R. Gandhi's friendly visit to the Soviet Union in July 1987.

India festivals in the USSR and Soviet festivals in India, timed for the 40th anniversary of India's independence and the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, are most outstanding confirmations of Soviet-Indian friendship. The festivals will last a full year and will serve the lofty objectives of the further rapprochement between our peoples.

Compared with the thousands of years of India's historical past, its 40 years of independence is merely an instant. Nonetheless, it is an age of tremendous importance, which has awakened to social and political life the multimillion masses of the Indian people and brought into action the inexhaustible resources of their spiritual and creative energy. The Soviet people are sincerely pleased with the outstanding accomplishments of great and friendly India, which plays an ever growing role in the struggle for peace, international security and social progress, and wish its peoples new outstanding accomplishments and victories.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

American Scientist V. Leontiev on Changes in the Soviet Economy

18020018r Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 124-126

[Text] The decisions on the radical restructuring of the Soviet economic management system are being extensively discussed in the capitalist countries. In addition to

clearly tendentious appraisals, views reflecting a weighed analytical approach are being expressed.

Vasily Leontiev is an important American economist. He is director of the Institute for Economic Analysis of New York University and Nobel Prize winner. He was born in 1906 in Russia. His world fame came from the methods he developed for economic analysis (the "cost-output" model), which allows the full computation of gross output and primary production factors per unit of end output in the national economy and the determination of accurate quantitative correlations between the gross national product, the national income and the development of various industrial sectors. V. Leontiev relied directly on the practical experience in national economic planning which was gained in the USSR in the 1920s and on the theoretical studies made by Soviet economists at that time. At the same time, his works stimulated the development in the USSR on intersectorial balances of the production and distribution of goods in the national economy, extensively used today in theoretical research and applied in planning practices. I believe that the editors of this journal have acted properly by deciding to acquaint the readers with the view on this problem expressed by V. Leontiev, one of the best known American economists, a viewpoint he expressed in an interview with a TASS correspondent.

By no means do we agree with all the thoughts expressed by V. Leontiev. However, familiarity with his viewpoint on the changes which are taking place in the Soviet economic management system are of unquestionable interest.

S. Shatalin, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member

The changes which are being made in the USSR are of an unquestionably revolutionary nature and, obviously, are aimed at upgrading the productivity of the Soviet economy. The approach chosen today for achieving this objective is somewhat different from the one practiced previously. The decision was made to introduce the interest factor. The people may be persuaded to work better and encouraged ideologically. However, enthusiasm alone is not enough. It must be supported materially. Naturally, V.I. Lenin knew this when he introduced the new economic policy. That policy was based on the principle of interest, which made the people work better. Even when problems developed, the people were frequently able to solve them by themselves.

With a developed division of labor, when an interdependence exists among the various types of economic activities, a substantiated price system is of tremendous importance. It is universally acknowledged today that prices in the USSR are inconsistent with real production costs which reflect, above all, production technology. The prices of some commodities are too low as to cover costs.

Proper prices supply producers with substantiated information. It is frequently said in the Soviet Union that if you work well you will be promoted, you will be paid well and will receive a bonus. But who, in the final account, decides whether you worked well or poorly? Your superior. This is both subjective and dangerous, for frequently a person finds it more important to create the impression that he works well than he does in reality. If a plant or a private entrepreneur makes a pair of shoes no one decides whether either of them works well or does not. They simply sell their shoes on the market and obtain earnings which are the difference between price and production costs. This takes place automatically and is impersonal, which precisely makes it objective, for it does not depend on the judgment of individuals.

Work in economics requires an objective evaluation which can be provided only by an accurate price and only by control through the market. In this case there can never be a situation in which there is a surplus of some goods and scarcity of others. This is the result of relying on gross output regardless of supply and demand.

Market control can be established over the entire economy, including its military sectors. Even when you are producing for your own consumption you could choose among several enterprises, place the same order to them and allow them to compete among each other. Even if all of them would produce the same type of aircraft one of them will inevitably be able to ensure the more economical utilization of manpower, better to organize the production process and earn higher profits.

Naturally, we cannot base everything on the forces of the market. It is very difficult for the individual enterprise manager to compute everything, particularly to make decisions concerning capital investments. Therefore, essentially, a combination is needed: Some responsibility for decision making and implementation must remain in the hands of the state and some must be assumed by the individual enterprises and collectives. Finding the proper combination is the most difficult aspect in this case.

Managing the economic life of a big country can be compared to piloting a sailboat. The first thing one needs is wind, which would blow the sails and push the ship forward. This wind is interest. However, we also need the steering of state management which, using the power of the wind, would lead the ship in the necessary direction, quite delicately. The steering mechanism of the American economy is weak. If a strong wind blows we get carried toward the rock of crisis. Today in the Soviet Union the opposite prevails: There is no wind and the sail is limp. Steering without wind makes it difficult to steer in the proper direction. A good captain could lead the ship in the direction different from that of the wind. This is the equivalent of an accurate economic policy, for society is interested not only in profit but also in a high standard of culture, good living conditions and helping people who are unable to achieve high earnings.

It is important for incentive and initiative to exist. A substantiated price system would result in the fact that successful work will be paid well. Along this way, however, there are difficulties as well. By mechanizing and automating industry a number of people lose their jobs. What to do with them becomes the problem of society and the state. At that point it may be necessary to subsidize them, i.e., to give them aid. This, however, is incomparably better than any artificial low price ceiling.

The second problem is that of avoiding social chaos in converting from current to substantiated prices. This task is like rolling down a high mountain, which cannot be achieved without breaks. That which could be computed should be computed, albeit approximately. For example, what should be the rough correlation among the prices of coal, electric power and wheat? It is only after that, that the economy can be gradually converted to the new price system. Substantial funds should be set aside to help those who would find themselves in a bad situation as a result of higher prices, and it becomes necessary either to lower taxes or subsidize low-income groups.

It is important to bear in mind that the price reform system and the entire restructuring will not yield immediate results. The difficulty is to have the population support the new prices although it will not immediately feel any tangible results. Many people will lose their jobs. This will particularly apply to those in leading positions. They will not like this. People on the "lower strata" may fear to remain unemployed and without social security. I believe that the state, if it carefully supervises this process, would be able to carry it out gradually and thus prevent individual tragedies. This will be easier to accomplish in agriculture than in industry.

Greater freedom of action will have to be given to economic managers in terms of deciding on the variety of goods to produce. However, if decisions on substantial capital investments must be made, some managers are simply unable to do so. Naturally, they could submit suggestions on their expediency. Nonetheless, leadership must come from the superior level, the central planning authorities. Even in large capitalist corporations the manager of a subdivision has considerable freedom in producing greater or lesser amounts of a given commodity. However, if he wants to make capital investments which, let us say, would exceed \$1 million, he must ask the permission of the corporation's management and substantiate his proposal.

It is precisely the planning authorities that must supervise this entire process, for capital investments and their efficiency depend not only on the situation today or tomorrow. Decisions on capital investments must be based on knowledge of the economic situation as a whole, and the ability to look into the future and make long-term forecasts. This cannot be made by an individual engineer. For example, one cannot base computations on the current price of energy, for 20 years from

now there will be a scarcity of oil and its price will rise. More nuclear energy would have to be produced. It is also necessary to take into consideration demographic trends, the situation on the world market and many others.

For example, a kolkhoz chairman could fully solve the question of growing one type of vegetable rather than another. However, should this require huge capital investments the question becomes more difficult. Capital investments are justified after a detailed study of development trends 10 to 20 years into the future. This makes decision making by some managers extremely complex. Let us take the building of a new automobile plant. We must know what will take place 10 years from now. We must see the entire picture, the entire sector. This is a task for the state.

The same could be said of scientific and technical progress. It is very important for this problem to be dealt with by the government, as is being done in Japan. Among all capitalist countries from which one could learn something I would not choose the United States but the Japanese. Their government plays a major role in economic life. The use of economic computations by the government in Japan is on a much higher level than in the United States. Incidentally, the methods I developed are being used more extensively in Japan than in the United States.

Even if the economic reform is fully successful, this will never bring about the introduction of capitalism in the Soviet Union. This is simply impossible. However, it could maximally improve the country's economy. Naturally, as a result of this you will have not only casualties but also successful and rich people. However, you have always had them and still do. Here as well the state could play a restraining role.

I believe that, in the final account, your system will remain one of social justice. However, a great deal will depend here on the leadership, the enthusiasm and the intelligentsia. I believe that the Soviet leadership is trying to earn the support of the intelligentsia, which has always played a tremendous role in the old and the new Russia. It can explain everything to the people and can help. There will be difficulties, for which reason reserve funds must be set aside to help those who will suffer. For when major changes are made someone always suffers. However, such is the price of progress. If the economy develops rapidly, in the final account these people will find their place in it. I am absolutely confident that you will never introduce pure capitalism. This would be stupid. What is necessary, however, is to improve the technology of economic management which, for the time being, remains very low.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

**Foreign Press Reaction to June 1987 CPSU
Central Committee Plenum**

*18020018s Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12,
Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) p 126*

[Text] *Daily Telegraph* (Great Britain): "Even if we take into consideration the previous decisive actions taken by Gorbachev concerning the breaking up of the bureaucratic machinery in the USSR, his current actions will be recorded in history as the most daring, radical and economically justified since Lenin's policy of the NEP."

F. Ricciu, writing in *Italia Oggi*, newspaper of the Italian business circles: "M.S. Gorbachev is implementing a profound reform and not making cosmetic changes which have always been ridiculed by Western Sovietologists. Even *The New York Times* wrote about this, calling upon the Americans to pay the closest possible attention to this. For my part, I would like to emphasize that not only Americans but everyone should pay attention to this, for the restructuring which is taking place in the USSR is fraught with consequences which could affect the rest of the world."

Asahi (Japan) emphasizes that the adoption of the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) "created real prerequisites for economic reform and for the first time truly offers Soviet enterprises the possibility of engaging in independent activities. Unquestionably, many obstacles remain, such as lack of experience in independent work by managers of plants and factories and the opposition of bureaucrats on different levels, who are unwilling to lose their privileges. Nonetheless, one can confidently say that the Soviet economy is entering a period of radical change."

Times of India: "The temptation may develop to consider the introduction of commodity-monetary relations and decentralization of management as proof of a right-wing deviation in Soviet policy. This would be near-sighted and erroneous. To begin with, inevitably commodity-monetary relations will play only a limited role in establishing relations among enterprises, which will be guided in their work by a common economic plan, which will determine the volume of investments, output and allocation of assignments. Changes in accountability methods are not necessarily a first step to the introduction of management through the market. Secondly, M.S. Gorbachev has made it perfectly clear that as far as the overall status of the national economy is concerned, centralized planning and management will predominate. Obviously, M.S. Gorbachev's target is not planning but the conservative bureaucratic machinery which is a hindrance to Soviet economic development. It encourages not the free activities of market forces but the democratization of the administration so that it may respond better to the human factor."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987. 05003

To Our Readers

*18020018t Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12,
Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 127-128*

[Text] Exactly 1 year ago, the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the Journal *Kommunist*" was published in issue No 12 of this journal. This document, of great theoretical and political significance, formulated long-term broad assignments concerning the dissemination and intensification of the ideas of the April Plenum, the 27th CPSU Congress and the subsequent Central Committee Plenums, the creative development of the new problems related to Marxist-Leninist social science and its sharp turn to the revolutionary restructuring taking place in the country, the development in all cadres of the ability to think and act in a new style and the interpretation of the innovative foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

Kommunist has taken the initial steps in the implementation of the responsible assignments formulated in the decree. A number of topical problems of the theory and practice of restructuring were considered. A certain amount of experience was acquired in organizing in this journal discussions on crucial problems of social science, so far neglected, above all those dealing with socio-economic problems. The readers welcomed a form of democratic discussion of the achievements and difficulties on the way of restructuring, such as editorial roundtable meetings sponsored at production and scientific collectives and party organizations.

Constant communication with the readers has become a strict rule in editorial activities. Letters to the editors have become firmly established in the journal. This does not apply exclusively to the section "In My Opinion... From Letters to the Editors," which is included in virtually every single issue. This also includes systematic surveys of the received mail. Finally, this also includes readers' conferences, and meetings between the journal's personnel and the party and economic activists and propagandists for the purpose of exchanging views on crucial theoretical and practical problems and for discussing editorial plans.

Naturally, the *Kommunist* collective does not overestimate the importance of the initial changes in its work. We clearly realize that the main work lies ahead and the journal is still at the beginning of a long and very difficult road. By no means have we been able to achieve everything we had planned and included in our editorial plans of which we informed the readers in detail (see No 14, 1986). Not all problems raised in *Kommunist* are being interpreted as profoundly, substantively and sharply as our time dictates. We are fully resolved to intensify our efforts to raise the activities of the journal to the necessary theoretical and analytical standard. This is required

by the resolutions of the January and June CPSU Central Committee Plenums and the requirements of ideological work under present-day circumstances.

The immediate plans of the editors call for the publication of a series of problem materials which will discuss the priority tasks in the application of the new economic management mechanism, social aspects of restructuring in management, enterprise activities based on full cost accounting, the reorganization of economic management agencies and party-political support of the economic reform. The range of problems in the development of the social sciences and spiritual life and problems of ideology discussed by the journal will be broadened.

It is a question above all of interpreting problems of developed socialism, democratization processes in Soviet society and the elimination of "blank spots" in our history, from the positions of Marxist-Leninist dialectics. Preparations are being made for other roundtable meetings on vital problems of present-day reality and, naturally, the summation and evaluation of the initial experience in converting the national economy to full economic management methods, and the study of the difficulties and contradictions of this complex transitional stage which the country is entering.

The journal considers as one of its permanent tasks the extensive coverage of the comprehensive experience and the achievements, searches and problems of global socialism. The editorial plans include the further conceptual interpretation of the foreign policy strategy of the CPSU, which is an organic alloy of the new political philosophy of peace and a program for specific decisive action leading to the development of a nuclear-free nonviolent world by the end of this century. Very close attention will have to be paid to the real dialectics of global developments and its trends and contradictions, ways of efficient solution of the global problems of mankind, the struggle waged by the worker and communist movements, the peoples of the liberated countries and the mass democratic movements for peace and social progress.

The content of *Kommunist* under the new circumstances, the range of the priority problems which will be studied on its pages, and the ways of the further improvement of editorial work in accordance with party requirements, as formulated in the Central Committee resolution on *Kommunist* will largely depend on the activeness of the widening dialogue between the editors and the readers and your advice, suggestions and initiatives. That is why we would like to know your views and evaluations better in order to check against them the editorial plans for 1988.

The editors would be interested in the views of the readers above all on the following:

What articles and other materials published after the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the Journal *Kommunist*" do you consider most relevant and interesting? Why? How do you assess the present sections and rubrics used by *Kommunist*? Are you satisfied with the genre variety? What new rubrics and genres would you like to see in the journal in 1988?

What are the specific problems of revolutionary restructuring which you would like to read about in *Kommunist*?

What new realities of social life, in your view, require collective discussion and interpretation at editorial roundtable meetings?

As the journal's experience has indicated, a certain increase in knowledge and intensification of scientific concepts on socialism, which help to surmount durable dogmas and obsolete stereotypes, can be achieved as a result of discussions on vital and understudied theoretical problems. What problems, in your view, could become topics for such discussions in the future? What are the advantages and disadvantages of holding them and what form should publications of such debates take?

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

Publication Data

18020018u Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 12, Aug 87

English Title: *Kommunist* No 12, August 1987

Russian Title: *Kommunist*

Editorial Board: N. B. Bikkenin(editor-in-chief), A. I. Antipov, E. A. Arab-Ogly, B. S. Arkhipov, K. N. Brutents, I. A. Dedkov, V. I. Kadulin, S. V. Kolesnikov, O. R. Latsis, Yu. L. Molchanov, Ye. Z. Razumov, V. F. Rubtsov, N. N. Sibiryakov, Yu. A. Sklyarov, B. P. Trubnikov, P. N. Fedoseyev, S. F. Yarmolyuk

Publishing House: Izdatelstvo "Pravda"

Place of Publication: Moscow

Date of Publication: August 1987

Signed to press: 4 August 1987

Copies: 1,070,000

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987

END