

064056

JPRS-UKO-88-003
2 FEBRUARY 1988



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

KOMMUNIST

No 16, November 1987

19980716 067

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

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

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

10
92
A05

Soviet Union
KOMMUNIST
No 16, November 1987

JPRS-UKO-88-003

CONTENTS

2 FEBRUARY 1988

Information Report on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum	1
EDITORIAL—A Party of Revolution and Building	1
Relying on the Lessons of the Past [L.I. Abalkin]	4
The Main Force of Revolutionary Change [L.A. Gordon and E.V. Klopov]	10
October Revolution and Party Agrarian Policy [V.P. Danilov]	16
The Soviet State: Continuity and Renewal [V.N. Kudryavtsev]	23
From Our Relevant Legacy. Basic Principles of the United Labor School (1918)	30
History—Revolution—Man	38
The Idea of Revolution in World History [V.N. Mironov]	55
The World of Socialism on the Road of Restructuring [O.T. Bogomolov]	61
Communists in the World of New Realities [G.G. Vodolazov]	68
The Creative Potential of Socialism	74
Summing Up Priceless Experience [A. Kozlov]	80
The October Revolution and the Motion Pictures; On Problems of Historical-Revolutionary Films [S. Freylikh]	84
Chronicle. Meetings with the Editors	88
Publication Data	89

KOMMUNIST

No 16, November 1987

[Translation of the Russian-language theoretical and political journal of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow 18 times per year.]

Information Report on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum

18020004a Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 16, Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) p 3

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee held its regular plenum on 21 October 1987. The plenum considered problems related to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and some current problems.

M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, submitted a report on the pertinent issues.

The following comrades spoke at the plenum: B.N. Yeltsin, first secretary, Moscow CPSU Gorkom; Ye.K. Ligachev, CPSU Central Committee secretary; S.I. Man'yakin, chairman, USSR People's Control Committee; L.A. Borodin, first secretary, Astrakhan CPSU Obkom; S.A. Shalayev, chairman, AUCCTU; G.P. Bogomyakov, first secretary, Tyumen CPSU Obkom; F.T. Morgun, first secretary, Poltava Obkom, Ukrainian Communist Party; V.K. Mesyats, first secretary, Moscow CPSU Obkom; B.V. Konoplev, first secretary, Perm CPSU Obkom; G.A. Arbatov, director of the U.S. and Canada Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences; Ya.P. Ryabov, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the USSR to the French Republic; N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman, USSR Council of Ministers; V.T. Saykin, ?Vorotnikov chairman, RSFSR Council of Ministers; A.Ya. Kolesnikov, head of a miners' comprehensive brigade, Molodogvardeyskaya Mine, Krasnodonugol Production Association, UkSSR; V.M. Chebrikov, chairman, USSR Committee for State Security; A.N. Yakovlev, CPSU Central Committee secretary; G.I. Marchuk, president, USSR Academy of Sciences; E.A. Chevvardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs; V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman, USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Agroindustrial Committee; A.A. Gromyko, chairman, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; V.V. Shcherbitskiy, first secretary, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; B.K. Pugo, first secretary, Latvian Communist Party Central Committee; V.I. Mironenko, first secretary, Komsomol Central Committee; M.S. Solomentsev, chairman, CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee; G.V. Kolbin, first secretary, Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee; and V.A. Zatzvornitskiy, head of a comprehensive brigade, Mosstroy Trust No 1, Glavmosstroy.

M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, delivered the concluding speech.

The plenum approved the basic stipulations and conclusions presented in M.S. Gorbachev's report and passed a corresponding resolution on the matter.

The plenum considered a problem of organization.

The plenum granted Comrade G.A. Aliyev's request to be released of his obligations as CPSU Central Committee Politburo member in connection with his retirement for health reasons.

This concluded the Central Committee Plenum.

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

05003

EDITORIAL—A Party of Revolution and Building

18020004b Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 16, Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) pp 4-8

[Text] No event in world history is comparable to our Great Revolution in terms of significance and consequences.

Years and centuries may pass but whenever we celebrate the anniversary of this epoch-making turn in the development of human civilization, the progressive forces on earth will over and over again interpret the scale and depth of the social changes triggered by the October Revolution and draw from the distance which was covered lessons for their own time and formulate new tasks.

Such an interpretation has been an important feature throughout all seven post-October Revolution decades, which were initiated by Vladimir Ilich Lenin. Only on few occasions did he have the opportunity of turning to the masses on the occasion of the anniversary of the October Revolution and each one of his addresses was a blend of a strikingly fine and profound study of the specific, the vital tasks of the moment with the formulation of the long-range and grandiose objectives in building a new society. Lenin used the anniversaries of the October Revolution above all for openly telling the working class and working people the truth about the situation in the country, analyzing the "common lessons" in building socialism and determining the extent of preparedness for forthcoming battles (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 37, pp 138, 145; vol 39, p 293). "...We must remember," Vladimir Ilich said, "that we must teach the workers and peasants with the examples of work already done and point out what is bad in our country so that we may avoid it in the future" (op cit., vol 41, p 408).

Lenin's appeal to the communists, to bring to light and gain a better knowledge of the inseparable dialectical link between the past and the present and skillfully to combine continuity with innovation assumes particular

importance during complex stages such as the present. Lenin taught a strictly scientific and truly Marxist approach to acquired experience, paying close attention to social shifts and changes, emphasizing the need "to take such new changes into consideration, to 'use' them and to master them..." (op cit., vol 20, p 188).

To us bolshevism is a model of indestructible blending of the principles of continuity and innovation. This precisely is the foundation on which the historical accomplishments of socialism, as well as our present deep belief in the reality of accelerated progress, is based.

It is precisely bolshevism, which appeared as the Marxist, the consistent revolutionary trend of political thinking in the global labor movement, that embodies unity between progressive theory and practice under constantly changing circumstances of the historical process, and the ideological, organizational and tactical principles of a proletarian party of a new type, as formulated by Lenin.

One of the distinguishing features of such a party is daring in unity of action, and openness of intentions and programmatic objectives. It was this that enabled it, at the different stages in social development, to formulate efficient and clear battle slogans, and to organize and unite the masses for the purpose of implementing the tasks realized by the working people and theoretically formulated by the bolsheviks.

Another distinguishing feature of the Leninist Party is its acknowledgment of the high role played by scientific revolutionary theory, which gave the bolsheviks the opportunity to bring to light the laws governing the development of social life, scientifically to substantiate and to solve new problems, to control events and to prevent events from controlling them.

The vitality of Marxist-Leninist theory lies in its creative nature. It is precisely creativity that makes this theory a weapon which is being constantly honed and improved in the course of its practical use and in solving new problems.

The organic rejection of arrogance, complacency and satisfaction with accomplishments, the absence of a complex of "infallibility," and the ability critically to analyze the results of one's activities, to determine the prime reasons for shortcomings and errors, to take bold steps in correcting them, and constantly to seek ways which open opportunities for progress constitute the intrinsic features of Lenin's scientific and political activities and the fundamental principle of bolshevism.

Yet another fundamental bolshevik principle, which determines the strength of the party and enables it to carry out its leading role in social life is its close and unbreakable ties with the working class and all working people. The "secret" of the vital strength of bolshevism

and a mandatory prerequisite for the success and influence of the Marxist-Leninist Party are its ability properly to express that which the people realize, to gain the support of the working people at all stages and at each turn in social development.

It was precisely thanks to the persistent and comprehensive work of the bolsheviks among the masses and the active involvement of the broadest possible popular strata in the class struggle that the revolutionary events of October 1917 assumed a truly national, a truly democratic nature, expressing the will of the majority of the population in Russia. This is an unquestionable historical fact. However, we must not forget that a majority born of the revolutionary upsurge, the enthusiasm of the masses and the decisive storming of the decayed social foundations is one thing, and the majority which had to be reestablished in the course of building the new society, another. As Lenin pointed out, in the first periods of the revolution the broad masses gave the proletariat their support "on credit" (see op cit., vol 45, p 77).

The party of the working class was as yet to justify the trust given by the masses and not to waste this "credit," but to convince the working people of the accuracy of the chosen course and to earn the firm support of the popular majority. This demanded of the bolsheviks-Leninists revolutionary daring and decisiveness in defending the basic interests of the working people, as well as caution and a thorough scientifically weighed approach to the solution of pressing social problems. Based on their own experience and through their own participation in building a new life, the toiling peasantry and the intelligentsia had to make a definitive choice and irrevocably take the side of the victorious revolution. In Lenin's view, the Bolshevik Party was not to issue decrees but to preach socialism (see op cit., vol 31, p 357), patiently leading the masses to understanding the need for a socialist organization of the society and the reorganization of the economy and culture.

Efforts to anticipate, to skip necessary stages of development with the help of administrative measures and commands and the unwillingness or inability, manifested one way or another, to take into consideration the demands and moods of the broad masses were particularly dangerous. While condemning such efforts, which were fraught with serious consequences to the cause of socialism, and exposing their adventurist nature, Lenin demanded that "in no case must we anticipate the development of the masses but wait until, on the basis of their own experience and their own struggle, these masses create a movement forward," cautioning against considering "what we experienced as having been experienced by the class, as experienced by the masses" (op cit., vol 37, p 141; vol 41, p 42).

Ignoring such demands and warnings was bound to harm the cause of socialism. A stiff price had to be paid for violating the Leninist principles and methods of building the new society, for violations of socialist legality and the

democratic standards of party and social life, voluntaristic errors, dogmatism in thinking, and inertia in practical action. This can neither be forgiven nor deleted from history.

Errors and miscalculations did not weaken the essence of the historical choice which was made in October 1917 by the working class and the country's working people. The very course of building socialism and the new social realities it had created despite difficulties and turns in its development, the true emancipation of the working people and their active involvement in conscious historical creativity were the features which predetermined the conversion of trust "on credit" into a truly nationwide support by the masses of the policy of the October Revolution and the Leninist Party. The cause of socialism became the meaning of the life and activities of the people.

This was convincingly confirmed during the period of civil war and foreign intervention, during the incredibly difficult situation of economic chaos and military dislocation which prevailed in the post-October years, the most difficult period of the first 5-year plans and the days of harsh trials of the Great Patriotic War and the postwar restoration of the national economy. Our people had to spend many long years of work with extreme stress, denying themselves even prime necessities. The Soviet state alone opposed world capitalism, constantly subjected to imperialist pressure and blackmail. We withstood. We did not bend and were not crushed.

The historically unparalleled foundations for a social life were established in practice through the struggle and efforts of the people: in politics, with the power of the working people; in economics, with the public ownership of means of production; and in human relations, with collectivism and comradely mutual aid.

The trust and support of the masses guaranteed the major successes achieved by socialism, of which all of us are justifiably proud: the elimination of class and national oppression, poverty and illiteracy, the transformation of the country into a powerful state with a mighty economic and scientific and technical potential, achieving one of the highest levels of education in the world, enhancing the working person, his social safeguards and confidence in the future, and the creation of an international socialist culture. The October Revolution has long been a matter of the greatest national pride of the Soviet people.

Lenin's party exists for the people and serves the people, for which reason it values the support of the masses. It always remembers this trust "credit," feels the pulse-beat of life and functions in the thick of the masses. Whenever new problems have appeared, the party has found ways to solve them by restructuring and changing its work methods and proving its ability to be on the level of the historical responsibility for the destinies of the country and the cause of socialism and peace.

This responsibility was manifested particularly strongly in the course charted at the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which was aimed at eliminating the stagnation trends and phenomena alien to socialism, which had appeared in our society by the turn of the 1980s. The working people accepted as their own the appeal of the April Plenum and the 27th Party Congress of restoring the creative, the revolutionary-critical and transforming spirit of Leninism, of adopting a truly bolshevik approach to the solution of the pressing problems which had appeared in the course of our development, of achieving a comprehensive renovation of Soviet society and ensuring the full utilization of the opportunities inherent in the socialist system.

Having profoundly and comprehensively brought to light the contradictory nature of the contemporary stage of development, formulated the immediate and long-term tasks and mobilized the masses for broad changes, the party thus reasserted the fact that it is the leading force of society and its true organizer and political vanguard. It convincingly proved that it has the necessary theoretical, political and moral potential to be on the level of the processes developing in the country, to lead the masses forward and to provide opportunities for attaining a new quality status in socialist society.

Of late a great deal has been changing in the life of the country, the party and every Soviet person. A great deal of this can be described with a single short word: restructuring. As a clear manifestation of a dialectically conceived continuity in terms of the past, restructuring includes the rejection of that which the Soviet people have no right to carry into the future. We must surmount the existing obstruction mechanism and its major power of inertia in various areas of life, clear the obstructions and learn how to think and act in a new style not by reasons of subjective preferences but by virtue of objective necessity.

As was noted at the June Plenum, restructuring won an ideological and moral victory and has become broader and deeper. Soviet society has been set to motion, a motion which is gathering strength, affecting ever new population strata and stimulating the social activeness of the working people. Stereotypes and clichés of previous years are being eliminated step-by-step, the gap between words and actions is being closed and an intensive search is under way for the most efficient means of solving the key problems of the country's development in all areas of life and ensuring the better satisfaction of the vital daily needs of the Soviet people. The CPSU links success in restructuring to the process of democratization, glasnost, and increased interest by the people in all accomplishments. A radical economic reform and democratization of society are the two main areas in which our party is currently focusing its efforts.

Naturally, the progress made by Soviet society in restructuring is no simple matter. It requires a real revolution in the minds of millions of people, in their thinking and

their approach to the work. Efforts to depict this path in rosy hues are alien to the party. New problems and many difficulties await us along this road. Nor are we ensured against possible errors. The hopes which the Soviet people link to restructuring and to the party's line of acceleration will be implemented and become reality only as a result of our joint intensive struggle and work, innovation and daring action. The tasks which face us are difficult and to a great extent unparalleled and unprecedented. However, they are attainable on the basis of the live creativity of the entire people and of everyone's initiative and honest toil.

During these pre-October days the party members and the working people in the Soviet Union realize more clearly than ever that further progress on the path of the revolution and socialism is possible only through the constant renovation of the ways and means of work, strategic concepts and tactical means. To follow the path of the October Revolution today means to surmount mental slackness and inertia, an obsolete attachment to conservatism, bureaucratic style and equalization, and the elimination of the remaining gap between thoughts and practical actions; it means to uproot irresponsibility, lack of discipline and of initiative or, in short, to reject anything which hinders the renovation of socialism and paralyzes the independence and initiative of collectives and individuals.

Today to follow the Leninist, the bolshevik path means for every party member and Soviet person to make a personal contribution to materializing the objectives of restructuring and the assertion of a new way of thinking and style of work, and the moral renovation of life. It means once again, at a faster pace, taking a course in democracy, acquiring a political culture and learning how to engage in a free and respectful discussion of even the most sensitive problems. It means involving the activeness and interest of the people in all processes of our life and setting in motion the political, economic, cultural and scientific potential acquired under the Soviet system.

The profound changes which are taking place in the country and are gathering strength irrefutably prove that the greatest revolution in history, which was made under the leadership of the Leninist Party, is continuing to this day. The revolutionary spirit of restructuring is the live breath of the October Revolution.

"...The revolution," Lenin said, "is a wise, difficult and complex science..." (op cit., vol 36, p 119). In the course of 70 post-October years we have studied this very difficult science. We have mastered it and, one could say, experienced many of its wise lessons. There was the joy of victories and sadness of defeats and irreparable losses along the way. Today the richest possible experience acquired by the party and the people and the specific and promising tasks of our further development are clearly expressed in the formula *more socialism and Leninism, more democracy and glasnost*.

The inseparable spiritual ties which link the Soviet people to the revolutionary 1917 and loyalty to Leninism helped us to endure and win. We have all the necessary reasons profoundly to trust that, in following the course of the October Revolution, and in drawing strength from the tremendous possibilities of socialism and the live creativity of the masses, the Leninist Party and the Soviet people will achieve new successes also at our present exceptionally crucial stage of historical development.

In pursuing the cause of the October Revolution and exposing and eliminating shortcomings, we are concerned not only about the future of socialism in our country but also about the future of the world's social progress. The Leninist Party realizes the extent of the international significance of the revolutionary changes taking place in the Soviet Union. We consider restructuring an answer to the historical challenge of the times. It is on the basis of its results that the peoples on earth will judge of the possibilities of the socialist system and of what it can practically give the individual, as well as the extent to which our society is economically and socially efficient.

"The ideals of the October Revolution call for work for the sake of the well-being of the Soviet people and the blossoming of the homeland, for the sake of socialism and peace," the CPSU Central Committee appeal to the Soviet people states. "Let us blend within a single entity our minds, will and energy. Let us address this invincible force to the solution of the new problems which face us. Let us implement all our plans. Let us worthily continue the revolutionary cause of October!"

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

05003

Relying on the Lessons of the Past

18020004c Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) pp 9-17

[Article by Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member]

[Text] As a result of the victory of the October Revolution, in the course of building socialism our country became a powerful industrial state with a powerful economic and scientific and technical potential. These revolutionary changes are the very foundations, the inexhaustible source of the advantages of the socialist system. The successes which were achieved trigger legitimate pride and convincingly demonstrate the vital power of socialism and the principles of organizing public production inherent in it. However, the thrust from age-old backwardness to the peaks of contemporary

science, technology and culture cannot conceal the serious problems of the distant and recent past. Their study should be based on the lesson in truth given to us by the 27th CPSU Congress.

Today, the set of steps for dismantling the obstruction mechanism and clearing the way to radical restructuring of economic management, while retaining everything valuable from the legacy of the past are impossible to take without studying the experience acquired in the 70-year-old history of socialist economic management and the mastery of its lessons.

Naturally, direct analogy is inadmissible in this case. In solving contemporary problems we must take into consideration radical changes in the conditions governing the development of the country. Equally unsuitable are nostalgia, calls for the restoration of the ways and means of management which developed in the past, and the depiction of individual periods of history as a kind of "golden age" in which progress was achieved easily and was problem-free. There have been no such period in the development of the Soviet economy.

I

A great deal of difficulties in the theory and practice of restructuring the economy and the management system arise as a result of the absence of comprehensively substantiated evaluations of many stages in our economic building. We are clearly short of theoretical depth and historical perspective in the study of the new economic policy, the reasons which led to changes within it and, subsequently, to the rejection of many of its methods and principles.

The experience of the first 5-year periods has not been studied to its full extent and contradictions. The efficiency of the economic management methods which were applied at that time and which were formulated not on the basis of contemporary scientific knowledge but on hasty conclusions reached in the immediate aftermath of events, has been exaggerated. In particular, this blocks the full realization of the inadmissibility of administrative-command management methods under the new changed circumstances.

The activities of sovnarkhozes at the end of the 1950s and beginning of 1960s, the factors which led to their creation and rejection, and the positive and negative results of the work of the national economy without sectorial ministries have essentially remained unstudied. The establishment of sovnarkhozes did not ensure radical changes in the economy. However, without a profound study we cannot determine whether this was due to the aspects of the territorial management system or to reasons of a more profound nature, above all to the retention of obsolete management methods.

Many contradictory aspects remain in assessing the economic reform of the 1960s, the lessons it taught us and the conclusions stemming from them. In this case an entire range of theoretical concepts lies between diametrically opposite views (immoderate enthusiasms and total rejection of anything positive which was accomplished during those years). This range is the clearest indicator of the lack of serious scientific research and summations.

The facts indicate that in terms of all most important socioeconomic parameters, such as the growth of the national income, social labor productivity and real per capita income, the 1966-1970 period was the most successful in the past 30 years. Why was it that such a powerful impetus for acceleration was lost and that the reform itself was frustrated? What forces and factors hindered the initiated changes? The lack of the necessary clarity, shielded behind bashful denials of the fact, triggers yet another and perhaps most important question: Could this not repeat itself, and could the initiated process of radical restructuring in the economic management system grind to a halt?

It would be difficult to provide a convincing answer to such questions without a thoughtful analysis of these and other historical events. We must acquire a clear and full idea of the reasons for which despite a gigantic scale of output our country is constantly and comprehensively experiencing shortages, why is it that despite the unquestionable advantages of a planned economy, for decades on end we have been unable to deal with the problem of the dispersal of capital investments and to accelerate the pace of scientific and technical progress and, finally, why is it that in a socialist society, with its humane principles, the residual principle in the development of the social sphere and the producer's diktat became possible?

The profound study of past experience and its proper assessment are prerequisites for far-sightedness in science and politics and a guarantee against the repetition of errors. Mastering the lessons of socialist economic management is of exceptional importance to the science of economics. This is the only approach which allows us to consider economic processes and production relations as they actually exist in the society.

In promoting special studies of the history of the national economy and of economic thinking, we must organically include historical experience in theoretical research, as a base for the study of the fundamental laws governing economic and social progress. The contemporary state of scientific developments remains inconsistent with these requirements. The result has been a rather widespread lack of professionalism in assessing past stages in the country's economic development. Naturally, everyone has a right to his own opinion on any problem. This is natural under the conditions of democratization of social life. However, the intensification of glasnost presumes an intensified understanding

of the problems under discussion. This applies above all to the science which has assumed substantially greater responsibility for shaping public opinion.

II

The creation of a totality of conditions which ensure the full, systematic and efficient implementation of the course of restructuring economic management, earmarked by the party, is the most important task in the present stage of the country's development. Its solution requires a clear idea of the dangers (based on past experience) which caution us along the way of revolutionary change and the knowledge of when and under what circumstances we obtained expected results or results which were substantially different from the targets.

Should we attempt to provide most general assessments of the lessons of the past, one would stand out particularly clearly: economic change, particularly change aimed at radically improving economic affairs, cannot be achieved without parallel and corresponding changes in the political system and in the social and spiritual areas. The radical renovation of economic life at the initial period of the NEP, the major successes which were achieved in the mid-1950s and, as a matter of fact, other major accomplishments of our economy became possible only under the conditions of a renovated political structure, broadened democratic principles in the organization of social life and improvements in the ideological atmosphere.

Nonetheless, disturbing the sequential nature of change could reduce to naught even quite well-planned economic reforms. Such was the case, in particular, of the quite profound and daring reform which we undertook to make in the mid-1960s. It gave a major impetus to the country's economic development. However, lacking the support of change in the political area and in the country's social and spiritual life, it misfired shortly afterwards.

The current restructuring of economic management which, unquestionably, is the most revolutionary since we started building a socialist society, requires a major renovation of political institutions and the elimination of bureaucratic encrustations in the activities of the state and economic apparatus. It presumes systematic democratization, glasnost and radical changes in social relations, including the firm observance of the principle of distribution according to labor and enhancing the prestige of honest and highly productive toil.

Historical experience proves that the system of social ownership and state management of the economy potentially includes the danger of extreme management centralization, which becomes reality in the absence of corresponding counterweights. Such centralization becomes necessary in extreme situations and it is only then that it can yield fast and tangible results. On the

long-term strategic level, however, it inevitably leads to major deformations of the socialist principles, resulting in the alienation of the masses from the feeling of ownership and the administrative system. Its specific manifestations are the growth of bureaucratism, on the one hand, and social passiveness, on the other. The negative consequences of this contradiction rapidly grow and make the need for its solution urgent.

In order to eliminate such consequences economic measures must be supplemented with political ones, and vice-versa. Let us note one of the key problems in the contemporary concept of restructuring: the interconnection between the democratization of social life and self-government and conversion to full cost accounting. Real democracy and self-government are impossible without the economic shielding of the labor collective and the worker from arbitrary decisions or administrative orders. Without this no real full cost accounting can be developed, a cost accounting with which quality and end labor results become the only sources of income.

Democracy and self-government, however, are not simply "additions" to full cost accounting. They themselves act not only as a consequence but also as a prerequisite, a condition for real change in the economic situation of the labor collective and the individual worker.

Profound changes in the economy, and the need for its rising to a qualitatively new level demand, as practical experience has indicated, not formal and purely superficial but profound, radical changes in the system of production relations. The more radical the planned changes are, the more profound strata and areas of production relations should be affected by restructuring. The natural question arises of how to distinguish between superficial, purely organizational and, in some cases, strictly formal changes and changes in production relations?

Production relations are always manifested as interests. If changes do not affect the interests of the people, leaving them passive and indifferent, they are an accurate indication that such changes are strictly of a formal nature. If they trigger a reaction, we see changes in the very economic foundations of the society, in the system of production relations.

The question of who represents specific interests is a most difficult and totally unstudied one. Quite frequently, without thinking, we identify the interests of society with those of the state and of the collective with those of the enterprise. Social interests, however, or the interest of the nationwide association of working people, could assume various manifestations and shapes, as could the interests of the labor collective. The creation of special authorities and other structural units, the purpose of which is to represent and defend interests, leads, as experience has indicated, to the fact that interests of such

structures tend to become separate and assume a self-seeking importance. This is one of the profound reasons for the appearance of bureaucratism and bureaucratic administration.

The process of democratization and radical renovation of socialism is inseparably related to the development of direct forms of expression and protection of the interests of the nationwide and collective, regional, ethnic and other associations of working people. It is only on this basis that we can eliminate the alienation of the workers from means of production owned by the whole nation, and make the working people the true owners of their enterprise, rayon and entire country.

The solution of this problem presumes changes in the very foundations of the socialist economic system—the relations of ownership of means of production. What are needed in this case are not partial improvements but the radical revolutionary renovation of the entire mechanism of the functioning and economic realization of public ownership. The revolutionary nature of changes means not the abandonment of socialism but the development of its internal nature and the fuller identification of its specific features. The very nature of revolutionary renovation indicates the depth of change and the radical changes in the quality of existing economic management ways and methods.

These questions lead us to yet another lesson based on the acquired experience in economic management: in breaking down existing means, methods and structures, we must have a clear idea of the type of legacy we are abandoning.

The solution of this problem is closely related to understanding the interaction among the principles and methods of socialist economic management. The principles express the permanent foundations of the socialist economy. They are not subject to the influence of fashion or circumstantial changes. Naturally, like any other, this conclusion must not be absolutized. As historical experience is gained, the very principles, as the guiding foundation for economic activity, are enriched and developed. However, they retain their same general socialist content at all stages.

As we implement a radical reform in economic management, today we proceed from the same principles which guided us in the first years of building socialism and which we have followed or, in any case, tried to follow throughout the entire 70-year old history of our country. It is a question of the principles of democratic centralism, combining one-man command with collective leadership, using planning methods together with economic instruments, combining sectorial with territorial approaches to management, etc. Any violation of these principles means deviating from the high road of socialist progress.

Unlike principles, methods of socialist economic management are flexible and variable. They cannot be frozen or standardized under all historical stages and circumstances. They are modified in accordance with the features governing precisely the development of a given country and the totality of specific historical circumstances. Efforts at preserving fixed economic management methods inevitably turn into major economic and social losses.

A great deal has been written about the fact that it was precisely such a situation that developed between the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s. However, this is not the only and by no means unique case in the extremely rich history of development of our country. In the already built socialist society a similar situation appeared on at least three occasions. As early as the end of the 1930s it had become obvious that the ways and means of planning and management, which had developed in the course of the first and second 5-year periods, had largely exhausted their possibilities and had become the reason for negative phenomena appearing in the economy. The phenomena themselves became topics of close study at the 18th Party Conference, which was held shortly before the war. At that time a number of problems quite similar to those we are facing today were discussed, such as a slow-down in the growth rates of output, labor productivity and scientific and technical progress, the adverse state of affairs in capital construction and transportation, weakened principles of material incentive and distribution based on labor, and so on.

The war, which broke out soon afterwards, interrupted the application of the lessons we had learned. As time passed the events of those years began to be forgotten or considered merely an episode in the comprehensive experience of the complex history of development of the Soviet economy. The postwar restoration and subsequent economic upsurge created the impression of efficiency and reliability of the methods used. The situation became aggravated by the turn of the 1960s, when serious negative phenomena reappeared and the pace of economic and social progress slowed down, which created the need for the reform of the 1960s.

However, even these lessons were not learned completely. The difficulties of that period were largely explained with references to subjectivism in management and economic policy. It was considered that matters could be corrected by surmounting such negative phenomena without undertaking radical changes in production relations and planned management methods.

When a similar situation appeared for the third time by the turn of the 1980s and the economy found itself in a pre-crisis condition it became impossible to set this problem aside, to ignore it and to fail to take the lessons of the past into consideration. Today it is possible to see most clearly that socialist production relations can fulfill their role as a motive force in the development of production, the accelerated growth of production forces

and increased efficiency only under the conditions of their uninterrupted progress. Otherwise they would inevitably lose their stimulating role and, in time, develop into a major hindrance to our further progress.

Production relations are improved either in the course of even development or as deep qualitative and revolutionary changes. The need for the latter is manifested and aggravated when, along with the increased scale of output and qualitative changes in the development of production forces, other unsolved problems pile up on top of each other.

The conversion to qualitatively new management methods is an important law and a mandatory prerequisite for mastering the richest possible opportunities and advantages of the socialist system of planned economic management. This is no simple matter. The old methods are durable and, resorting to a peculiar mimicry, could survive for a long period of time, hiding behind different names. This particularly occurs if the organizational structures and political institutions remain unchanged. Such an adaptability is a rather grave threat to the implementation of any major reform.

Similar phenomena can be found today as well, during the most crucial stage in the radical restructuring of the economic management system. They are manifested in efforts to retain a detailed formulation of assignments for commodity output, to adapt economic standards to the old forms of planning and to emasculate the real content of self-financing under the guise of state orders, although this is a system which was rejected by life a long time ago. Strictly speaking, there is nothing surprising in this. The contemporary situation only confirms the historical lesson that one must struggle, persistently and stubbornly, for the new.

III

Economic practice teaches us yet another lesson: the development of monopoly trends in production, the scientific and technical area, the banking system, etc., is a major hindrance in a socialist economy. This is confirmed by the most profound Leninist idea that any monopoly, not only the one based on private ownership, inevitably becomes an obstacle to scientific and technical and economic progress. Without abandoning the advantages of nationwide ownership and unified planned economic management, we must supplement them with the broadest possible development of economic competition among producers for customers and among enterprises for the right to use state resources (credit above all) based on their most efficient application, competitiveness in the scientific and technical area and use of competitive principles in the drafting and adoption of the most important national economic decisions. The possibility of the consumer to select the ways and means of satisfying his needs and of the supplier of

finding the most efficient technical projects and solutions is a mandatory prerequisite in economic competition. We must not forget the repeated instructions by the Marxist-Leninist classics about the need not only to ensure the full satisfaction of the requirements and the comprehensive development of the individual but also the unrestrained solution of such problems.

Shortages, which are one of the chronic illnesses of the Soviet economy, cannot be eliminated without eliminating monopoly trends and without developing economic competition.

Today no longer exclusively on the basis of theoretical evaluations but also in accordance with historical experience we can claim that an economy with shortages cannot be efficient. It invariably lowers demand concerning the quality of output, weakens incentives for labor and social activeness and leads to chronic breakdowns in material procurements for the production process and to its unrhythmical functioning. The existing management methods, with their extreme centralization and bureaucratic distortions are less the result of shortages, as is frequently claimed, than the reason for their existence.

Ensuring the right of enterprises to choose their own suppliers and the areas of utilization of their resources and asserting competitive principles would be impossible without the extensive development of a socialist market with its specific means of influencing production. The market is not a capitalist invention. It has a number of general economic features inherent in any system based on a developed division of labor and a commodity form of economic relations.

The contemporary view on the role of the socialist market and the ways of enhancing it through the development of wholesale trade in means of production, increased price flexibility and efficient combination of supply with demand plays an important role in the program for a radical restructuring of the economic mechanism. The planned steps are based on the new political and economic concept of the most complex processes of national economic development and the lessons learned from the lengthy and, as it has now become clear, mistaken neglect of the role and possibilities of the socialist market.

In the past social progress was frequently conceived as a progress from more complex to simpler structures and a number of practical steps were based on this idea. Today such concepts have become hopelessly obsolete. Based on historical experience, the conclusion may be drawn that the increased complexity of forms of organization of economic life and economic management methods is one of the most important social laws, although not any complexity may be considered a feature of progress and may be merely the result of objective production requirements. Taking this into consideration, it would be hardly accurate to consider the progress of socialist society as a

mechanical increase in the share of state ownership at the expense of restraining other ownership forms. The richer and more mature nature of progress is legitimately manifested in the growing wealth and variety of forms. In particular, this is expressed in the increased variety of the dimensions, scale and types of enterprises and associations.

Also vanishing are efforts to find a single solution to problems, applicable in all circumstances. Today we cannot conceive of such standardization appearing in the guise of uniform systems for the organization of cost accounting in small service industry enterprises and huge heavy industry complexes. Furthermore, the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) requires a minimum of two types of organization of cost accounting. Trying to determine which of these forms is the better one would be erroneous. Each one is good in its own way and is efficient and effective under specific and varied circumstances.

IV

The interpretation of the lessons of the past and the formulation of efficient ways of socioeconomic development would be impossible without substantial changes in economic theory and the development of a new style of economic thinking radically different from previous ones, including the views held in the 1960s.

Today we cannot restrict ourselves to the study merely of external economic forms, leaving unchanged concepts relative to the deep foundations of production relations, ownership, its structure and its subjects, and the mechanism of their exercise. We are no longer satisfied with the traditional two-dimensional depiction of reality and its interpretation as an interweaving or combining the plan with the market, and centralism with autonomy, in which strengthening one aspect becomes incompatible with the development of the other. With such an approach the development of the market is considered a weakening of planning principles and the increased autonomy of enterprises and associations as undermining centralism.

This type of thinking, frequently encountered to this day, greatly aggravates the ideological situation in which the restructuring process is taking place. Its rejection and the formulation of a new, a modern type of thinking presumes profound mastery of historical experience, not simply for the sake of noting facts or obtaining ready-made answers but of adopting a broad view on contemporary problems, assessing them against a background of profound historical changes and developing a clear idea of the sources of these problems and the possibilities of their solution.

A great deal must be interpreted (and, sometimes, reinterpreted) today anew, relying above all not on bookish wisdom but on objective historical experience. In a global sense, it is a question of the very essence of

socialism, its economic system, motive forces and internal contradictions. We must answer questions on the ability of the socialist economic system to renovate itself and the ways which enable us to identify and bring into motion the extremely rich but by no means applied advantages of socialist economic management. It is inadmissible to reduce answers to such questions to a meaningless repetition of the idea according to which the advantages of socialism are related to public ownership. We must substantially enrich the concept of social ownership itself, and to bring its internal structure to light. We cannot reduce the question to expanding, along with the state form of ownership, the volume and significance of cooperative ownership or various modifications of ownership related to the development of private auxiliary farming and individual labor activity.

The acknowledgment of the need and expediency of variety of forms of socialist ownership is a major step forward. Nonetheless, this is neither the main nor by any means the most difficult problem in the theory of ownership. The most difficult problems are those affecting state socialist ownership, surmounting its deep personalized and anonymous nature and the unreceptive attitude of state enterprises toward scientific and technical progress and changes in the requirements of society. Their solution will require knowledge of the inner logic and of the legitimately increased complexity of the mechanism for the application for the method of nationwide ownership and proving the need for its inclusion within the structure of relations based on the elements of collective contracting and group forms of economic management and appropriation.

The new understanding of this most important category is a necessary link in shaping a contemporary style of economic thinking and presumes a conversion from simple and straight depiction of ownership to an awareness of its complex internal structure and from simple declarations to the study of the mechanism of its dynamics. It is becoming increasingly clear that it is only through the real involvement of the worker and the labor collective in the process of public acquisition and the shaping of a truly proprietary attitude toward the work, inseparably related to a conversion to full cost accounting and self-government, that ownership could acquire a real economic content and become truly socialist. Otherwise it would remain a meaningless juridical cover and socialization will be strictly formal.

To include the individual in the real mechanism of dynamics of ownership and to eliminate his alienation from it means to achieve "more socialism." This is the main way of mastering the advantages it offers. The greatest progress in the concept of restructuring the management system, as formulated by the party, has been made in understanding the place and role of the main link. The conclusion was reached that the production enterprise (association) is a socialist commodity

producer while its labor collective is the owner of the means of production. This moves us far ahead in the political and economic interpretation of the realities of economic life.

The contemporary concept of centralism has been developed much less and in far fewer details. Yet it is clear that a radical solution of problems in the area of scientific and technical progress and reaching higher levels in labor productivity and production efficiency are impossible if based on the local, the isolated activities of individual enterprises. Furthermore, it is quite unlikely for the advantages of socialism to be proved on the level of the individual enterprise.

This can be accomplished only through the utilization of the advantages of centralized economic management, the implementation of a unified, well-planned, flexible and efficient economic strategy and a fast redirecting of resources toward the priority trends of science, technology and social development. It is precisely this, combined with the development of a truly proprietary attitude toward labor and its results, that can ensure reaching the highest possible production efficiency.

A modern approach to this matter is incompatible with purely mechanistic considerations on expanding or curtailing centralism in management. Today it is a question of giving it a qualitatively new aspect, of developing an essentially new philosophy of centralism. This refers to centralized planned management, with enriched functions (including those of information and orientation) aimed at solving basic strategic problems of national economic development, implemented through economic methods and offering maximal scope for the autonomy of enterprises and the enhancement of labor collectives.

The new concept of centralism, which is significantly richer and more substantive, is an organic part of a modern style of economic thinking. It is based on a consideration of the qualitatively changed conditions of development of the national economy and the critical interpretation of the complex experience of previous decades.

Naturally, a mastery of the lessons of the past demands calm and thoughtful research. The main feature here is not even the sharpness of a critical perception of the past, although it too is necessary. Without ignoring the outstanding accomplishments of our planning system, we must learn how to draw lessons from its history. No one is guaranteed against errors. Such was the case yesterday, and such is possibly the case today and will be even tomorrow. However, it is only he who does not repeat the old errors but learns from them and marches forth daringly and purposefully, that shows wisdom and achieves success.

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

05003

The Main Force of Revolutionary Change

18020004d Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 16,
Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) pp 18-27

[Article by Leonid Abramovich Gordon, doctor of historical sciences, professor, head of laboratory, USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers Movement, and Eduard Viktorovich Klopov, doctor of historical sciences, professor, department head, USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers Movement]

[Text] At sharp turns in history, when society clearly realizes the need for change, the question of who is ready and able to make the necessary changes becomes particularly crucial. The accuracy of Marx's doctrine on the working class as the main force of revolutionary change was proved in practice in the Russia of 1917. The October Revolution won thanks to the energy and heroism of the Russian proletariat.

Seventy years have passed since, marked by the implementation of the ideals of the October Revolution. The path was complex and contradictory. In terms of socialism, one of the most relevant warnings was provided by Lenin: "One cannot jump over the people" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.") [Complete Collected Works], vol 32, p 50).

The guarantee for success is the most thorough correlation between plans, thoughts and actions and the real possibilities of the human factor. In this case any over-assessment of the real potential of society and its insufficiently full utilization are equally dangerous.

That is why today, in the period of restructuring, the need for a sober consideration of the level of development of the working class becomes particularly understandable. "The worker finds ridiculous images of paper-drawn industrial righteous men, images which resemble icons," M. Koltsov wrote in his time. Since then, unfortunately, we have been very successful in the enthusiastic-propagandist (and essentially, prayerful) depiction of the role and status of workers in the socialist society. We were all too successful despite the traditions of Marxism-Leninism and the practical requirements of building socialism, which require a systematic study of the manner in which the working class applies its social potential. We were all too successful in poorly conceiving how, by changing society, the working class itself changed and about the changes within it, and the conditions and forms of its life, which lead to the intensification of its role as the main force of social progress.

In the course of revolutionary battles against autocracy, the landowners and the bourgeoisie and against the very foundations of social and national oppression, the Russian proletariat took a course in political and ideological training, displaying its best qualities: resolve, firmness and inflexibility.

After the victory in the civil war, when the Soviet Republic acquired the possibility of solving the constructive problems of the revolution, the other prerequisites of the leading role of the working class became increasingly important. This applied above all to increasing its relatively small size and significantly enhancing the level of its general and production standards. The working class and, particularly, its vanguard, the Communist Party, had to realize that the building of socialism had to be achieved through means other than those which had been used in the course of the struggle for the overthrow of the exploiting classes and the subsequent military and political suppression of their resistance. In other words, the workers in our country had to take the difficult path of converting from exploited and oppressed proletariat, fighting for its liberation, to a politically and economically ruling class, responsible for the socialist development of the society and for meeting the needs and requirements of all working people.

Many problems were solved, more or less successfully, at the early stages of socialist change. At that time the radical technical restructuring of the national economy was of the greatest importance. Alongside the development of industrialization, and on its basis, the size of the working class increased rapidly. Initially, when untrained reinforcements joined its ranks, a number of problems had to be solved not by skill, so to say, but by the force of numbers. That is why the number of workers increased faster than did industry. As a result, whereas by the end of the 1920s workers, together with the nonworking members of their families, accounted for one-eighth of the country's population, by the turn of the 1940s they already accounted for a full third.

This process developed further in the postwar decades. Today the share of worker families exceeds three-fifths of the Soviet population. At the same time, substantial changes occurred in the social composition of the working class. The most important was the broadening of its nucleus, which consists of groups of workers in industrial sectors.

This is a fact of essential significance. For a long time, "new recruits" from nonproletarian strata predominated within the working class, supplied essentially by the peasantry. They did not find it easy to learn how to work as part of a large-scale industrial production system. Although, in the final account, many of them firmly joined the ranks of the working class, a lengthy period of professional and social adaptation was typical of their majority. It was accompanied by frequent moves from one enterprise to another, insufficient mastery of industrial labor standards, including the rules of production democracy. To a certain extent this objectively helped to establish and ensure the long duration of administrative economic management methods. In the arsenal of available means of the struggle for discipline, without which industrial production is inconceivable, administrative-legal measures played an important role in the matter of

a thrifty attitude toward socialist ownership. In turn, this hindered the molding of the new social qualities of the workers and feelings of ownership.

The current structure of the working class is a far better one in terms of developing constructive activities. As sociological studies conducted in the 1970s and 1980s indicate, in the old industrial centers in which production collectives which developed a long time ago prevail, up to 70 percent of the workers were with practical experience in excess of 10 years and approximately 40-50 percent of them had worked in the same enterprise almost without change. Naturally, in areas of new industrial development and at new enterprises the percentage of cadre workers is lower but even there it is increasing rapidly. Therefore, today the working class not only accounts for the majority of the population in the country but itself consists essentially of people who have reached the age of social maturity, mastered the "secrets" of their chosen profession, are part of the life of their collective and share its interests.

Increasing the standards of general and professional knowledge assume tremendous and ever growing significance in multiplying the real contribution made by the working class to the building and progress of socialism. That is why in the first post-October years a great deal was done to eliminate illiteracy in labor collectives. Furthermore, young people who had taken a training course in primary (at that time fourth-grade) schools were prevalent among the new generations of the working class in the 1920s and, particularly, the 1930s. On the eve of the war the average education of the workers was on the level of the third to the fourth-grade.

This process was interrupted by the war but resumed and gathered even greater strength in the 1950s, when the bulk of the young had incomplete secondary training. As a result, by the turn of the 1960s the indicator of the average level of worker education had risen to the fifth-sixth grade. In the mid-1980s it had approached 10 years of schooling, for an increasing number of young people were entering the production process with full secondary training. The share of workers with such training today is no less than 60 percent.

However, we should stipulate that since major shortcomings exist in the work of the schools, which affects the quality of youth training and education, these figures are somewhat "padded." This makes it all the more important today to develop the various forms of extracurricular training, the self-education of the working people in particular. This is demanded by the tasks of restructuring.

Another reason for avoiding the temptation of providing a one-sided positive assessment to the present level of education of the working class is because for the time being a significant number of suitably trained workers are employed in unskilled, noncreative and physically hard labor. Meanwhile, as confirmed by scientific

research and something which is, incidentally, known to party and economic personnel, it is precisely such workers who display a typical dissatisfaction with their work and in whom a healthy ambition (which is greatly needed today by our society) weakens. They become passive in social life as well.

Initially the professional-skill standards of the working class showed a slow increase. During those stages in the country's history (the end of the 1920s, the 1930s, the 1940s and, to a somewhat lesser extent, the 1950s and 1960s), when many problems had to be solved according to the principle of "not skill but numbers," the vocational training of the overwhelming mass of workers took place directly on the job. Subsequently, another trend became increasingly stronger: the training of future young workers in basic skills in specialized educational institutions, based on a higher general education standard. By the turn of the 1950s only 13 to 15 percent of all young men and women entering public production had such professional training. By the mid-1960s the indicator did not exceed 23 percent. In the 1980s, however, more than one-half of the young people had undergone a training course in vocational education schools, departmental vocational technical schools and factory-plant training courses. Therefore, today the overwhelming majority of young people who join the ranks of the working class, become immediately part of its skilled groups. Furthermore, whereas as late as the mid-1970s only 25 percent of all graduates of training courses and vocational training schools had acquired some professional knowledge in the course of completing their general secondary education or after their graduation from such schools, today this indicator has already exceeded 85 percent.

All in all, since 1960 some 55 million people have been trained in vocational-technical and FZO schools. Another nearly 5 million workers are graduates of higher or secondary specialized schools. Therefore, today approximately two-thirds of the working class consists of workers with more or less thorough vocational training. Naturally, we must not ignore the fact that a significant percentage of workers trained in a given skill frequently work in a different area (although in this case as well we cannot consider the vocational training obtained in their youth as "frozen education capital"). Nor should we forget the just criticism of errors made in the vocational-technical education system, as a result of which many graduates are unable to operate the latest equipment. Nonetheless, a positive rating can be given to the overall vocational-skill standards reached by most workers. Our working class as a whole is trained for actively engaging in the new technical reconstruction of the country's national economy. It is important to remember, however, that in order to make a real technological revolution in public production we must steadily broaden the scale and upgrade the quality of vocational training and retraining of workers on all levels.

Socially significant changes in the structure of the Soviet working class occurred also as a result of the fast increase

in the share of workers among the working people in union and autonomous republics which were less developed from the socioeconomic viewpoint in the past. Whereas the number of workers in the entire Soviet Union increased by a factor of 1.8 over the past 25 years, it tripled in the republics of Central Asia and increased by a factor of 2.7 in the Transcaucasus and of 3.7 in the Moldavian SSR. These processes developed essentially by including in the ranks of the working class working people of the native ethnic groups. Naturally, we should bear in mind that in these republics the working class increased primarily "in width," gaining new strength mainly at the expense of the rural population. A significant percentage of these republic detachments of the working class consists of sovkhoz workers, whereas the growth rate of workers of native nationalities employed in the industrial economic sectors is still inconsistent with their ethnic numbers in the entire population. Furthermore, so far the problem of upgrading the cultural and technical standards of the workers has been solved here less thoroughly than required by the social and economic situation. Thus, the system of vocational-technical training did not develop with adequate speed in some republics in Central Asia and the Transcaucasus.

The consciousness and level of organization of the workers increased along with changes in their structure and cultural and educational standards. The overwhelming majority of the working class has long been rallied within the trade unions. The number of communist workers is growing steadily. On 1 January 1961 there were more than 3.1 million (or 33.9 percent of CPSU membership); they reached almost 5.8 million (40.1 percent) at the start of 1971; 7.6 million (43.4 percent) in 1981; and about 8.6 million (45 percent) on 1 January 1986. Therefore, at the start of the 1960s one out of 14-15 workers, and 25 years later one out of 10-11 workers, was a member of the CPSU. Millions of workers have been elected members of Soviets and work as people's controllers. Tens of millions of them carry out social assignments.

As we can see, in the 7 decades since the Great October Socialist Revolution, the social and production potential of the Soviet working class has increased substantially, and so has its preparedness for creative activities. However, it is precisely when it seemed that this process had gained its greatest strength that the country began to experience increased stagnation and the growing contradictions, as was emphasized at the June Plenum, assumed "essentially pre-crisis aspects." Conditions for the social creativity of the working class actually worsened. As a result, a passive and dependent attitude became widespread among some workers and the desire to do quality and efficient work abated; the number of violators of labor discipline and of thieves of public property increased. Socialist competition and many other types and trends of production and political activity became formal and only concealed the inactivity of public organizations and economic managers.

All of this led to the growth of a major contradiction: the "social muscle" of the working class (i.e. the sum of factors which determine its ability to intensify social change) strengthened but, meanwhile, was used ever less efficiently.

The situation began to change after the April Plenum and the 27th Congress, when the gradual freeing of the working class from obstacles which limited its activeness in public production and management began to take place.

This process was initiated with steps aimed at strengthening labor and planning discipline, upgrading the efficiency of public production, which was helped by state inspection, the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism and the criticism of distortions of socialist theory and practice, the results of which were substituting economic management methods of the national economy with administrative-mandatory orders, equalizing the wages of poor and conscientious workers and entire collectives, and weakening of the democratic principles governing production and social life. These steps stimulated the social activeness of the working people who actively supported the party's new political course.

Nonetheless, we must acknowledge that today we have taken merely the initial steps to release the constructive energy of the working class and that its obstruction mechanism has by no means been entirely eliminated. Today the systematic implementation of the stipulations of the 27th Congress and the January and June Central Committee Plenums on a radical restructuring in economic management and all-round development of socialist self-government by the people, with no half-measures or concessions, is assuming decisive significance.

The most relevant feature now is the significant enhancement of the activeness of the workers in the struggle for the full restoration and systematic implementation of the socialist principles of social justice, which include, as the most important among them, wages based on quantity and quality, and the ever more extensive application and promotion of democratic self-government principles in the social life of the citizens of the socialist society. Historical developments have made the working class particularly active precisely in the struggle for the material and social interests of the working people and for the right independently to make administrative decisions on all levels of social life. Furthermore, the combination and interweaving of such forms and trends in the proletarian class struggle have made it exceptionally powerful. Today this is manifested as the main reserve and main factor in strengthening the leading role of the working class in the perfecting and renovating of socialism.

Nonetheless, it is precisely in these areas that major obstacles are still encountered. Thus, the concept that the desire to make good money is in no way one of the

socially approved values became rooted in social awareness, and equalization was established in economic management practices. Under such circumstances wages are virtually independent of the real efficiency of labor and their higher levels are thoroughly blocked to "excessively" zealous workers and collectives. In this case, outside control over labor activities is almost entirely relied upon.

Such an approach introduces a destructive element in economic practice, paralyzing the effect of material and moral incentives for labor and restraining the initiative and energy of the most skillful and able workers. Actually, it is precisely equalization, along with the other elements of the obstruction mechanism, that largely contributed to the fact that the Soviet economy found itself in a pre-crisis condition, the growth rates of the people's well-being declined and stress in the social area increased.

It would be a grave error, however, to classify this phenomenon merely as a pure product of bureaucratic creativity, lacking historical and social origins. Actually, it is the extension, the contemporary aspect of equalization traditions which were characteristic of the least developed trends in the labor movement, which tried to solve the problem of social justice and social equality through the simple redistribution of the acquired wealth and sharing essentially their lumpen-proletarian rejection of all differentiation in income and well-being.

These traditions were reflected in some concepts related to the policy of "war communism." They were restored and acquired a social base in the 1930s, when the majority of the working class consisted of unskilled labor, who had still not learned how to work efficiently and, for which reason, were not interested in any tangible disparities in earnings, although such disparities were a reflection of the different actual labor contribution made to the development of the production process. Since these moods coincided with those of a significant segment of the machinery of the governmental and economic administration, which had given priority to outside control over the production process and which actually denied the role of internal incentives for efficient work, isolated efforts to eliminate equalization in wages were doomed to failure.

Since then the situation in the country has changed substantially. Most workers today are well-educated. They have the skill and desire to work ably and with high-quality standards and hope thus radically to improve the well-being of their families. The Soviet economy as well has changed: today it is a huge national economic complex which cannot respond to direct administrative management. Nonetheless, the old stereotypes of the economic mechanism, equalization in particular, remained through the mid-1980s. This was, above all, the result of the interest of the inflated economic apparatus which had been established in order

to implement the principles of bureaucratic administration of the economy and which considered such principles as just about the only possible ones at all stages of development of socialism. However, many workers and rank-and-file employees as well were interested in preserving the equalization approach to wages, including some skilled workers, who had adapted themselves to the existing economic mechanism.

Naturally, under these circumstances as well the working class did not stop defending its immediate interests. Its progressive groups sought the type of ways and means of improving wages and upgrading living standards which were based on a significant increase in the economic potential of society and contributed to such increase. The clearest manifestation of this trend was the brigade form of labor organization and wages with the use of cost accounting methods (collective contracting) and assessing the actual contribution of brigade members in accordance with the labor participation coefficient, a system which was developed by the workers themselves. It contributed to the creation of economic, organizational and moral conditions which encourage everyone to work efficiently and to upgrade labor productivity and thus to increase his earnings. The other trend was and remains, above all, reliance on quantitative indicators, to the detriment of the quality of output, rushing at the end of the latest calendar period in the course of which extended shifts and overtime are practiced, naturally with wage differentials. This trend contains an element of an essentially Luddite attitude toward modern equipment which essentially leads to its premature wearing out.

Unquestionably, the former trend is progressive, for which reason it is also promising. This does not mean, however, that it will automatically gain the upper hand. It is significant that brigades working on the basis of a single contract and on a cost accounting basis appeared as early as the 1970s. At that time, however, they were not considered part of the general economic management system (as was the case with cost accounting brigades, which became quite popular at the start of the 1930s). Furthermore, without the authoritative support of party, economic and trade union organizations, they remained isolated phenomena and had no real influence on the socioeconomic situation. It was only the 1980s, when this form of labor organization was given political, moral and organizational support that the number of brigades began to increase.

Nonetheless, the full victory of the progressive forms of wage organization and labor lies ahead, when the economic conditions governing the functioning of enterprises and the overall national economic complex will change radically and when the principles of self-support, self-financing and full cost accounting will become the base of the activities of all units engaged in public production, from top to bottom.

Socialist enterprise and competition are called upon to play a tremendous role in the radical solution of such problems, including in the new technical reconstruction of the national economy. Naturally, in this case labor returns of some groups of workers and production collectives will grow faster than in others. If payments for outstanding labor accomplishments remain, as they have been so far, restricted one way or another, the efforts and zeal of the best workers will inevitably weaken, and economic development will slow down. In other words, socialist control over the measure of labor and consumption must include the struggle against the incomplete and depreciated rating of the labor of the progressive and most productive workers and against any and all forms of equalization.

Nonetheless, it is not exclusively the earnings of the individual and the just wage (based on end results) that determine the level of worker activeness in production, not to mention in other areas of social life. Equally significant is the need of the worker to be the master of his own destiny, enterprise and country. This need is satisfied by participating in the formulation and making of administrative decisions in labor collectives and the possibility of determining the principles and forms of functioning of the state authorities and economic managers, which can rally the citizens within social organizations representing their specific interests, and so on. The progressive detachments of the working class have always aspired precisely toward the type of sociopolitical system in which all citizens can decisively influence the course of social development or, in other words, the full development of democratic principles on a socialist basis.

Naturally, the objective conditions governing the development of our society have not always favored successful progress toward this objective. The inadequate level of cultural development of the working people, including that of the working class, and the fact that the factory-plant proletariat, the advanced detachment of the revolutionary masses, accounted for no more than a small part of the latter, at the early stages of socialist change the "soviets, which, by virtue of their program, were the instruments of management through the working people" were actually "management authorities for the working people through the progressive stratum of the proletariat but not through the toiling masses" (V.I. Lenin, *op cit.*, vol 38, p 170). This Leninist statement contains the most important idea of the general trend of development of socialist democracy—from organizing management in the interest of the people's masses to socialist self-government by the people.

However, the actual course of events developed in such a way that the management of society through the apparatus of the state became increasingly widespread and strong, whereas problems of self-government were given second priority. On the one hand, objective conditions for the management of society "through the toiling masses" became increasingly favorable (above all

as a result of the increased share and enhanced standards of the working class) while, on the other, political practices reacted very poorly to this process. Meanwhile, the aspiration to "statify" one and all gathered more and more strength.

The apparatus of the management authorities and public organizations solved the real problems, and frequently all that was left to the rank-and-file citizens was their formal approval: they voted at elections for soviets and at meetings of collectives (unanimously, as a rule), carried out social assignments and made accurate and relevant decisions. Such activities, however, had an insignificant influence on the actual situation at enterprises, establishments, cities, and villages and in society at large.

The permanent production conferences were one such form of "illustrating" activity. Conceived precisely as regularly working units which would solve all basic problems of material production and as a means of converting the large masses of workers, all rank-and-file personnel into co-managers, as it were, they did not become agencies for social activities. Conferences are held extremely irregularly to discuss individual and, sometimes, partial problems of enterprise activities. They neither control nor can control the course of implementation of resolutions and have no means whatsoever of influencing enterprise administrations.

Now, however, at the initial stage of restructuring, the democratization of public production becomes particularly important. Brigades, above all those working under cost accounting conditions or with wages based on end results, have already indicated the way to be followed in order to involve the workers in production management and to develop a proprietary attitude toward the affairs of the labor collective and the people's good. In the case of the working class, however, the problem of participation in production management cannot be localized on the brigade level. The creation of conditions which would enable all labor collectives to consider themselves the owners of the enterprise and to act as such with the entire range of rights and obligations is assuming increasing importance. Without this we cannot direct the economy to the track of intensification and truly enhance the activeness of the working class. We must acknowledge that in practice the rights proclaimed in the Law on Labor Collectives remained unexercised, for the administrative-command mechanism of economic management substantially restricted the legal, economic and organizational prerogatives of enterprises.

That is precisely why the strategy formulated at the April Plenum and the 27th Party Congress stipulates the comprehensive solution of problems of production and intensification and democratization of social life. The fact that the economic categories of "self-support" and

"self-financing" are considered as inseparably linked with the sociopolitical category of "self-government," as the key elements of the new economic system, is of exceptional importance.

The January and July Central Committee Plenums gave an essential impetus to this process. The adoption of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) was particularly important in the development of worker initiative and enterprise. In the words of M.S. Gorbachev, its purpose is "radically to change the conditions and methods of economic management in the basic economic units and legislatively to combine within enterprise activities the principles of planning and full cost accounting, autonomy and responsibility and to legitimize the new forms of self-government."

Naturally, in itself the promulgation of this law, as any other state law, marking the beginning of a radical restructuring in the economic mechanism, will not bring about the increased managerial activeness of the entire mass of workers engaged in public production. This will require the systematic implementation of the new concept of economic management and the systematic involvement of workers and all performing personnel in the administration of the affairs of enterprises and their subdivisions. Such efforts are particularly important considering the fact that the long nonparticipation of rank-and-file working people in the formulation of management decisions could not fail to bring about unhappy consequences. Many people are simply not ready to engage in such activities. They feel no need to exercise the rights or responsibilities of owners of the production process.

The sociological study conducted at three industrial enterprises in Ivanovo last May by personnel of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers Movement and the Department of Scientific Communism at the Ivanovo Power Institute provide an idea of the nature of these problems.

For example, the feeling of ownership among the surveyed workers is manifested above all in the area of the direct application of their labor and substantially declines in the case of the upper "stories" of the enterprise. The question of whether they feel themselves owners of the production process, actively influencing the state of affairs at their work place, was given a firm "yes" answer by 68 percent; the figure on the brigade and section level was 38 percent; it was 21 percent on the level of the shop or department, and 11 percent on the level of the enterprise as a whole. Equally noteworthy is the answer of the question whether the respondents considered possible *personally* to criticize various category workers at meetings. It turned out that 84 percent were ready publicly to criticize rank-and-file workers; 73-77 percent were prepared to criticize rank-and-file engineering and technical personnel and foremen; 59 percent would criticize shop chiefs and 39 percent, enterprise directors. However, what kind of feeling of

ownership could there be without a feeling of "permissibility" of criticizing managers? It is obvious that the assertion of self-governing principles is impossible without the elimination of such a "complex."

Naturally, there are reasons for such feelings, one of them being the lack of confidence that enterprise managers truly take into consideration the views of the workers. Typically, 63 percent of those surveyed said that usually the opinion of the collective is taken into consideration by brigade leaders; the figure for foremen was 44 percent, for chiefs of shops 26 percent, and only 13 percent for the enterprise director. Is this not the reason for the fact that by no means all workers are ready to elect enterprise and enterprise subdivision managers? Thus, in answering the question of whether such elections would be of any use, 80 percent agreed that brigade leaders should be elected; 67 percent were in favor of electing chiefs of shops and foremen; 55 percent of chiefs of shops and department and only 40 percent deemed expedient the election of a director and his deputies. Furthermore, nearly one-half of those surveyed (47 percent) believe that rank-and-file workers are qualified to judge and accurately assess activities of managers (another 30 percent wrote that they were incompetent in such matters and 23 percent were unable to answer the question).

Readiness to manage the production process and, in general, to work under the new conditions is weakened by the poor level of information on the nature of enterprise activities subsequent to the planned reorganization. For example, at the time of the survey (i.e., 2 months after it was published) only one-quarter of the respondents had attentively read the draft Law on the State Enterprise (Association). Slightly more than one-half had become familiar with it through a variety of channels (radio, television, and newspaper and journal publications). The rest knew virtually nothing concerning this document.

To a great extent this explains the fact that only 39 percent of the respondents agreed with the view that this law "would help the collective of our enterprise to work more efficiently and with greater usefulness to society and to ourselves;" another 36 percent expressed the vague statement that "it would hardly be of any importance to the work of our collective and that in all likelihood everything will remain the same." Finally, 7 percent expressed the fear that "after the enactment of this law our working conditions could even worsen." Naturally, reality and the practice of working in a new fashion will be the best propagandist for the law. However, the mass information media and the party organizations face the major and important task of profoundly explaining this document and correlating it with the interests of the collectives.

Naturally, these data and the conclusions on which they are based by no means cover the entire set of problems related to the readiness of the working people to assume

a significant share of managerial functions along with responsibility for enterprise activities. This is rather a preliminary approach to the understanding of such problems, the solution of which is of tremendous importance in the further intensification of the sociopolitical activeness of worker masses.

The entire experience gained in the development and activities of the Soviet working class, and its participation in the socialist restructuring of our country indicate that it is fully prepared for making progressive and essentially revolutionary changes. Furthermore, it is deeply interested in their full and systematic implementation, for the policy of renovation provides a new powerful impetus for the assertion of the proletarian principles of social justice and social equality on the basis of increased well-being and spiritual blossoming of all members of socialist society. However, in order for the tremendous social potential of the working class to be resmelted into the energy of creation and into real action, we must comprehensively provide maximally favorable conditions for the activeness of the working people to increase and serve the cause of socialism.

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

05003

October Revolution and Party Agrarian Policy
18020004e Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) pp 28-38

[Article by Viktor Petrovich Danilov, doctor of historical sciences, leading scientific associate, USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of USSR History]

[Text] The first victorious socialist revolution in world history was made in a country with a predominantly peasant population. The question of the destinies of the peasantry and the satisfaction of their needs and aspirations and of involving them in the creative building of the new society was, therefore, of prime significance for the victory of socialism.

The 1871 Paris Commune and the 1919 Hungarian Revolution were defeated, in the final account, precisely because the working class was unable to win the peasant masses over to its side. This problem was successfully solved by the workers in Russia. They won the support of the broad peasant strata and the oppressed peoples (who were also primarily peasant) and made their own proletarian revolution nationwide. This was the decisive prerequisite for the victory of the Great October Revolution.

"Power to the Soviets!," "Land to the peasants!," "Peace among the peoples!" were the main slogans which rallied within a single revolutionary current the sociopolitical movements—socialist and general democratic—which were different in terms of nature and tasks. This greatly

increased the power of the strike dealt at the old society. At the same time, however, it tremendously complicated the course of the revolution, making it internally contradictory. The establishment of a primarily petty-peasantry farming system in the country was the direct result of the revolution in the countryside. It was only with the victory of the revolution and on the basis of its gains that the task of converting the peasantry to the path of socialism, despite the hugeness and difficulty of this task, could be formulated.

Today, under the conditions of restructuring, interest in the meaning and results of the changes which took place in the countryside in Soviet times has increased inordinately. The nature of the economic and social contradictions of these changes is the topic of sharp debates and conflicting views. This is understandable. The roots of many of our successes, difficulties and problems lie in the experience and lessons learned in solving the problems of building socialism in a peasant country.

In answering the question of why, compared with the advanced countries, it was easier for the Russians to start a proletarian revolution, V.I. Lenin wrote that "Russia's backwardness was able to blend the proletarian revolution against the bourgeoisie with the peasant revolution against the landowners. We started with this in October 1917 and we would not have won at that time so easily had we not done this" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 38, p 306. Subsequent references to V.I. Lenin's Complete Collected Works will indicate volume and page only). The peasant agrarian revolution, which was supported by the Russian proletariat, swept off the entire system of land-owning and autocratic oppression.

The importance of the agrarian revolution and its nature and end results cannot be understood without an objective analysis of Russia's prerevolutionary socioeconomic development.

By the turn of the 20th century Russia had become something of a "model" of the contemporary world. Interwoven in its socioeconomic structure were a great variety of systems—barter-patriarchal and semi-serfdom forms of farming, petty-commodity production and capitalism in its early stages and forms, including imperialism. "...It was the most backward land-owning system and the wildest possible countryside with the most advanced industrial and financial capitalism!" Lenin noted (vol 16, p 417). Naturally, as a whole the Russian economy had become capitalist. All the systems within it were part of the overall capitalist system and were used by it. It was precisely this that provided an objective opportunity for the development of the democratic revolution into a socialist, a proletarian revolution, which undertook to solve the entire set of social problems, not only strictly socialist but also bourgeois-democratic.

At the time of the revolution the peasant farms had also become an irreversible part of commodity-capitalist development. The social strata of a bourgeois society were developing in the countryside: impoverishment and proletarianization were turning increasingly broad masses of peasants into poor people and farmhands and their exploitation was the foundation for the growth of the kulaks; the eroding strictly peasant environment was turning into a middle petit-bourgeois stratum. However, the bourgeois "disappearance of the peasantry" was by no means completed, for agriculture had not been totally restructured on a capitalist basis. Lenin emphasized repeatedly this feature of the prerevolutionary countryside. In 1914, in considering the status of the "contemporary agrarian economy," he wrote: "Today it is precisely a process of capitalist restructuring of the semi-medieval agriculture (patriarchal and serfdom) that is taking place in Russia. This process began more than half-a-century ago." He also wrote: "The entire crux of the matter...is found precisely in this type of reorganization of a barter into a market economy..." (vol 24, pp 276, 278; see also vol 32, p 146; vol 45, pp 279-280, etc.).

Centuries of serfdom had not vanished without a trace. The extreme economic weakness of the peasant economy, the powerful patriarchal system, the natural isolation and a prevalent orientation toward home consumption rather than production for the market excluded the fast and efficient modernization of a capitalist type. Interesting computations were made in his time by the noted economist N.D. Kondratyev: On the eve of World War I the average value of buildings, cattle and means of production per U.S. farm was the equivalent of 3,900 rubles, compared with less than 900 rubles per peasant farm in European Russia. Poverty limited the possibility of an upsurge in the peasant economy. Another characteristic feature was the preservation of the rural community, which supported the reproduction and functioning of the peasant farm on a barter (rather than market) basis, its limited opportunities and need for economic and social ties and contacts. Naturally, capitalism did its destructive work in the community as well. However, the system prevailed in the great majority of the country's settlements.

The semi-serfdom domination of the landowners in the countryside was the main reason for the backwardness of agriculture in post-reform Russia. The consequence was that the capitalist restructuring of agrarian relations as well took place essentially through estate farming, which ascribed a sluggish and conservative nature to all economic development and doomed the peasantry to "decades of most painful exploitation and slavery..." (vol 16, p 216). At the same time, capitalist developed also took place through the peasant farms, particularly in areas free from landed estates (Kuban, Don, Siberia and some others). The outcome of the struggle between the landowners and the peasants and between semi-feudal capitalism and democratic capitalist was not decided until 1917, for all the forces of the old society, the autocracy above all, were on the side of the landowners.

Stolypin's agrarian reform, which was the answer of the autocracy and the landed estates to the first Russian revolution (1905-1907) was aimed at accelerating bourgeois development in the countryside while preserving large-scale private land ownership and singling out among the peasantry a narrow stratum of "strong" people, the kulaks, who were not accidentally nicknamed by the people "Stolypin's landowners." The "weak," the multi-million strong masses of the peasantry, doomed to lack of land, were sacrificed to them. The result of such a reform, had it taken place, could have been the full and definitive establishment of a landowner-kulak ("Prussian") type of capitalism and the pauperization of the majority of the rural population. Capitalism would have required decades to "transform" this entire pauperized social environment, which was extremely weak in terms of production and culture, hurt by agrarian overpopulation, etc. If we can imagine the implementation of Stolypin's reform, agriculture in the country would have been a strip-farming system including hundreds or, perhaps, several thousand very large specialized enterprises and dozens or, perhaps, a few hundred-thousand American-type "family" farms, and many millions of families living in "overpopulation cesspools." This would have been North American wealth with Latin American poverty! Furthermore, the "American way" of agrarian-capitalist development, for which the peasantry objectively struggled, would have meant the ruination and proletarianization of the bulk of peasant families and the total triumph of the kulaks who would have become capitalist farmers.

In practical terms, Stolypin's agrarian reform would not have solved the problem, for it was already too late. Autocracy was losing control over the course of events. The approaching revolution left no time for reform. P.A. Stolypin intended to "reorganize Russia" in 20 years, but for the first 10 years during which the initiated reform was being implemented, no more than 10 percent of peasant farms (1 percent annually!) were "reorganized." The failure of Stolypin's reform, regardless of Stolypin's personality, is explained not with the "intrigues" of real or imaginary figures on the historical scene at the time but the decisive and comprehensive opposition of the peasantry.

Stolypinism (the people's description of that period) merely increased and aggravated the rage and hatred felt by the peasant masses for landowners and the autocracy. The firmness and the irreversible nature of their rejection of olden times are confirmed by the expressive examples of handwritten leaflets which were disseminated in the summer of 1917 in various parts of the countryside in the central part of the country, which called for the elimination of landed estates in such a way that "they could never come back" (taking, in a way, into consideration the experience of the first Russian revolution). Subsequently, the Soviet system had to make a great effort to prevent pogroms against landed estates and persuade the peasants that now these estates were the property of the people.

The struggle between the two ways of agrarian-capitalist development, between the landed estates and the peasantry, waged in the upper and lower echelons, determined the entire sociopolitical situation in the prerevolutionary countryside. Two social wars were developing there. The first was the war waged by the entire peasantry against landed estate ownership and related semi-serfdom exploitation. The second was a war within the peasantry, which increased as it stratified into rural proletariat and rural bourgeoisie. The events of the three Russian revolutions convincingly proved the predominance of the former, which is understandable, for the elimination of the estate-serfdom rule in the countryside became a national task without the solution of which the country's further development was impossible. It was precisely in the struggle against the landowners that the Russian peasantry itself called for the nationalization of the land. Although this demand was also aimed against the rural bourgeoisie, which was increasingly acquiring land with every passing year, its anti-estate trend was of decisive significance.

That is why the agrarian revolution in Russia, which began as a peasant war against the landowners in the spring of 1917, and which merged with the Great October Socialist Revolution, went through a separate stage in solving bourgeois-democratic problems (until the summer of 1918). At that point the vestiges of serfdom, landed estates above all, were eliminated, and the entire peasantry acted in a single front, as a single class-stratum. Large private land ownership was confiscated on the basis of Lenin's Decree on Land; virtually all land used for agricultural purposes was given free of charge to the peasantry to be worked on an equal basis. The decree included the "Peasant Instruction on the Land," which was based on 242 locally issued instructions. It was thus that the will of the peasantry became the law of the land. This immediately predetermined the decisive conversion of the bulk of the Russian population to the side of the Soviet system and to its first agrarian changes. It was only after the land was given to the peasantry for use that specifically socialist tasks began to assume priority in the development of the agrarian revolution. In the summer and autumn of 1918 committees of the poor and worker food procurement detachments inflicted a crushing blow at the kulaks. A noticeable increase in the number of collective farms took place, the organization of which became one of the main trends in Soviet agrarian policy.

Lenin pointed out that in Russia it was only the proletarian revolution that led to the total destruction of the "estate land ownership (it had not been destroyed prior to the October Revolution). We completed the bourgeois revolution and the peasantry as a whole followed us.... The soviets rallied the peasantry in general. The class division within the peasantry had not matured as yet, had not become apparent.

"Such was the process which developed in the summer and autumn of 1918. The Czechoslovak counterrevolutionary uprising awakened the kulaks. A wave of kulak

uprisings spread throughout Russia. It was not from books or newspapers but from real life that the poorest peasantry realized that its interests were irreconcilable with those of the kulaks, the rich, the rural bourgeoisie" (vol 37, p 313).

In emphasizing that it was only as of the summer and autumn of 1918 that the countryside "itself experienced the 'October' (i.e. the proletarian) Revolution," and that it was precisely then that a turning point occurred, Lenin wrote: "Having made the bourgeois-democratic revolution together with the peasantry in general, the Russian proletariat addressed itself once and for all to making a socialist revolution, at which point it was able to shake up the countryside and to win the proletariat and semi-proletariat over to its side, rallying them against the kulaks and the bourgeoisie, including the peasant bourgeoisie" (Ibid, pp 314-315).

At the same time, Lenin pointed out the great mistake of trying to absolutize the bourgeois-democratic and socialist stages in the development of the agrarian revolution, "to separate one from the other by anything other than the extent of preparedness of the proletariat and the extent of its unification with the rural poor...." (Ibid, p 312).

Until the summer of 1918, the revolution in the countryside solved problems of a socialist nature. This is confirmed by the appearance of collective and soviet farms, the organization of the poor in the struggle against the kulaks, which was initiated in several parts of the country, and the subordination of general peasant rural and volost soviets to the political leadership of the superior agencies of the soviet organization of state authorities by the working class. At the initial stage of the revolution, however, what predominated in the countryside was the confiscation of landed estates and the redistribution of the land for equal use by petty-private farmers. It was precisely this that determined the socio-economic content of the first stage of the agrarian revolution and the main deployment of class forces in the countryside. Conversely, during the second stage, when specifically socialist tasks became prevalent, the results which had been achieved in the summer of 1918 were brought to their completion through the fiercest possible struggle against the kulaks.

The interconnection between bourgeois-democratic and socialist changes was also manifested in the nationalization of the land, which became not only the most radical means of abolishing landed estates and, in general, private land ownership, but also the first step toward socialism.

As a whole, the socialist reorganization of agriculture neither was nor could be achieved in the course of the revolution. However, such a target was formulated and prerequisites for attaining it began to develop. The first among them was the establishment of the Soviet state and the purposeful and planned building of a new

society. The nationalization of the land allowed the state to influence the socioeconomic development of the countryside and to direct it into a socialist channel.

The building of socialism in the countryside proved to be a most difficult project. It was a matter of the destinies of 120 million people who (based on the 1926 census) accounted for more than four-fifths of the country's population. The bulk consisted of petty producers working their private family farms. The processing of small pieces of land with primitive tools doomed them to daily hard manual labor which barely ensured their survival and which led to an endless duplication of the same old working and living conditions. Their way of life was limited to the narrow boundaries of their backyard, village and community, and their traditional awareness, customs and national culture.

A society, four-fifths of which was peasant, could not develop at the necessary pace. It inevitably proved to be backward. It lost opportunities for independence and autonomy, not to mention the possibility of achieving social justice and a high standard of prosperity. The 20th century imperatively dictated the accelerated development of industry, science and education. The creation of large-scale mechanized agricultural production was becoming an objective need, an imperative of the time.

At the same time, socialism opened the way to the radical social reorganization of the countryside by replacing the private ownership of means of production with social ownership and the elimination of the exploitation of man by man.

The idea of collective farming, as the foundation for social justice, freedom and equality, dated from the distant past. It was a manifestation of the protest of the working people against the division of society into rich and poor, oppressors and oppressed. The idea of collective farming through joint work on communally owned land was a basic part of the system of utopian socialism, particularly in the plans of Fourier and Owen and, subsequently, those of A.I. Hertenzen, N.G. Chernyshevskiy and their followers, who were the founders of Russian peasant socialism. Practical attempts at creating agricultural cooperatives in Russia were initiated in the 1870s. Although at that time such efforts proved unsuccessful, they nonetheless continued. By the turn of 1916, according to partial data, there were 107 registered agricultural cooperatives in Russia.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution instilled new life in the idea of collective farming. The revolutionary enthusiasm of the initiators of collectivization, who tried to introduce among the peasantry the fundamentals of a new life, was supplemented by the spontaneous joining of kolkhozes by numerous poor people, demobilized soldiers and industrial workers and was triggered by dislocation and hunger. By the end of

1918 there already were 1,579 communes and cooperatives on the territory of Soviet Russia (which, at that time, actually consisted of no more than the central area of the European part of the RSFSR).

Many revolutionary leaders, including the head of the People's Commissariat for Land, considered the impressive growth of collective farming sufficient as a start of collectivization of the bulk of the peasant farms over a period of 3 to 4 years. They had no qualms about using "a certain amount of coercion" (such as subordinating the minority to the majority in making such decisions at rural rallies). That is why, as early as the end of 1918, in thinking of the ways of converting the countryside to socialism, Lenin said that "it would be the greatest possible stupidity to try to promulgate decrees and to legitimize the social farming of the land," and that this problem must be solved "patiently, through gradual transition, awakening the awareness of the toiling segment of the peasantry and advancing only to the extent to which such awareness was awakened," and that "in this area we are relying on the lengthy and gradual persuasion, on a number of transitional steps..." (vol 37, pp 141, 356, 361).

These instructions, however, were not fully accepted by the practical workers. Naturally, we must also take into consideration the fact that during the revolution the concept of "gradualness" and "length" were perceived differently compared to a period of peaceful evolution. In any case, the First All-Russian Congress of Land Departments, Committees of the Poor and Communes (December 1918) proclaimed as the main task "with a view to the soonest possible restructuring of the entire national economy on a communist basis" "the steady and broad organization of agricultural communes, soviet communist farms and public farming." The resolutions passed at that congress and the February 1917 law on "Regulation on the Socialist Land Structure and Steps for Converting to Socialist Farming" was an effort, characteristic of "war communism," of routing capitalism "by storm" and directly converting to socialist production and distribution. Haste, bureaucratic administration and coercion became apparent in the organization of kolkhozes in the winter of 1918-1919.

Breakdowns in the organization of collective and soviet farms in the countryside were firmly condemned at the Eighth RKP(b) Congress (March 1919). "To act here through coercion," Lenin said at the congress, "means to defeat the entire project.... The task here is reduced not to the expropriation of the middle peasant but the consideration of the specific living conditions of the peasant and to learn from the peasant means of converting to a better system without issuing orders!" (vol 38, pp 200-201). The resolutions passed at the congress formulated and codified the basic principles of collectivization: voluntary participation, persuasion through practical example, creation of material conditions, etc. Let us note among them the most important cooperative principle, that of autonomy: "The only valuable associations

are those which are organized by the peasants themselves, on the basis of their free initiative and the advantage of which they have seen in practice" (Ibid, p 208). These ideas and essential decisions were developed in Lenin's works during the first years of the new economic policy and, combined with them, constituted the cooperative plan for leading the peasants to socialism.

Let us single out the following from Lenin's speech to the 8th Party Congress: "...Learn from the peasants means of converting to a better system." These words have a most profound meaning. They contain a "curtailed" general idea of the Leninist cooperative plan.

In order to understand the essence of the cooperative plan, the link between cooperative and the NEP, repeatedly emphasized by Vladimir Ilich, is of essential significance. Traditionally considered by our literature as initiated in the 1930s, the cooperative was considered an important yet subordinate, specifically rural form of implementation of the NEP as the policy of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism. Nonetheless, to Lenin the link and correlation between the concepts of "NEP" and "cooperative" were two entirely separate things: "It is not the cooperative that must be adapted to the NEP but the NEP to the cooperative" (vol 54, p 195). His article "On the Cooperative," which called for "achieving through the NEP a participation within cooperatives of the literally entire population" dealt with the development and substantiation of this idea; it contained an essentially new conclusion on the organizational forms of the new society: "...A system of civilized members of cooperatives, with a public ownership of the means of production and the class victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie is what a socialist system means" (vol 45, pp 372-373).

In Lenin's view, as the policy of the transitional period the NEP was to be consistent. It was to be implemented systematically through cooperatives but also have as its positive target the maximal development of cooperatives and their conversion into a universal form of social organization of the country's population. Lenin's words on the "cooperativization of Russia" were not tossed accidentally (vol 45, p 370). This does not mean in the least that Lenin accepted the idea of "cooperative socialism" during the period of the NEP. The lines we quoted on the socialist system as a system of civilized members of cooperatives was directly related to Lenin's indication of mandatory conditions, such as the public ownership of means of production and the class victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, whereas "cooperative socialism" was oriented toward the type of conditions prevalent in a bourgeois society.

To this day we have not interpreted to the proper extent Lenin's essentially new conclusion on the organizational forms of a socialist society; we have not considered the entire system of its theoretical and practical consequences. The particular study of the problem formulated by

Lenin becomes particularly relevant today, when we are solving the problem of making extensive use of cooperatives in the democratization of the economy.

Naturally, in a country in which the majority of the population was peasant it was a question, above all, of its way to socialism through cooperatives. The NEP was not meant to promote the strict restoration and strengthening of petty peasant farming, which inevitably included capitalism (albeit limited) but it provided the opportunity of building socialism and taking into consideration the real situation and interest of petty commodity producers, operating "on the level of the most ordinary peasant," and building "in such a way that all petty peasants could participate in such building" (vol 45, pp 370, 372).

An entire stage of socioeconomic and cultural development stood between petty peasant farming and socialism. For that reason the cooperative plan for the socialist reorganization of the rural economy had a most strong link of cause and effect with the radical technical reconstruction of agriculture and the enhancement of the general culture of the popular masses, or the equivalent of a true cultural revolution. Laying the material foundations for socialism in the countryside presumed, according to Lenin, "the use on a mass scale of tractors and machines in farming..." (vol 43, p 60). The enhancement of culture was to lead to the total literacy of the population, the ability "to make use of books," and to be "a cultural tradesman," so that the entire population would "literally" and "not passively but actively" participate in the cooperative movement (vol 45, pp 372-373).

Vladimir Ilich never set any definite time for the socialist restructuring of the countryside. Conversely, he always emphasized that it was a question of a problem to be solved "within an indefinite time," that it was "a matter for generations" (vol 43, pp 60, 227, etc.). In his article "On the Cooperative" (1923) he wrote that in order to involve "the literally entire population" in cooperatives through the NEP an "entire historical age" would be required or, at best, "10 or 20 years" (vol 45, p 372). Practical experience proved the accuracy of Lenin's prediction. By the end of the 1920s, i.e., 5 or 6 years later, more than one-half of the country's population had joined the most widespread trade and credit forms of cooperativization (that was precisely what he advocated).

It would be an error to pit the commercial aspects of cooperativization against its production functions, and even more so to claim that Lenin's cooperative plan was exclusively limited to the use of one or the other. The plan called for the development of all types of cooperatives. Voluntary cooperation offered the possibility of creating associations of all kinds. In the actual historical process, throughout the 1920s there was a parallel growth, although on a different scale, of all forms of cooperativization. Quite soon an entirely clear trend of

cooperative development appeared: on the basis of the extensive cooperativization of market relations between peasant farms and the multiple-step system of consumer, credit and marketing-procurement cooperatives, there was a gradual but nonetheless increasingly noticeable expansion of the simplest forms of production cooperatives (machine, land reclamation, seed growing, and other associations). In turn, they became nutritive grounds for the organization and growth of collective farms which, here as well, began with their simplest form—associations for the joint cultivation of the land. The process of production cooperativization developed more successfully in sectors in which the advantages of large-scale production became understandable to and practically attainable by the peasants.

However, the successful development of cooperatives under the conditions of the NEP was interrupted. To the bulk of the peasants the comprehensive collectivization which was undertaken between the end of 1929 and the beginning of 1930 was a direct conversion from petty to large-scale farming, skipping the preparatory "practice" on the first levels of cooperativization. One of the main principles of Lenin's cooperative plan was rejected at that point.

The accelerated collectivization meant, at the same time, that the pace of social reconstruction greatly outstripped the pace of technical retooling. Most kolkhozes appeared on the basis of combining simple peasant tools and went through a lengthy period of organization essentially based on manual labor. The advantages of joint labor without mass mechanization and electrification were limited and unable to ensure any substantial upsurge in agriculture.

Great difficulties existed in the organization of internal kolkhoz life. This applied, above all, to labor and distribution relations. It was precisely in this area that the obvious lack of practical experience was felt. The search for and trying of ways and means of efficient organization, accountability and payment for labor had to take place in the course of the mass establishment of kolkhozes. Problems related to the socialization of the consumer sectors of the agrarian economy, the problems of cattle and poultry in particular, were solved not immediately and with great losses.

In the course of its establishment and further development, kolkhoz production was modeled after the large-scale industrial system. The use of small economical forms, the private auxiliary plots of kolkhoz members above all, was limited to the extreme. The mechanical borrowing of the experience gained in the industrial organization of production and labor led to neglecting the particular features of agriculture related to the specific role which natural processes played in it and the immeasurably greater role of the individual qualities of the working person and his attitude toward his work, the extreme disparity in the technical facilities for labor, and so on. Efforts to solve problems of kolkhoz-sovkhoz

production on the basis of "large-scale-industry" dogmatism were made in the 1960s and 1970s and still very recently. Today the clarification of the faultiness of such efforts and, above all, the groundlessness of unrestrained "consolidation" of the production system has become one of the most important prerequisites in agricultural restructuring. Therefore, the main source of difficulties in the establishment and strengthening of kolkhozes was the violation of the principles of Lenin's cooperative plan. The Leninist instructions which we cited and the party decisions on the need for the establishment of objective and subjective prerequisites for cooperativization and its strictly voluntary nature, and the inadmissibility and faultiness of violence and haste were ignored by the Stalinist leadership. The excessive acceleration of collectivization and the related methods of exerting gross pressure in the creation of kolkhozes and in the course of their organizational-economic strengthening, the artificial aggravation of the class struggle and the extensive application of "anti-kulak" steps led to unnecessary losses and persecutions and peasant protests which reached the level of armed uprisings and brought about the destruction of one-half of the cattle herds and the hunger of 1932-1933 in the rural areas in the Ukraine, the Don, the Kuban, the middle and lower reaches of the Volga, the Southern Urals and Kazakhstan.

The use of methods alien to socialism not only conflicted with its objectives but also led to their distortion. The conversion of agriculture to large-scale socialized production began to be considered as early as 1928 as a means of solving the grain problem within the shortest possible time, regardless of social losses and their consequences. The consideration of the cooperativization of farms not as the independent target in the socialist restructuring of society, the achievement of which has its own inner logic and criteria for success and failures, but as a means of solving other problems constituted an essential violation of the Leninist cooperative plan and led to all other related distortions.

The view alien to socialism that the kolkhozes are a source of material and human resources for society and the state became deeply rooted. With collectivization, the kolkhozes acquired a status in terms of the state, which sharply restricted their autonomy and initiative and, therefore, their economic growth. The system of planning through directives, and the mandatory commodity procurements to the state based on symbolic prices, which were lower than market prices by a factor of 10 or 12 and bureaucratic ordering of kolkhozes, introduced in 1933 and applied until 1958, were the reasons for the slowed-down conservative development, a development which, therefore, had to be updated. In end result of all this was a lagging of agriculture behind the needs of society, the fleeing of the peasants away from the land and the abandonment of the countryside. A situation developed in which one of the main tasks of state policy was to restore interest in agricultural labor in a society which, until very recently, had been a peasant one.

Under the conditions of restructuring we speak openly and fully about the violations and distortions of socialist principles, which were allowed in the course of collectivization and the further development of the kolkhozes. This is necessary in order to identify the roots of the problems which the party and the people are solving today. However, neither the history of collectivization nor, even less so, the history of the establishment of the kolkhoz system may be considered violations. We do not forget, we have no right to forget the fact that despite all distortions and exaggerations which were committed in the course of collectivization there was also the revolutionary creativity of the masses and the real enthusiasm of the builders of a new society. Nor should we ignore the tremendous increase in the productivity of agricultural labor as a result of replacing petty-private with large-scale socialized farming and manual with mechanized labor. Suffice it to say that a worker in agriculture (on an annual average) "fed," in addition to himself, two other people in 1913 and 10 people in 1985. We must also take into consideration the tremendous facilities for work and the reduced time spent in farming.

The role which kolkhozes and sovkhozes played in the socialist reorganization of agriculture remains the main factor in assessing them. Despite the errors and distortions which occurred in the collectivization of agriculture, it nonetheless represented a most profound revolution in socioeconomic relations in the countryside. It blocked in this area the last sources and channels of class stratification and exploitation and facilitated the harnessing of material and human resources for developing industry, strengthening the defense power and ensuring the social and cultural progress of the entire society. The kolkhozes and kolkhoz members withstood the most severe trials of the war and made an immeasurable contribution to the great victory. Together with the sovkhozes, the kolkhozes were and remain one of the foundations of the present Soviet economy and the entire Soviet social system. Furthermore, the kolkhozes and sovkhozes can successfully develop under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution and the democratization of economic and sociopolitical life, which is what we call restructuring.

Guided by the Leninist ideas on the cooperative, contemporary CPSU agrarian policy has taken the path of profound democratization of the economy. The resolutions of the June Central Committee Plenum, the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Urgent Measures for the Accelerated Solution of the Food Problem in Accordance with the Stipulation of the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum" and the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decrees "On Additional Measures for the Development of Private Auxiliary Farms of Citizens and Collective Truck Gardening and Horticulture" and "On the Further Development of Auxiliary Farms of Enterprises, Organizations and Establishments" are aimed at the extensive utilization of all forms of cooperation. It is a question not only of the further development of kolkhozes as cooperative

associations (one could even speak of their revival in this respect) but also of the new ways and means of farming in sovkhozes, auxiliary farms of industrial enterprises and the individual sector, which may be traced to Lenin's cooperative plan.

As the CPSU Central Committee resolution points out, a significant increase in food production within the shortest possible time will require the "comprehensive harnessing of all sources for such increase." The CPSU Central Committee proceeds from the fact that it is precisely the "accelerated development of public production in the agrarian sector of the economy that is the firm foundation for the solution of the food problem in the country," and that it is precisely it that will "be a good base which will enable us most fully to utilize also the possibilities of the auxiliary farms of enterprises and private citizens and other sources of additional food production."

The accelerated development of public production in kolkhozes, sovkhozes and other agricultural enterprises presumes substantial changes in its organization and functioning. Such changes are stipulated in said CPSU Central Committee resolution and include the "full utilization of cost accounting and contracting forms of labor organization, combined with the intensification of crop growing and animal husbandry and the processing industry." Conversion to full cost accounting and self-financing in 1988-1989 should ensure the independence of the labor collectives and release their economic activity and initiative. The extensive use of family and individual contracting, involving the leasing of land and other means of production and the revival of private auxiliary farms would include minor economic methods in solving the nationwide task, and bring to light and utilize their potential. The contracting organization of labor, which will be introduced in 1988, will be aimed at surmounting formalism, inertia and stereotype in the development of public production and, above all, make the worker the true owner of the land. This will contribute to the strengthening of live interest in working the land, in farming.

The most important feature of these changes is the use of self-government as the only alternative to the command-mobilizing management system, the futility of which has been established. Economic self-government is inherent to the fullest extent precisely in cooperatives in which both labor and labor means are those of the collective of the members of cooperatives. That is why the cooperative is a very advanced form of harmonizing (balancing) private with public interests, ensuring the efficient involvement of the individual interests of the working people within the economic development mechanism.

As applied to the country's agroindustrial complex, today's slogan of "More Socialism!" means "More Collectivism!" However, this is not formal but real collectivism, based on true autonomy, self-government and

activity and, consequently, full responsibility assumed by labor collectives. This means the practical implementation of Lenin's idea of socialism as a system of civilized members of cooperatives.

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

05003

The Soviet State: Continuity and Renewal

18020004f Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) pp 39-49

[Article by Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudryavtsev, academician, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the State and Law]

[Text] The 70-year history of the Soviet state is a glorious and difficult path of struggle and building, continuity and renovation. Great victories and bitter failures, gigantic steps forward and phenomena of stagnation occurred along this road. The main thing which characterizes the past 7 decades is the creativity of the people's masses, which laid new paths to the future. The historical experience in the development of Soviet statehood is of permanent significance. It is open to any country and people following the path of socialism.

I

The Soviet state is the result of the organic combination of scientific theory with revolutionary practice. It was born in the course of a sharp struggle concerning the forms in which the proletariat should exercise the political power it had assumed. The historical experience of the revolution in Russia convincingly proved the Marxist assumption according to which, in terms of solving the problems of proletarian dictatorship, the preservation of the old forms of state organization is unacceptable, but even less so is the rejection of statehood in general. It is to the great credit of V.I. Lenin and the bolsheviks that, while presiding over the breakdown of the old state machinery, they rejected the speculative development of a new governmental structure but instead turned to the experience of the masses. This experience was simple: the establishment of soviets of worker, soldier and peasant deputies, which were agencies of self-government by the working people born of popular initiative itself. In Lenin's view the soviets were a new type of democracy, "which develops a vanguard of the toiling masses, making of them legislators, executors and military guards, and creating an apparatus which can reeducate the masses" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 51).

The young Soviet state established its system, earned the support of the working people and gained their recognition and authority. During the very first days of the revolution it was able to solve radical problems of

historical significance: peace, land and national equality. This laid a fundamental principle of state policy: the Soviet system has no interests other than those of the people.

On 8 November 1917 the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets suggested that all nations sign an immediate democratic peace: a peace without annexations and reparations. Secret diplomacy was rejected and condemned. All subsequent foreign policy of the land of the soviets has been aimed at preserving peace on earth. It dates essentially from this short decree which was to become part of history.

The Decree on Land, which was adopted the same day and which abolished land ownership, marked the beginning of changes in the economic area. The Declaration of the Rights of the Toiling and Exploited People (January 1918) proclaimed the entire land to be the property of the whole people. It nationalized natural resources and introduced worker control over production, and universal labor service. It was thus that the foundations of a socialist economy were laid.

The principle of a proletarian national policy was defined in the Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia (November 1917), which proclaimed the equality and sovereignty of the peoples of Russia, their right to free self-determination, the lifting of any and all national and national-religious privileges and restrictions, and the free development of national minorities and ethnic groups. The republic was established as the "free alliance of free nations" and, soon afterwards, became a federal state.

In only slightly over 3 months the first Soviet Constitution was drafted. It was adopted at the Fifth All-Russian Congress of Soviets, on 10 July 1918. Its main task was formulated as follows: "...Institution of the dictatorship of the urban and rural proletariat and the poorest peasantry in the guise of a powerful All-Russian Soviet System, with a view to the total suppression of the bourgeoisie, elimination of the exploitation of man by man and establishment of socialism, in which there will be neither division into classes nor governmental system" (Article 9).

In describing the Soviet state of the transitional period, Lenin wrote that it will "inevitably be a state which will be democratic in a new fashion (for the proletariat and the poor in general) and a new type of dictatorship (against the bourgeoisie)" (op cit., vol 33, p 35). Such dialectics of democracy with dictatorship was clearly manifested in the very first documents of the Soviet system.

The RSFSR Constitution decreed the arming of the working people. It proclaimed their freedom of expressing their views, freedom of the press, assembly and associations, meetings and demonstrations, free education, freedom of conscience, and mandatory nature of

labor and defense of the socialist fatherland. At the same time, it stipulated that "there can be no room for exploiters in any agency of the system" (Article 7). "Guided by the interest of the working class as a whole, the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic deprives individuals and individual groups of the rights they have enjoyed to the detriment of the interests of the socialist revolution" (Article 23). Individuals resorting to hired labor or subsisting on unearned income were deprived of the right to vote (Article 65).

This dialectics reflected current legislative activities. Let us look at the content of the decrees promulgated by the VTsIK and the SNK during the very first month of the revolution, November 1917. Here are the principal among them, which were essential in terms of novelty and extremely specific in content: pension increases; requisitioning of warm clothing for soldiers at the front; reducing the size of the armed forces; struggle against the bourgeoisie and its agents sabotaging food supplies to the armed forces and hindering the conclusion of peace; elimination of social estates and civil ranks; worker control; revocation of the increased prices of sugar; issuing rations to soldiers' wives; confiscation of houses in which apartments are leased; closing down of the Land Bank of the Nobility and the Peasant Land Bank; detention of the leaders of the civil war waged against the revolution; and converting military plants to economically useful work. One can easily see here a clearly drawn class line: restricting the bourgeoisie, depriving it of economic and political power; and implementing, as we would describe it today, the initial social programs in the interest of the working people.

The amount and content of the work of the VTsIK and the SNK at that time were absolutely unique. Suffice it to say that between 1917 and 1921 more than 3,000 decrees were drafted and promulgated, written either by Lenin himself or with his participation! The main emphasis was on their practical implementation (sometimes through slogans and appeals) by the workers and the peasants. It was thus that hundreds of thousands and millions of working people became involved in independent participation in the management of the state. This was assisted also by the organizational forms of the exercise of the Soviet system. The city soviets held their sessions, in accordance with the 1918 Constitution, no less than on a weekly basis; the rural soviets held them twice as frequently. The superior authorities in the volosts, uyezds and guberniyas and in the republic were the congresses of soviets which elected new executive committees at each congress.

During V.I. Lenin's life, in 5 years (from 1917 to 1922; until the founding of the USSR) there were 10 all-Russian congresses of soviets, after which their frequency began to drop. The regular renovation of the membership of delegates elected at soviet congresses through multiple-step elections ensured that local interests were extensively represented and prevented passiveness and stagnation.

What kind of stagnation could even exist, when life steadily raised ever new and more complex problems for the young governmental system! The transitional period was crowded with grave contradictions, social antagonisms and seemingly insoluble problems. On the one hand, it was necessary to remove the older privileged population strata from managerial positions; on the other, it was impossible to function without the use of bourgeois specialists. As the Soviet Republic was demobilizing the army, foreign intervention and civil war were breaking out. Black marketeers and middlemen were strangling the proletariat, while the NEP demanded "to learn how to trade." It was within the cluster of such contradictions that the party and the soviets formulated a flexible, cautious yet principle-minded and energetic policy, based on the interests of the popular masses.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a firm and uncompromising system. Sabotage on the part of officials and entrepreneurs, White terror, foreign intervention and civil war brought to life forms of suppression, such as revolutionary courts, "Red terror" and extrajudicial repressive measures and limitations of political and civil rights imposed on some population categories. A noticeable centralization of the administrative machinery took place under such extreme circumstances. Nonetheless, while resorting to such steps, the bolsheviks displayed the necessary restraint and cautioned against the danger of extremes in any kind of dictatorship. Let us point out four situations.

First was the method used in solving the ethnic and religious problems concerning the peasantry. Lenin insistently warned against haste and lack of caution in solving such political problems and, particularly, in the application of coercive and repressive measures, which could only frighten the masses. "Revolutionary violence and dictatorship are excellent things," he said, "if they are applied when suitable and against those who deserve it. However, they must not be applied in the area of organization" (op cit., vol 38, p 149).

Second was the variety of views and clashes of opinions. Although firmly opposing factionalism in the party, Lenin always supported the freedom of view and critical remarks. As was pointed out at the Ninth All-Russian RKP(b) Conference in 1920, "Any repression whatsoever taken against comrades for expressing different thoughts on various problems or party decisions are inadmissible" ("KPSS v Rezolyutsiyakh..." [The CPSU in Resolutions...], vol 2, Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, p 300).

Third was a clear view of the danger of bureaucratizing the state apparatus. We know the persistence with which Lenin appealed to fight this phenomenon, particularly in his last works. "We shall be struggling against bureaucratism for many long years and anyone who may think otherwise is a charlatan and a demagogue, for in order to overcome bureaucratism hundreds of steps will have to

be taken; comprehensive literacy, culture and participation in the Worker-Peasant Inspectorate are needed." Another important stipulation was the following: "We must not delude ourselves with untruths. This is harmful for it is the main source of our bureaucratism" (op cit., vol 42, p 260; vol 45, p 46).

Fourth was the attitude toward legality. During the first years of the Soviet system the "right of nihilism" had become widespread. It was the result, on the one hand, of the hatred felt by the masses of tsarist laws and, on the other, the belief that the law, like the state, will wither away in the next few years. Gradually, however, the possibility of creating and applying new Soviet laws, something which was absolutely necessary in the restructuring of social relations on a socialist basis, became increasingly clear. A characteristic example of this is the "Instruction on Problems of Economic Work," which was drafted by Lenin and adopted at the Ninth All-Russian Congress of Soviets in 1921. This "Instruction" stipulated that the republic's people's courts "strictly watch over the activities of private merchants and entrepreneurs and do not allow even the slightest restriction of their activities but, at the same time, impose the most severe punishment for even the slightest attempt at deviating from the strict observance of the republic's laws..." (op cit., vol 44, p 337).

In working on the party program, in the summary of the section on the courts Lenin earmarked a clear way of democratizing and humanizing judicial policy: expanding the use of probation, replacing the deprivation of freedom with "mandatory labor while living at home," using educational institutions instead of jails, and introducing comrade courts in the armed forces and among the workers (see op cit., vol 38, p 408). Legal codes in all areas of the law were drafted within a short time, systematically embodying the principles of socialist legality.

The revolutionary accomplishments during the period of proletarian dictatorship created an unparalleled enthusiasm in the masses. A decisive struggle against the old world, dedicated efforts for the sake of a bright future, and deep faith in the imminent victory of a global revolution were the characteristic features of communists and Komsomols of the 1920s and 1930s. This revolutionary mood yielded results in later years as well, manifested in the development of shock work and the Stakhanovite movement, the heroic exploits during the Great Patriotic War and the postwar restoration of the country. The creative spirit of the Great October Revolution is embodied today in the radical restructuring of our society and the renovation of socialism.

II

Marxists have always considered proletarian dictatorship a transitional period in the establishment and development of the new social and state system. M.I. Kalinin wrote in 1926 that "the proletarian state will

gradually, in the course of the successful building of socialism, and the elimination of capitalist relations and the disappearance of the capitalists, convert into a state of the whole people which will have a new purpose and content (aspiration toward communism)" (M.I. Kalinin. "Voprosy Sovetskogo Stroitelstva. Stati i Rechi (1919-1946)" [Problems of Soviet Building. Articles and Speeches (1919-1946)]. Moscow, 1958, p 292). This process developed unevenly, accompanied by grave contradictions by virtue of a number of historical reasons, both internal and external.

Soviet political theory considers the state of the whole people a natural stage in the development of socialist statehood on a new economic and sociopolitical basis. Unlike the state of dictatorship of the proletariat, all toiling masses and social groups constitute its social base: workers, peasants and intellectuals. The economic foundations of the state of the whole people are socialist ownership of the means of production and a comprehensively developed socialist economic system. The lack of antagonistic class contradictions opens extensive opportunities for democratic methods of management and the maximal involvement of the popular masses in the process of governmental decision making and in the strict observance of legality. In accordance with the communist ideal that "The Free Development of One Is a Prerequisite for the Development of All," the objective of the state of the whole people is to expand the real opportunities for the application of the creative forces, capabilities and gifts of all citizens.

These features and elements of the state of the whole people took a long time to develop. The social base of this state was laid as early as the mid-1930s, with the elimination of the vestiges of exploiting classes. During the prewar period the country achieved substantial economic successes. The well-being of the population improved noticeably. As to the political development of society, the situation proved to be more complex and contradictory.

The 1936 USSR Constitution introduced a number of democratic changes: all previous restrictions of the rights of individual population categories were abolished; elections for soviets and for people's judges became universal, direct and equal, with secret voting. The list of rights and freedoms of the citizens was extended substantially; the independence of the courts, the inviolability of the individual and his home and the secrecy of correspondence were proclaimed. The legislative power became the exclusive prerogative of the USSR Supreme Soviet (the supreme soviets of the individual republics).

At the same time, however, the real democracy of social life, as an inseparable feature of the state of the whole people, was not secured. Furthermore, opposite processes took place. A substantial disparity developed between political theory and practice, between the democratic stipulations of the constitution and authoritarian decisions and between words and actions; openness was

eliminated. The "theory" of aggravation of the class struggle with the successes achieved in the building of socialism, formulated by Stalin, became the ideological foundation for mass repressions in the second half of the 1930s, which affected the leading cadres in the party, the state, the armed forces, the public organizations and the ordinary citizens. Both the scale and the full historical, moral-political and legal groundlessness of such cruel steps were fully realized by our society only in the mid-1950s, when the extensive rehabilitation of those innocently sentenced was implemented. It was at that time that the extrajudicial repressive agencies ("special conferences") were abolished and so was the exceptional procedure of trials for the commission of crimes against the state; the state security organs were placed under the control of the party and the state.

The restrictions imposed on democracy, which became the standard of political life during the period of the cult of personality, were related to the insufficiently developed political awareness and culture of the population and the weakness of democratic traditions. These restrictions were intensified by the difficult prewar situation and, subsequently, by the war, which required the extreme stressing of efforts, the drastic centralization of the apparatus and the extensive use of ordering as a method of management.

It is sometimes claimed that under the then leadership a number of injustices were committed but that there was order, discipline and responsibility. But let us ask ourselves at what price was this harsh discipline attained? Externally, it was achieved through administrative measures and coercion. Internally and psychologically, through belief in the infallibility of the leader and in the fact that he was right always and in everything. It was thus that a passive attitude and fear were cultivated; the wish to assume responsibility weakened and debates and free collective discussions were excluded.

Stalin's views that the individual was a "bolt" in the state mechanism radically conflicted with the principles of socialist democracy. However, they fully agreed with cases of arbitrary behavior and illegality, the systematic growth of the state apparatus and its bureaucratization, and increased departmentalism and parochialism. It was precisely these processes that, in the final account, became the embryos of stagnation phenomena which the country faced in recent decades.

Historical experience in building the state indicates that administrative and "arbitrary" methods of management and extreme management centralization can be efficient and even necessary under exceptional circumstances, such as war. The fact that we were able to withstand the harsh trials of the Great Patriotic War and that we won is explained with the justice of the cause for which the people fought, their faith in the ideals of the revolution and their loyalty to socialism. The strong centralized leadership and the transformation of the entire country into a military encampment also played their role. Under

normal and peaceful living conditions, however, such methods of social management become anachronistic and lead to adverse consequences. This became most clear with the development of the contemporary scientific and technical revolution which demanded the encouragement of initiative, creativity and independence in decision making as well as daring and enterprise. However, it was precisely these human qualities that were the first victims of the command style of work of state authorities, a style which had become a ruinous habit.

The excessive "statification" of the economy, culture and social life led to shortcuts in the theoretical area as well. A number of publications erroneously equated the state and the entire society, on the one hand, with the state and its apparatus and its department, on the other. Hierarchically, the state interests (including those which had been misinterpreted) stood above any interest of the society or the class, not to mention the individual.

As a whole, the difficult and conflicting development of the state of the whole people hindered the development of awareness. Nonetheless, this development was marked in the second half of the 1950s and beginning of 1960s with positive processes. Greater attention began to be paid to the forms of social activeness of the working people. At the 22nd CPSU Congress, N.S. Khrushchev pointed out that "our party...will continue to follow a course of transferring and increasing number of state functions to the public organizations." This process, which was progressive as a whole, was unstable, however, and in many of its manifestations was accompanied by extremes (such as the use of voluntary investigators of criminal cases), which soon put a halt to and reversed the movement.

Also during that period the beginning was laid of a significant updating of legislation, making it consistent with the socialist social relations in the economy, social life and ordinary activities which had developed by then. Nationwide discussions of draft laws were held, followed by the adoption of the new foundations of legislation on labor, marriage, the family, health care and public education; laws were passed on environmental protection and on the foundations of civil, criminal and procedural legislation.

The new Soviet constitution was promulgated by the USSR Supreme Soviet in 1977, thus completing the process of legislative renovation. Its pivotal idea was that of completing the growth of the state of dictatorship of the proletariat into a socialist state of the whole people, the supreme objective of which was building a classless communist society.

The constitution substantially broadened the rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens. The main trends in the development of the Soviet political system, according to the constitution, was the development of democracy: the

increasing participation of the citizens in the management of governmental and social affairs, perfecting the state apparatus, upgrading the activeness of public organizations, intensifying people's control, strengthening the legal foundations of governmental and social life, broadening glasnost and taking consistently public opinion into consideration (Article 9).

The political significance of these concepts was unquestionable. However, the actual development of the state and the law in the 1970s and 1980s followed a slow and complex road. A number of stipulations in the new constitution, above all those affecting the political system and the social sphere, failed to reflect the actual situation; the programmatic concept on the further development of socialist democracy was not implemented. Many negative phenomena became widespread. At the same time, however, a realistic reinterpretation of reality was taking place in the various Soviet social strata; the foundations for a new, critical and constructive attitude toward our realities were being laid and were maturing; ways were being considered of surmounting stagnation and a new political thinking was appearing. Views, moods and social expectations, which became the firm foundations for the renovation of socialism, which is taking place today, were developing and strengthening in the views of the various professional and age groups, in the creative work of writers and poets and in scientific developments. The party was able to combine these moods and expectations and to undertake the restructuring of social life, starting with itself, once again displaying its vanguard role at a crucial time.

III

We are not sinning against the truth by considering restructuring a truly revolutionary process, leading to radical changes in social life and in our awareness. It must renovate the existing and create new social and political institutions.

In the case of building the state, as proceeding from the resolutions of the 27th Congress, restructuring must fulfill at least three tasks: first, complete the building of the state of the whole people in all its aspects: socio-economic, national, legal and moral. Second, remove all the encrustations and deformations (such as corruption, abuses and bureaucratic distortions in the work of the apparatus, and areas closed to criticism) which appeared and accumulated essentially in recent decades; ensure the full restoration of the Leninist principles of state and social life. Third, not only earmark but also largely ensure in the next few years the development of Soviet statehood and the socialist self-government by the people. "We must clearly realize," the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum emphasized, "that we consider the objectives of accelerating socioeconomic development not only as eliminating the lagging and deformations in various areas of social development. Dictated by

historical necessity and the radical changes in domestic and international conditions, they are aimed at achieving a new qualitative status in socialist society."

Today as well, in the period of restructuring, the state of the whole people has preserved its continuity with its historical predecessor—the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat—although at the contemporary stage in its development all elements of the state organization of society have become qualitatively different. Today they also are experiencing processes of profound renovation, the main task of which is the all-round democratization of our governmental and social life.

As in the past, the soviets remain the *political foundations* of the Soviet state. Unlike the transitional period, however, they express the will and interest of all classes and strata within the society and the working people of all nations and ethnic groups in our country. Democracy is an organic feature, the essence of the socialist state. Here as well, however, there has been a renovation and development. This is a question, first of all, of improvements in representative democracy: the organization and forms of activities of soviets, the electoral system and the body of deputies; second, intensified control over the activities of executive authorities—the apparatus of the state and its officials; third, the development of direct democracy.

In our view, the main problem today is the unconditional restoration of the Leninist principle of the full rights of soviets on all levels, as the authorities of the people's system, including and above all as applicable to the executive authorities: the councils of ministers, ministries, departments, and soviet executive committees. We must totally abandon the concepts which prevailed in the 1930s, according to which under socialism "the power is not in the hands of those who elect and vote but those who rule," of people "who have mastered the handling of the executive apparatus of the state and who guide this apparatus" (J.V. Stalin, "Soch." [Works], vol 4, pp 37 and 366). Changes in the electoral system and the Soviet laws which will be enacted next year on the nationwide discussion of important problems of governmental life and on the procedure of appealing to the courts erroneous actions by officials, actions which violate the rights of citizens, will play a positive role in the implementation of the principles of true democracy. Other laws aimed at expanding democracy are being drafted as well.

We know that in discussing the ways of development of democracy and self-government in the future life of the society of working people, the Marxists were critical of the theory of the "separation of powers," which sharply distinguished between legislative and executive activities. However, historical experience indicated that by no means is the combination, the blending of such functions always useful. The danger is not only that the legislative authority will assume executive or control functions but the opposite: that the executive apparatus will begin to

legislate. Stalin's statements we quoted essentially justified this totally unrestrained law-making on the part of the apparatus of ministries and departments, which generated an innumerable number of regulations and instructions which we find so difficult to delete today.

We believe that the science of politics and the state should intensify its study of the problems of the division of power, making such division more specific, taking into consideration Engels' words to the effect that "actually, this is merely a prosaic practical division of labor applied to the state machinery with a view to its simplification and control" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 5, p 203). Does a socialist state not meet such a division of labor?

Furthermore, the socialist state has as its *economic foundation* socialist ownership of the means of production. This radically distinguishes our system from any previous socioeconomic one. From a mixed economy we converted to the total domination of a socialist economic management system, which enabled us to turn our country into a powerful industrial state, successfully to solve most difficult social problems and ensure the country's defense capability.

Accelerated socioeconomic development will require in this area of state building as well new political and legal solutions. They will affect above all the restructuring of the economic management system. The Law on the State Enterprise (Association), which substantially broadened the rights of enterprises, provides a firm legal foundation for relations between them and the central management authorities and territorial agencies. However, this is merely a first step. We must reduce and streamline the network of ministries and departments and refine their structures and functions. In order to complete the radical reform in the economy it is necessary, in our view, additionally to draft many other union laws: on state social and economic planning, the kolkhozes, the industrial and consumer cooperatives and work on inventions. Obviously, we should go back to the question of drafting a USSR Economic Code, which would combine the numerous laws pertaining to the national economy.

The development of a variety of forms of economic activities (state enterprises, kolkhozes, cooperatives, family contracting, individual labor, and mixed forms) presumes the creation of an efficient legal mechanism which will ensure the support of all such forms and provide for reliable control on the part of society and the state over their efficient and legitimate use. Naturally, such control, which is directed toward the struggle against parasitism and abuses, should not turn into "banning," which has reappeared at the initial stages in the course of restructuring, in terms of family contracting and individual labor. Life demands a fast change in the social mentality and the elimination of essentially petit-bourgeois concepts which to this day are promoting equalization and dislike of any kind of enterprise and initiative. In the area of scientific development of the

problems of ownership under socialism we believe that we must take into consideration the essential fact that production relations of a socialist type can successfully develop not only within the state enterprise but also on the basis of public (cooperative, kolkhoz) ownership and individual activity, which exclude exploitation and are even socially useful varieties of the division of labor. This entire variety of forms of production relations does not contradict socialism in the least or its fundamental principle of division according to labor but, conversely, converts it into a truly efficient instrument of social and economic development.

The variety of forms of economic activities in contemporary socialist society requires a deeper and more detailed study of the *socioclass foundations* of the state of the whole people. Such foundations remain essentially unchanged: there are working people in town and country: workers, peasants and intellectuals. The new economic forms introduced with restructuring will not create in our country nonworking strata, not to mention classes. This is excluded both by virtue of the domination of the public ownership of means of production as well as the fact that the political power is in the hands of the working people. Therefore, the efforts of Western propagandists to depict restructuring as a return to the NEP with its mixed economy, i.e., as a development toward an unplanned market economy, are naive.

The new feature which is truly related to restructuring is the increased attention paid to the social area and the elimination of the residual principle in its development; another new factor is the elimination of dogmatic and simplistic concepts of socialism as allegedly equalizing the various interests of the people, subjecting them to a uniform stereotype. Finally, it also means the profound study of the entire variety of interests of the various population strata and groups, their satisfaction and their active use in socially useful areas. "In the final account, the meaning of restructuring is taking into consideration interests, influencing and managing them, and managing with their help," the June Plenum noted.

In their governmental-legal aspect these considerations are a base for the elaboration of concepts of legislative acts the purpose of which will be to reflect and guarantee more fully and in greater detail the various interests of urban and rural residents, young people, people practicing different professions, etc. The functional manifestations of such interests as well need a fuller and efficient legal regulation: the organization of voluntary societies and creative associations, cultural and sociopolitical activities, the development of sports and tourism, and others. We believe that we must resume transferring to the public some functions which are currently performed by state agencies. This question has already been raised in the press (see *Kommunist*, No 12, 1987). Do we need all those committees and departments, which essentially are ministries, in sports or foreign travel? Is this not a case of unnecessary "statification" of the social activeness of the working people?

Restructuring must be extended also to *national-state relations*. The USSR is a single union multinational state based on the principle of socialist federalism and a result of the free self-determination of nations and the voluntary unification of equal Soviet republics. The great 70-year old history of the country of the October Revolution would have been impossible had from the very beginning the Communist Party not solved the national problem on the basis of the only accurate Marxist-Leninist basis.

Today, when all nations and ethnic groups in our country are not only equal juridically but have also achieved true political, economic, social and cultural equality, naturally the problems of national-state building have changed. It is now a question of perfecting the system of relations between the USSR and union and autonomous republics, and the fuller and more comprehensive consideration of their interests as well as the interests of the union as a whole, and of developing true internationalism and further progress in national cultures.

The period of stagnation in our development led to the fact that some negative phenomena in national relations were underestimated, pushed into the background; problems were solved sluggishly and sometimes not on a proper legal basis. The broadening of the autonomy of union republics, which took place after the 20th CPSU Congress, was subsequently halted. Excessive centralization in state management became one of the obstructions to smooth and mutually profitable national-state progress. V.I. Lenin repeatedly emphasized that it is only on the basis of the "full implementation of democracy" that we can achieve the "practically absolute elimination of even the slightest national frictions and the slightest national mistrust..." (op cit., vol 30, p 22). It is precisely this system in solving national problems that it is being applied by the party in the course of restructuring.

The state of the whole people is a state of *socialist legality*, without which true democracy is impossible. Historical experience has indicated that it is clearly insufficient to be satisfied with partial improvements in this area of life. The process of restructuring requires suitable legal support. At the same time, the legal system of socialism itself must have its content, organizational forms and methods of functioning renovated.

Recently acquired experience urgently calls for substantial improvements in the activities of law enforcement agencies, the enhanced professionalism of their personnel and the total elimination of cases of illegal indictment of citizens and sentencing of innocent people, and putting an end to red tape, callousness and neglect of people. The press has already listed a number of steps considered primary in this respect: strengthening the guaranteed independence of the courts and the prosecutors; upgrading the role of defense attorneys in preliminary investigations and in court; intensifying public control over the work of the militia and the correctional labor institutions, greater glasnost and publication of

judicial statistics. We must also radically review and democratize penal, procedural and correctional labor legislation. Juridical science must develop optimal methods for the organization and activities of courts, prosecutor's offices and MVD authorities and a method for the study of negative phenomena and means of preventing them. Obviously, upgrading the quality of work of law enforcement authorities will entail financial costs. It has long been known that "cheap justice" eventually turns up quite costly to the state and society.

This means that essentially it is a question of an all-round *reform of our legal system*, which will include the updating of current legislation in most of its areas; changes in the structure and methods of activity of legal institutions; and upgrading the legal knowledge of officials and citizens. The main aspects of this reform are strengthening the principles of humanism, justice and respect for the individual, strict observance of his rights and freedoms, equality in the eyes of the law and mandatory responsibility of everyone for his own actions.

The Soviet state is an organization of toiling masses. Marx wrote that "freedom means converting the state from an authority above society into an authority entirely subordinated to that society..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, op cit., vol 19, p 26). It is precisely this task that is achieved through the development of Soviet democracy and the strengthening of legality. The state of the whole people is conceivable only as a socialist state of law, i.e., a state with rights of citizens, labor collectives and other organizations of working people and obligations to them, and a state which bears full political and moral responsibility to its people.

Socialism is not created by order from above, Lenin noted. It is the creation of the popular masses themselves. It was this truth that was the starting point in our 70 years of history. It is still the foundation of the historical process which we describe as restructuring and renovation of socialist society. The guarantee for a successful restructuring and its irreversibility is based on the profound interests and will of the Soviet people, who have understood and accepted the historical challenge of our time.

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

05003

From Our Relevant Legacy. Basic Principles of the Unified Labor School (1918)

18020004g Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) pp 50-62

[Text] The appeal (declaration) of the State Committee for Education, entitled "Basic Principles of the Unified Labor School," published in this issue, is one of the first documents which defined the ideological platform of the revolution in the field of education.

The Council of People's Commissars, headed by V.I. Lenin, was founded by the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Worker, Soldier and Peasant Deputies on 26 October (8 November) 1917. One of its members was People's Commissar of Education A.V. Lunacharskiy. Lunacharskiy describes a talk he had with Vladimir Ilich on the following day, as follows: "Let me tell you a couple of words, Anatoliy Vasilyevich. I have no time now to give you all kinds of instructions concerning your new obligations, nor could I tell you that I have some kind of perfectly thought-out system of ideas concerning the first steps of the revolution in the area of education. Obviously, a great deal will have to be changed completely, redone, and developed in new directions. I believe that you must have a serious discussion with Nadezhda Konstantinovna. She will help you. She has thought a great deal about such matters and I believe that she has found the right direction.... I wish you luck. The first victory has been won but unless we win an entire series of victories after it, things will be bad. Naturally, the struggle has not ended but is only at its very beginning."

The State Commission for Education was founded by joint decree issued by the VTsIK and SNK on 9 (22 November). It was assigned the overall management of public education. The people's commissar of education became its chairman. The commission's duties included the formulation of the basic principles of and plan for the organization of public education in the RSFSR.

The commission drafted the regulation on the unified labor school of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic and the "Fundamental Principles of the Unified Labor School." The two documents were published simultaneously. The first, which was ratified at the VTsIK session on 30 September 1918, became the law which defined the organization of Soviet schools. Mandatory free 9-year education was introduced, divided into two stages: the first was for children from ages 8 to 13 (a 5-year course); the second was for children between 13 and 17 (a 4-year course). The separation of the schools for boys and girls was eliminated. The teaching of any kind of religion and the performance of any kind of religious ceremonies were declared inadmissible. Productive labor, the general-education polytechnical nature of training and self-government were proclaimed the foundations of school life.

The purpose of the second document is essentially described in one of its leading paragraphs together with a list of steps to be taken, which were necessarily aimed at that time only at a partial reform. They provide an overall basic understanding of the nature of a communist school and indicate the objectives which were pursued in the course of the systematic restructuring of the educational system. It is precisely this that accounts for our present interest in this text drafted by A.V. Lunacharskiy, who acknowledged that it was "in the full meaning of the term achieved under the ideological dictation of Nadezhda Konstantinovna."

The concept of the unified labor school was reflected in the party program which was adopted in March 1919, at the Eighth RKP(b) Congress. The part dealing with the tasks of the communists in the area of public education, as confirmed by N.K. Krupskaya, was drafted under V.I. Lenin's direct guidance. One of the tasks was the "full implementation of the principles of the unified labor school, teaching in the native language, coeducational training, unquestionably laic, i.e., free from any religious influence whatsoever, and encouraging a close link between training and socioproductive labor, thus educating comprehensively developed members of a communist society."

We cannot say that said documents were ignored in the history of education. However, having acknowledged their significance in building the Soviet school, it was pointed out that they contain substantial shortcomings. The commentary which accompanied their publication in the last two collections—"Directives of the VKP(b) and Decrees of the Soviet Government on Public Education." A collection of documents for 1917-1947 (Izdatelstvo APN RSFSR, Moscow-Leningrad, 1947) and "Public Education in the USSR." A collection of documents, 1917-1973 (Pedagogika, Moscow, 1974) is typical: "We should bear in mind that these documents are not free from a number of major errors (idealizing the 'nature' of the child, excessive emphasis on a variety of types of artisan labor, ignoring the positive elements of the experience of the old school, elimination of homework, etc.). However, for their time both the Regulation and the Declaration played a positive role in the struggle against scholasticism, drill and formalism, which were inherent in the old prerevolutionary school" (quoted from the 1974 collection).

Therefore, both documents may seem to have played their role. But reading the Declaration more closely, we see that many if not all of its concepts are amazingly relevant. Here is a single comparison between the stipulations on education and the theses of the USSR Ministry of Education "School Restructuring on the Level of Contemporary Requirements," which was published for purposes of discussion last July. The principal means of educating the new man, according to the ministry, is above all the acquisition of knowledge which should shape an integral perception of the world, loyalty to ideas and duty, honor and nobility, goodness and courage, loyalty to the ideals of communism and readiness to defend the homeland. In order to accomplish this, each subject must be related to moral categories. The declaration emphasizes that beneficial results in this respect "can be achieved only with a properly organized school life...." The children must participate in all aspects of school life. To this effect they must have the right to self-government and constantly practice active mutual aid. In preparing to become citizens of the state, they must feel at the earliest possible age citizens of their own school." A.S. Makarenko left us a model of implementation of this principle in the creation of a collective of

children. Unquestionably, it would be easier to acknowledge the accuracy of this approach if we apply Marx's view to the school: the essence of man constitutes the totality of all social relations.

It is the view of the editors that the "Basic Principles of the Unified Labor School" (1918) have retained their relevance to this day and that their republication will help us to identify the reasons which hinder the process of achieving the objectives stipulated in the present reform of general education schools.

Basic Principles of the Unified Labor School

State Commission for Education, 16 October 1918

We are starting the new school year. With any kind of normal conditions, one would expect that the schools would reflect the Great October Revolution, the radical and fruitful reform, a reform so comprehensive as to place the Russian school, at least as far as the principles and concepts of which it is based, in a leading place in the civilized world.

Naturally, however, even with such entirely normal conditions the school cannot be restructured immediately and at first, to a greater or lesser extent, reality would fall substantially behind the plans.

Today we would be justified to hope for only a partial reform, for we are not only about to encounter obstacles caused by the insufficient number and equipment of schools and the lack of training of teachers but also the insufficient formulation of plans, as a result of the complete, sabotage-originated, dislocation in the central department and in the entire scholastic apparatus, a dislocation out of which we have begun to come out only recently. Despite all the proof of the readiness of the Commissariat to do everything possible to restore our suffering school to the level of a truly national school, for reasons of political consideration some teachers remain hostile to the Commissariat. Naturally, this is tremendously harmful in the complex and delicate matter of school reform, in which the sincere and energetic participation of all of its elements is urgently necessary.

However, if a real school reform must be necessarily partial (which would not prevent it, as the already promulgated decrees prove, to be nonetheless the most radical of any reform of the past), it becomes even more urgent for the Commissariat to set the objective to which we aspire and, in addition to the enumeration of the individual reforms which must be carried out, immediately to provide an image of the type of school toward which we shall advance and which will be the only type which we could acknowledge as normal in a renovated Russia.

Obviously, the school reform after the October Revolution is in the nature of an act of struggle waged by the masses for knowledge, for education. The Commissariat

of Education must eliminate as soon as possible that which is perhaps the most important: the area of class privileges. It is not only a question of making the school universally accessible in the way it is organized now, for this organization was the work of the old regime and is unsuitable for the toiling masses; it is a question of a radical restructuring of the school in the spirit of making it a truly people's school.

In the older school the lower classes suffered from extreme neglect and even deliberately added deleterious features, for they were schools for the "simple people;" they were the subject not only of simple indifference but also of open hostility and, finally, the aspiration, in as much as was possible, to turn them into an instrument for poisoning the minds of the people, an instrument for the dissemination of the disgusting loyalty. On the higher levels, the school was not simply a school for the upper classes, as in England for example, but also a school drilling loyal supervisors of slaves.

The new school must not only be free on all levels and not only accessible and, as soon as possible, mandatory, so that it can be firmly strengthened, but also be a unified and a labor school.

What does it mean for the school to be unified?

It means that the entire system of ordinary schools, from kindergarten to university, must be a single school, an unbroken ladder. It means that all children must enter the same type of school and start their education in the same way, and that all of them must have the right to climb the rungs of this ladder to the top.

It may be that the state would be simply physically unable to guarantee at this time to all Russian children that they will eventually go to university. In any case, the move from one school level to another should be ensured above all for the most talented children with priority given to the children of the proletariat and the poorest peasantry.

However, the concept of unified school does not mandatorily presume its uniformity.

Having formulated certain stipulations, the observance of which is considered absolutely mandatory, the central commissariat will also provide wide scope for the independent activities of the public education departments of the soviets which, in turn, naturally, will not restrict the educational creativity of the pedagogical councils providing that they do not obstruct the democratization of the schools.

Private initiative will also be given adequate scope.

The People's Commissariat of Education will set a programmatic minimum for all groups of schools.

In addition to the fact that research in several directions will thus remain open to the Russian school, the school cannot alone, on all levels, remain unified horizontally, as it should be vertically.

The state needs specialists. The adolescents themselves clearly show different inclinations and gifts. Pedagogy, as such, favors the gradual narrowing of the range of knowledge and concentrating the attention on specially selected subjects, for equally remote from the ideal of an educated person is the specialist, who considers as extraneous to his specialty the rest of mankind, and the shallow person, who is a jack of all trades and master of none.

Therefore, at a certain age, the age of 14, the students will be divided into several areas or groups but in such a way that many basic subjects will remain the same for all students and instruction within each separate group, after this division, will only be more emphasized in some subjects. In no case should such groups be considered exclusive.

Furthermore, as shall be discussed further, the new school will substantially change its appearance according to local conditions without losing none of its general spirit.

The new school must be a *labor* school. Naturally, in the case of schools in a Soviet state in the course of transition from a capitalist to a socialist system, this becomes even more mandatory than it is in the schools of advanced capitalist countries, although even they have realized the need for such education and, to a certain extent, have implemented it.

The requirement of introducing labor as a foundation for teaching rests on two entirely different grounds the results of which, however, easily blend.

The first foundation is psychology, which teaches us that true perception is achieved only through action. The child thirsts for mobility, for he has been kept swaddled. He masters knowledge with exceptional ease, when it is transmitted in a happy active form of game or work which, capably organized, coincide; instead, he has been asked to learn from listening and from books. Children are proud when they acquire any kind of practical skill of which, however, they have been *entirely* deprived.

From this viewpoint labor discipline is reduced to active and mobile creative familiarity with the world. According to Frebel, kindergarten is the first systematic area in which the labor principle is applied and we must demand a corresponding development of training based on the same principle but, naturally, adapted to the different age groups and encompassing a wider range of knowledge in the higher grades.

The other source of aspiration in contemporary progressive labor schools is the direct desire to acquaint students with what they will need most of all in life, with that which plays a prevalent role in their lives at the present time, such as farming and industrial labor in all of their varieties.

We must take into consideration, however, that whereas we are by no means opposed to specialized technical training for senior students, we energetically object to any specific narrowing of the range of labor training at the lower levels of the unified school, i.e., at least not before the age of 14.

In the first stage, instruction rests on processes which are of a more or less artisan nature, consistent with the small force of the children and their inclinations, natural for that age group. In the second stage, priority is given to industrial and agricultural labor in its contemporary machine-oriented aspects. In general, however, the purpose of the labor school is by no means to drill the students in one craft or another but to give them a polytechnical education, practically acquainting the children with the methods used in all most important forms of labor, some at the workshop or the school farm, some in a factory or plant, and so on.

Therefore, on the one hand the child must learn all subjects by walking, collecting, drawing, photographing, modeling, making cardboard collages, observing plants and animals, raising them and taking care of them. Languages, mathematics, history, geography, physics, chemistry, botany and zoology are all subjects which not only allow but also require a creative and active method of teaching.

On the other hand, as it comes closer to each ideal, the school must teach the student the principal means of labor in the following areas: carpentry, masonry, machining, wood carving, molding, hammering, casting, metal turning, smelting and welding, tempering, drilling, leather work, printing, etc. In the countryside, naturally, the focal point of teaching would be the equally great variety of farm work.

The hours generously spent in labor, some 10 hours a week, would not be regretted. The Americans have realized that children subjected to such work have not fallen behind in their study of other subjects but have benefited, so that, in addition to other subjects, labor, according to American educators, saves time.

Furthermore, it has a beneficial influence on the emotional growth of the students, powerfully developing attention, precision, inventiveness, and so on. Technically skillful hands automatically lead to the development of some most important areas of the brain.

Naturally, the polytechnical training of a 14-year-old will enable him to master any skill faster.

Let us consider the way knowledge is absorbed in schools where labor holds a prevalent role.

The line separating the individual subjects disappears, naturally, entirely in the elementary school, which accounts for the last years of kindergarten. Here virtually all classes are reduced to a single master subject, not as yet differentiated: the labor familiarity with nature and the social environment surrounding the child.

A game, a walk, a talk provide material for collective and individual thinking in child activities. Starting with the child himself and his environment, everything is the subject of questions and answers, stories, compositions, drawings and emulations. The curiosity of the child and his eagerness to act, without any coercion whatsoever, are systematized and directed by the teacher in such a way as to obtain the highest possible results. All of this is the main subject of teaching, something like a children's encyclopedia.

Obviously, at a higher stage of learning education is not limited to this. In this case systematic work at mastering a certain cycle of knowledge assumes the main role. However, such teaching of the individual disciplines should in no case narrow this encyclopedia which continues here as well to play a major role but of a somewhat different nature. At this point it assumes the nature of the study of human culture as related to nature.

Such encyclopedic teaching, which is concentrated on labor processes during the first stage (ages 8-13) should be divided into two cycles distinct in terms of the location of the material and the training method. During the first period, teaching is based on a series of preselected targets. The students are asked to study one industrial product or another or an element of culture, which is subjected to comprehensive discussion both as material provided by nature and as a result of its processing. Incidentally some knowledge is acquired concerning its physical and chemical properties, origin and development. This is followed by a description of all pertinent data on the history of labor (means of processing in the past) and, finally, the means used by modern industry in the production of that specific item. It is self-evident that a simple description should be the least important; priority must be given to the active absorption, for which reason the items must be chosen in such a way that their study could take place during trips, live observations and independent reproduction of the majority of related labor acts: the children themselves could find and subject to study, with the help of the teacher and elder comrades, any objects of interest to them. However, such free studies should not hinder the covering of a planned course with the best possible didactic choice of objects, so that the result may be a complete although curtailed familiarity with the most important aspects of the past and, incidentally, a number of natural science data.

In the second round, the somewhat broader cycle of approximately the same type of knowledge is taught in a systematically historical order. In other words, the children become familiar in the course of live essays and always with the help of their independent efforts with the history of labor and, on its basis, the history of the entire society. The evolution of all culture based on the growth of labor possibilities should be not only taught from a book or the stories of the teacher but, to a certain extent, with the help of life; not only their minds but also their bodies and, above all, their hands must become periodically involved to the extent of the possible, in the life of a savage, a nomad, a primitive farmer, a barbarian (the ages of the great river kingdoms, the age of antiquity, the Middle Ages, etc.).

The teaching of this subject, i.e., the encyclopedia of culture, could easily assume an undesirable superficial nature if the teachers are insufficiently well trained. The study of this subject and its method should be immediately introduced in pedagogical institutes and gradually applied in the schools, as trained teachers become available.

The same subject, converted into a course of sociology on the basis of the evolution of labor and the economic forms it creates, with incomparably technically more accurate and profound and, in a word, scientific and technical study of advanced labor means (machines) and a sufficiently rich statistical and juridical study of contemporary society and its polarization (labor and capital, socialism and capitalism) would be the content of the labor encyclopedia in second-level schools, where it should blend with the systematic study of the history of science, closely related to economic life in terms of the origin of economic views and methods and as a source of further economic change.

Incidentally also extracurricular studies are encouraged, particularly subjects which are of interest to the student at that time, such as individual research, composition, papers, models, collections, etc.

As we already pointed out, the higher the student rises in the school ladder, the more subjects, along with this encyclopedia, are added, i.e., the systematic study under the guidance of specialists, of the native language, mathematics, geography, history, biology in its various subdivisions, physics, chemistry and living foreign languages.

Naturally, in turn such training must be imbued with the labor method of its absorption. Furthermore, during certain hours of the day the corresponding libraries, laboratories and collections must be made accessible to the student for extracurricular studies. We ascribe particularly great importance to the fact that labor, on which teaching in the new school is based, should be productive and real, and involve the real participation of the student in the country's economic life.

Recalling Marx's statement of the conversion of child labor from a curse into a source of healthy, full and active knowledge, the new school will firmly establish ties with production facilities in the vicinity and take students to see factories, plants, railroads or various other industries, wherever, based on local conditions, access is available, not for the sake of visiting and looking, but for the sake of working.

Such work, however, which takes place under the supervision of teachers, should never lose its educational nature; it would be inadmissible for it to assume forms harmful to health or not be paralleled at all times by a broadening of physical skills and knowledge.

The second-level schools could be quite varied in terms of the type of work on which polytechnical knowledge is based.

Such knowledge and its live connection with the entire cycle of natural and social sciences could be mastered on the basis of virtually any kind of production, for today all production varieties are closely interwoven. A textile factory, metallurgical plants and sugar refineries, a carpentry workshop, navigation, agriculture, railroads, streetcars, mails, the telegraph and so on could all be separately included in the foundations of teaching. Whenever physically possible, naturally, in the course of 4 years of work, as much variety in such exposure as is possible should be provided. If no variety is possible, using local production facilities as a starting point, we must nonetheless not allow any given school to become a kind of specialized training institution but see to it that on the basis of specific production facilities the student becomes familiar with the overall level reached in contemporary culture.

Aesthetic subjects, such as collages, drawing, singing and music, are by no means something secondary, a kind of luxury. Drawing in particular, and collage as its auxiliary subject, should play an outstanding role. The student must gradually develop through his pencil a new organ for particularly precise and graphic speech. Drawing is taught initially on the basis of the method of free creativity of the child, imaginary, based on memory, etc. This is followed by drawing from nature, based on a properly selected series of objects and, finally, develops into precise mathematical drawing, on the one hand, and artistic drawing, on the other. It is only at this third stage that the systematic teaching of theory is allowed.

Furthermore, drawing should be a base in teaching all subjects, used both by teachers and students. A sketch, a diagram or an illustration must be provided with each lesson. Drawing and collage, particularly at the first stages of training, should also act as calisthenics for the eyes and the senses, so to say, and develop coordination between visual impressions and motor reactions, providing specific familiarity with the dimensions of objects, starting with geometrically shaped items. The eyes must

be sharpened from the color viewpoint as well, in developing further the methods usually applied in good kindergartens. The study of the color spectrum, with all of its curious combinations, and the development of the ability to see nuances and combinations and, finally, the use of water colors are as mandatory as pure drawing and must parallel it. Singing and music must equally be related to sharpening the sense of hearing. Rhythm and chorus singing must be assigned a most important role as subjects which develop collective skills and the ability to share emotions and actions.

In general, aesthetic education should mean not teaching some kind of simplified art for children but the systematic development of sensory organs and creative capabilities, which increases the possibility of enjoying and creating beauty. Labor and scientific upbringing, deprived of this element, become deprived of spirit, for the joy of life through admiring and creating something is the final objective of both labor and science.

The labor principle in school contributes to a great extent to the physical development of children. Alone, however, it cannot meet this objective. Mass rhythmical calisthenics, individual development of the muscles of the body under the observation of a physician, and games which gradually turn into serious sports without, however, the unhealthy spirit of rivalry, is the way to be followed in this respect. Gymnastics and sports must develop not only strength and skill but also the ability to engage in clear collective action, a spirit of mutual aid, etc. School hygiene and proper breakdown of classes, and the constant and close participation of the physician-educator in school life are all necessary prerequisites for the proper development of children to whom the school should supply also healthy food or, at least, a lunch.

The school year will be divided into two categories of classes: winter, normal, and summer, in which work in the open, work of a rural type, would predominate.

Part of the school day (no more than 4 hours during the first stage and 5 to 6 hours during the second) should consist of projects included in the curriculum; the rest of the time should be set aside for the student to use some of it as he wishes within the school, making use of its resources, and some of it for total relaxation. The schedule itself should be drawn up in such a way as not to tire the student with its monotony. A more individualized training is an exceptionally important principle in the renovation of the school. By individualized training we mean that the teachers should analyze the inclinations and the character features of every student and the possibility of better adapting to his personal needs that which the school gives and demands of him.

We asked that a clear distinction be made between individualized instruction and a spirit of individualism. The educational school should try to expunge from the children's hearts, to the extent of the possible, the

features of egotism which man has inherited from the past, and to prepare him for the future, trying, starting with the school, to weld together firm collectives and develop to the greatest extent the ability to share joint experiences and a feeling of cohesion.

Individualization does not end with this. The individual remains the highest value of socialist culture. However, this individual could develop in full his own gifts only within a harmonious and cohesive society of equals. School individualism develops the aspiration to always consider himself first and to use others. Socialist upbringing, which combines the desire for a psychologically united collective with fine individualization, leads to the fact that the individual is proud of developing within himself all his capabilities for the sake of service to the entity. The objective here is to avoid holding back the development of particularly gifted characters. However, although this is an honorable objective and should in no way be neglected, another is much more important: to lower, to the extent of the possible, the number of failing students. Even in progressive democratic countries the number of failing students is huge. The American educator was right when he said that if any factory director would lose as much raw material as the percentage of failing students found in even the best schools, such a director would immediately lose his job.

Concern for the laggards is the first concern of the democratic school, for in the overwhelming majority of cases falling behind is the result not of the lack of natural capability but of worse conditions at home. Even in bourgeois America this problem is taken to such an extent into consideration that only the most experienced teachers, the most skillful ones, the best paid and the most honored teachers are allowed to teach classes for slower students. Although we may not be able immediately to implement measures in favor of those who are particularly successful, in no case should slower students be left without the school's special concern.

The institution of special classes for failing students should be mandatory in any more or less well-organized school.

This description, although brief, of the type of teaching which would meet our initial requirements in the schools cannot be completed without drawing the attention to two other entirely necessary prerequisites for its development: the school must be *laic and coeducational*.

There is no point in citing arguments in favor of these two concepts. Let us merely note the urgent need for extensively disseminating these principles among the population. In this area the new school will meet with the opposition of widespread and, therefore, seemingly strictly democratic prejudices; in this case virtually nothing can be achieved through force. Yet the adverse results of confessional schools are incalculable. Freeing the school from the influence of the church is not only an

important but a most essential completion of its general liberation from servitude to the state, under which the school was a nursery for moral vice described as the virtues of slaves.

Coeducational training, wherever applied, has yielded the best possible results. "It is no longer necessary to prove," says Whipple, "that girls are unable to do the same work and just as successfully as boys; practical daily experience has proved the opposite; efforts are now being made to prove that the girls are doing this to the detriment of their health."

This, however, is impossible to prove, for there is a great disparity in the mental capabilities and physical forces among boys themselves. The question of the uneven strength of fellow students is solved only through individualization of training, which will take into consideration the sex of the student as well. Progressive education should pay particular attention to the educational functions of the school which, of late, have been sacrificed to training, giving priority to intellect and forgetting the molding of a character and the development of the will.

There is a great deal of truth in this turn to pedagogical arbitrariness. At the same time, another trend became apparent, from individualism and concern for better equipping the students for their future careers to rivalry in life (which was a particularly distinguishing feature of the progressive bourgeois and relatively free schools) a conversion to the ideal of developing within the growing generation the principles of cohesion and social awareness.

Unfortunately, however, the true reasons on which such searches are based are extremely antipathetic. They are directly related to the imperialist phase in the development of capitalism and the cult of the military state and the consequent need to instill in the adolescents an unparalleled feeling of discipline and dedicated loyalty to the Moloch of the state. This precisely is what is known today as civic education and its principal sanctuary is chauvinism, embellished by a variety of statements.

The bourgeois world is fluctuating between two poles: individualism, which is demanded by the world of private ownership, and rivalry and loyalty, absorption of the individual by the hierarchical military-industrial machinery of the state. Nothing could be worse. We, as we pointed out, do not forget the right of the individual to develop in his own way. We have no reason to curtail this right, to deceive the people and to cast them by force into specific molds: the strength of the socialist society rests not in the barracks homogeneity or artificial drilling or religious or aesthetic deception but on the real unification of interests.

That is the reason for which we can apply most profound unity with maximal variety. To the extent to which we must emphasize in training the individual approach, to that same extent we have the most splendid task of creating a school collective, united in a feeling of happy and firm comradeship, which will develop in the heart of the adolescent and promote corresponding tendencies, an extensive feeling of social involvement and the ability to really feel oneself a firm part of a great entity. Voluntary discipline, a spirit of mutual aid and joint work, self-government based on total equality, acting together wherever possible, a variety of labor actions and the aspiration to create a joint complex result are the principles which, alongside with the study of the past and the present of mankind under the light of scientific socialism, will give us the type of citizen we need and which can never be raised by the bourgeois school, which can produce only egotists or sheep. We may find repulsive the objectives of the school in bourgeois circles but at least a few of their methods which are practiced better by bourgeois educators deserve our attention. The truly intelligent and experienced educator cannot fail to notice that labor is the single magic word which answers the three questions of how to develop willpower, how to mold a character and how to promote a spirit of cohesion.

Naturally, willpower cannot be developed other than by developing varied and expedient activeness. Obviously, this is achieved with a properly organized teaching of labor which, in this case, involves a combination of games and sports. Character features which we consider as the most desirable are persistence, industriousness, a feeling of cohesion, etc.

However, all such character features stem, according to the categorical assertion of individuals who deal in pedagogy, entirely naturally from labor upbringing. Finally, since we do not mean in the least by labor education the training of people in individual artisan work but familiarity with labor processes and collective work of a factory-plant type, we introduce in the schools themselves the great collectivizing force which has welded and hammered out the unity of the contemporary proletariat. From the educational point of view, the socialist school must most extensively promote the labor principle which is being introduced timidly and in a twisted way in progressive bourgeois pedagogy.

However important the labor principle may be in developing willpower, character and cohesion, beneficial results can be achieved in these areas only with a properly organized school life. This applies above all to fraternal and loving relations among students, based on equality. It follows from this that no strictness, no punishment should be applied in the renovated school. One of the questions asked in America of candidate teachers is the following: "Do you consider able to maintain discipline in the classroom without resorting to punishment?"

Every teacher in the renovated school should be able to ask himself this question. As the experience of American and Norwegian schools has proved, sufficiently gay and intensive work literally eliminates from the classroom all incidents which, in the opposite case, lead the teacher to apply disciplinary penalties. The only rule applicable to school discipline is "know how to keep the children interested."

The teacher must be familiar with the interests of the students. He must not appear to the latter like a chief, belonging to some kind of special breed, boring and judgmental, totally unrelated to the adolescent. He must be the senior among the children, the senior brother in a large family, which is what the school is.

The children must participate in all aspects of school life. To this effect they must enjoy the right to self-government and engage in constant active mutual aid. As they prepare themselves for becoming citizens of the state, they must feel themselves the citizens of their school as early as possible.

School self-government by the students could be divided into three areas:

First, student participation in the managing councils of the school, in accordance with the regulations included in the appended Regulation on the Unified School;

Second, self-government by strictly student groups. In this case we must avoid the greatest error of the American school: singling out, on the basis of elections, a kind of small tyrants or permanent oligarchs, which evil is worsened even further if such an oligarchy is appointed by the teachers. The class or any other group of students should be able to engage in self-government jointly. To this effect the largest possible number of duties must be established; such duties must be divided into several areas, starting with an expert umpire in games, judges, spokesmen for the class in dealing with the teachers and students in charge of the blackboard, cleanliness in the classroom, order in the cafeteria, etc.

Such positions should not have a long-term tenure. The children should hold them from 1 day to 2 weeks and be replaced either on the basis of a roster or by drawing lots. The wise Athenian democracy implemented these principles even in the tragically serious matter of administration of the state, fearing electoral intrigues and pseudodemocratic coercion. Naturally, in the latter case great harm could be caused. In the self-government of school students, which apply to very minor matters of their way of life, the good aspects of such a practice are far superior to disadvantages;

Third, the students must be given total freedom in the organization of all kinds of societies, whether permanent or temporary. Let them set up scientific circles, edit journals, organize political clubs and societies in charge of sponsoring exhibitions, sports, dancing, shows, choirs, orchestras, etc.

In this case the fraternal participation of teachers in such societies, on an equal footing with the students, is desirable. The school cooperative must play an invaluable educational and training role in such societies.

This is what defines internal school life in its general features. The public opinion of the students must be sufficiently strong and, if necessary, manifested through a certain social condemnation of those who violate such a real and free yet nonetheless firm order promoted by the school.

As to the school administration, it must apply the regulations presented in the appended Regulation on the Unified School.

The picture of such a school we have described is less ideal than it is at least entirely satisfactory and, from our viewpoint, cannot be implemented in one fell swoop.

The task of this statement is that by establishing a general type of school toward which we should aspire to link above all within this single objective the somewhat disparate features included in the various decrees which have already been promulgated or are currently being enacted and which will become mandatory with the new school year.

The true implementation of these plans depends to a tremendous extent on two conditions: first, the funds available to the state and, second, the extent of the training of the faculty.

Nowhere in the world do the central authorities maintain national schools entirely; everywhere the state seeks help: first, by charging tuition, something which has never been eliminated as yet anywhere and for any type of school; second, which is much more important, local population self-taxation. Under the present circumstances in Russia, we voluntarily reject paying for education and can hardly rely on any substantial local financial aid.

Nonetheless, despite the severe dislocation and desperate poverty in which our homeland was plunged as a result of a criminal war and the upheavals of the revolution, we have the right to expect of the awakened people and the state system it created a tremendous stress of efforts for the sake of properly organizing the most important area of the national economy, using this word in the broadest meaning of the term of main governmental concern: public education. Considering the present loss in the purchasing power of the ruble, we shall be needing immediately many billions of rubles and we are confident that we shall obtain them from the central Soviet authorities.

However, this does not take care of everything, for the dislocation has been manifested also in the extreme need for textbooks and school aids, many of which can neither

be bought nor developed at any cost. The special committees for school aids, which were set up in Moscow and Petrograd, have set as their objective the struggle to meet this need and, to the extent of the possible, will begin to solve this vital problem.

Having established the needs of the renovated school in this respect, we shall stop at no sacrifice; through mass production and mass purchases, including purchases abroad, and by establishing huge publishing facilities, warehouses and active shipments, we shall meet this specific hunger experienced by the Russian people. However, even if we eliminate the scarcity not only of money but also of other facilities, we shall unquestionably have a tremendous shortage of teachers.

We already mentioned the fact that the introduction of universal mandatory education, albeit on the simple literacy level, would be impossible for us to achieve this year because of the lack of sufficient numbers of somewhat trained teachers. We can speak only of the systematic expansion of the network of schools and the gradual enhancement of the schools to the level stipulated in the present declaration, at which point the disparity between the type of teachers we must have and those we do have becomes monstrous. If the clear objective we have set ourselves should urge us to work in all areas of this extensive and complex matter, it is clear that what we must do before anything else is to train teachers.

Last year we already set up in all guberniyas more than 100 short education courses to acquaint the existing teachers with the principles of the labor school and the new teaching methods. As of this school year such courses will systematically function throughout Russia so that all existing teachers will attend them in the next 3 to 4 years. At the same time, it has been decided to set up in each guberniya model labor schools in which live examples will be provided as to how to manage the new school.

Starting with this school year teachers will be assigned to higher educational institutions to improve their knowledge in pedagogical and general education subjects.

Nonetheless, all of this is quite insufficient if the renovated schools are to receive new teachers. The Soviet system does not forget even for a minute that the truly socialist labor school can be created and led only by the revolutionary teacher-socialist. The development of cadres of socialist teachers is one of the most important and responsible tasks of the People's Commissariat of Education. In order to achieve this objective it has been decided, above all, to provide in all pedagogical training establishments free access to all democratic elements who sincerely wish to dedicate themselves to pedagogical activities, regardless of the level of their previous education. The general development of those enrolling in pedagogical schools will be established through a colloquium.

All other conditions being equal, decisive preference will be given to candidates nominated by proletarian organizations and committees of the poor.

In the area of training the new type of teachers, the People's Commissariat of Education firmly supports the organization of a type of higher pedagogical school which will become a reliable nursery for socialist teachers, loyal to the interests of the toiling masses. Unfortunately, the total replacement of existing pedagogical schools by such a type of unified higher pedagogical institution is a matter for the future. Today, as a transitional step, we have undertaken the reorganization of all teachers institutes, training colleges and permanent educational courses into higher pedagogical institutions which should train extensively educated pedagogues, who can teach an entire set of related subjects. The same educational institutions will teach instructors for pre-school education, and extracurricular training, and instructors in charge of promoting labor principles in school life.

In order quickly to create new teaching cadres we intend, this very school year, to open a new set of annual pedagogy courses, making successful use to this effect of all democratic forces teaching in higher schools and pedagogical educational institutions.

In order to promote the scientific development of training and education problems and to train professors for pedagogical educational institutions, we have decided that this very school year we shall undertake, initially, the creation of perhaps one Higher Pedagogical Academy.

Propaganda among adults cannot restructure the soul of the people. The new schools are being created in order actively to help the spontaneous factors which operate in this area. The training of the new type of teachers will be half of the work needed for the creation of the new type of schools and a contribution to the creation of a new democracy.

A. Lunacharskiy, people's commissar for education

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

05003

History—Revolution—Man

1802004h Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) pp 63-82

[Text] *"History does nothing; it 'has no infinite wealth,' it 'does not fight any battles!' Not 'history' but specifically man, the real living person, is the one who does all of this, who has everything and who struggles for everything. 'History' is not a particular individual who uses man as a*

means of achieving its own objectives. History is nothing other than the activities of man pursuing his objectives" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 2, p 102).

"...The Real, the Living Person..."

O. Kuprin

History does nothing by itself. In this case the "author's copyright" entirely belongs to nations or, in simple terms, to people or, even more specifically, to individuals. And the individual, as we know, not only makes lofty plans but also errors, commits exploits and displays weakness. Both the greatest and the most shameful acts in history always assume a living human shape. That is why history itself is, in the final account, the science of man, of what he was, is and will be. It is precisely this kind of approach that we are short of today. That is what the readers of *Kommunist* write about. In order to make this topic clearer, I shall permit myself an aside.

Even as a child, I never liked "Do not touch signs in museums. This strictly forbids the subconscious wish of the child to touch history, such as the legendary cart from the period of the civil war, which is on exhibit at the Museum of the Revolution. But as we grow up this aspiration to "touch" is replaced by the burning desire to know, to know in all details, everything that occurred *then*. Even the most insignificant details of the great event, so insignificant as occasionally to make us smile, make this event come alive and become human and close to us. It is as though no 7 decades stand between us and it.

At the Winter Palace, the telephone switchboard operator on duty, who saw through the darkness Red Army men and soldiers mounting the final assault, reported to the provisional government that "a delegation of 300 to 400 people was approaching." The decisive onslaught was postponed several times. For nearly 8 hours a tight ring of rebels had surrounded the Winter Palace. Meanwhile, the ministers of the last bourgeois government in Russia had interrupted their long session to have dinner. While they were eating their soup, artichokes and fish, in the building on the opposite side of the square, the military district headquarters received the ultimatum of the military-revolutionary committee, demanding their surrender. Headquarters was given 20 minutes to decide. The ultimatum was carried from headquarters to the Winter Palace after an additional 10-minute extension was granted.

Twenty minutes, 30 minutes, an hour passed, and there was no answer. The "provisionals" had decided not to respond to the ultimatum, apparently hoping for something to happen. The leaders of the onrush no longer doubted their success. Nonetheless, they were very unwilling to cause casualties.... In Smolny, Lenin was

impatient. The opening of the Second Congress of Soviets had been postponed. Mensheviks and SR were making the situation more intense and recruiting supporters. Later, when gunfire was heard at Smolny, they became almost hysterical ("Our people are being shot at the Winter Palace!").

How to describe this great revolution in all its facets and the contradictions of living human affairs? During those minutes and hours it was filled with an incredible interweaving and confrontation of hope, despair, belief, passion, impatience, firmness and doubts felt by simple mortals, who had not as yet become legends.

Many other events were to take place until the point at which V.A. Antonov-Ovseyenko would open the doors of the Small Dining Room, and tell the ministers in the provisional government:

"In the name of the Military-Revolutionary Committee you are hereby arrested!"

And now, here are few letters to the editors.

To date the mail received by the history department of *Kommunist* is second only to the volume of letters received by the economics department. Only two of the dozens of letters I have read dealt with ancient times; the others were about the 7 Soviet decades. This was not in honor of the anniversary but an expression of the need to understand the significance of our days in the complex and contradictory process of building socialism, which became reality since the minutes and hours I mentioned. It was a need to interpret events not via statistics or chronology but in specific, ordinary, human terms.

"There is no historical process without human destinies, for this process always take place through specific events," writes A. Zinchenko, docent at the Vinnitsa Pedagogical Institute. "Of late the VUZ history textbook has been increasingly losing its emotional attractiveness, and the wealth and color of specific historical facts are yielding to sociological structures.... As the experience of the 20th century has eloquently demonstrated, if we deal only with millions of human destinies as part of social phenomena, the specific individual with his creative potential and life itself lose their significance. This is a most important moral lesson of history."

I agree with the author of this letter that historical laws can be understood with the help of the interpretation of the destinies of individuals, although I cannot imagine how could a "VUZ history textbook, covering any period, deal with living individuals." I do not know how to do this but I would like, for example, for the students to be able to imagine a January evening in 1918, the moment when A.M. Kollontay caught Lenin staring through a window in a darkened room. "Stars," Vladimir Ilich said. "What stars we have! Obviously, it is getting colder."

He turned to her: "Do you ever look at the stars in the sky?"

"When I am traveling across the ocean or in the countryside."

"The ocean? Oh yes, you have been to America! And I, since early adolescence, have been well-familiar with all constellations. I am beginning to forget them. No time..."

One minute later, this was entirely different person. It was reported to Lenin that sailors had organized the trial of Cadets in a kangaroo court. He immediately summoned V.D. Bonch-Bruyevich and picked up the telephone. He sent Kollontay to the Balts. "We shall not congratulate them for this. No. We shall not tolerate anarchy!" He was extremely indignant, although it was two of his political enemies who had been killed. Returning to Smolny, Kollontay found Lenin uptight and pale. He said: "Looking at stars, are we!"

I cherish this episode and although it does not add any particular knowledge about the first month of the Soviet system, it allows us, albeit in our imagination, to live in those unique times for a few minutes.

Over the past 2 years we have learned many new things about the recent past. An avalanche of facts has been hurled at us by newspapers, journals, the radio and television. Today soccer and hockey passions pale compared with the passion for history. Some call for "let us have more exposure!" others conjure us saying "enough! enough with this glasnost." And these "others" lose their restraint sometimes to such an extent as to write to *Kommunist*: "Just look, many of our newspapers are using phrases as though written in the West. The idea comes to mind that perhaps the repressions of 1937 and 1938 were not all that groundless."

The first call for repentance and the second for confining to oblivion. These, however, are extremes. Separating them is an incredibly varied kaleidoscope of views. But everything is drowned by the demand "to know! We must know everything!" One cannot disagree with this. At the same time, this emotional carousel around serious history works creates confusion in some and objections in others objecting to the honest search for the truth. "We must not revise the past and change our minds on the eve of the Great October," we read in a letter to *Kommunist*. Such social moods, in the words of another reader, "under the conditions of glasnost occasionally trigger violent dogmatic attacks against innovative scientists."

We speak of the need for new approaches, a new style of thinking in politics and economics. However, a new style of thinking is equally necessary in history. "A historical way of thinking can be truly developed when the people learn how to experience history rather than simply act as judges sitting on the bench of our time," writes from

Kiev Lieutenant Colonel Candidates of Philosophical Sciences P. Demchuk. This is well put: To experience. In other words, we must judge from the human standpoint the achievements and errors of our predecessors in assessing our own affairs, convictions and doubts, making use of their experience and not separating ourselves and our own time as something having its own intrinsic value, lacking historical roots or responsibility to the future. However our predecessors may have lived or whatever they may have done, we are their extension from the global historical and strictly ordinary viewpoints. Actually, the former is nothing other than the integration of the latter.

Many of those who have written to *Kommunist* take seriously to task the science of history, and not only it alone, noting that glasnost should not be limited exclusively to criticizing that which we should reject. Equally important is the study of that which we could use in order for history to become a practical science as well. To speak and write about the achievements of socialism in pompous intonations (were they not, among others, responsible for our stagnation?) means to avoid real contradictions and their sober analysis, to separate achievements from their substantive grounds and from the "real, living person," who "has done all of this, has mastered all of this and has fought for all of this." With increasing insistence the readers call for "serious studies of the moral and psychological climate which prevailed in the country for the entire period after the victory of the Soviet system" (A. Valonov, Leningrad). Specific problems to be studied are also cited, such as the psychology of the combat and labor heroism of the Soviet people during the war years. Economists are citing amazing statistics on the incredible increase in output during the most desperate months and years of the Great Patriotic War, after the loss of the largest industrial centers, as well as equally incredible increases in the growth of labor productivity under conditions which, to say the least, were worse than Spartan. The figures are known, they are staggering, whether it is a question of the labor accomplishment or the sacrifices made by the Soviet people. But if even dry statistical "materials" are staggering, what can we say about the spiritual and moral explosiveness of such material? Do historians and psychologists have the right totally to surrender this to works of literature and the arts?

Also understandable is the fervor with which N. Chuykin, a war veteran who lives in Travniki Village, Chelyabinsk Oblast, "defends" the 1930s. Always, throughout the 70-Soviet years, the honest Soviet people struggled and worked selflessly. Whatever may have happened, life has always been many faceted and multi-dimensional. Such was life in the 1930s as well, which was perhaps the most contradictory period in our history. In order to realize such contradictions, asking over and over again the same question is not enough. The more questions, the more strictly ordinary questions are asked, the greater becomes the possibility of acquiring a full picture of the past.

That period was followed by other years, the 1940s, the crucial years which were then followed by a "flood of feelings" of 1945 and the hunger of 1946. Another great exploit was the short time which it took to rebuild the national economy, which was no less a "miracle" than the rapid conversion of industry to war production in 1941 or the launching of the first space satellite in 1957. Each one of these and subsequent major and minor "miracles," however, has a very specific human dimension which is always complex, for it contains joy, pain, something touching and something cynical, something heroic and something cowardly. Some things must be rejected and some preserved as our own, as the legacy of our fathers or grandfathers.

In order for our present changes to be truly revolutionary and develop without the screeching sounds of old hindrances we need, as our weapon, as our practical support, the revolutionary experience of the entire 7 decades of the past. We need the blocks of 1917 and 1945 and the achievements of those other days and years. They must become part of us as we make our present decisions and take actions which will then be weighed on the scales of history. Today the extent of their significance may not be appreciated properly, the more so if we do not particularly wish to do so. We could simply ignore them, the way the switchboard operator at the Winter Palace initially failed to realize that he was witnessing the culminating point of the main event of the 20th century.

Time will put everything in its proper place. Today, however, it is we who must decide and act. Everyone in his own place. By itself, history does nothing.

A Reader's Suggestion

Periodicals are publishing works by Andrey Platonov, previously unfamiliar to the readership at large. Many people are interested in his career. He started as a journalist in Voronezh. I believe that the readers of *Kommunist* will be interested in the article by this 20-year old journalist, which was published in Voronezh's *Krasnaya Derevnnya* on 4 August 1920.

V. Verin, Moscow

Red Labor

A. Platonov

Most of the building of an electric power plant has been completed in Shaturskiy Rayon, Ryazan Guberniya, not far from Moscow.

That station was built on thick peat strata in a useless, wild, unsettled area, on deserted swamps. The peat which is dug in this district will be sent to the station and will power its machinery; the energy such machinery will

generate will turn into electric power and, by wire, across 100 versts, will flow to Moscow, to power its factories, plants, streetcars and meet other needs of Russia's red center.

The power plant is not yet entirely finished. All it can do for the time being is generate the power it needs for its own construction. However, that is what matters most: on this accursed slumbering swamp, foggy and deadly quiet, it would be difficult for a person to stand up firmly on his feet. This is a precious first blow at a sluggish, hard, stubborn and hostile force frozen in these barren, cold, silent lands.

This is a path of the trust, faith, goodness and firmness of the man frightened by no struggle, to extract from the ground the good for his life.

When the construction of the new great useful waterfall—the Shaturskaya Electric Power Station—was undertaken, there were many who did not believe that any project could be undertaken now, when even nails are in short supply, and that no power can draw the worker masses to the hungry Ryazan Guberniya.

A few good people, perhaps motivated by the sense and urgent need alone to provide Moscow's industry with free energy, so that it would no longer depend on roads, on bringing in fuel and on poor railroads, and for many other reasons, undertook the almost impossible, almost miraculous project of generating power out of powerlessness. It is this power that will revive, intensify and strengthen this working country.

There exists in the Russian people a secret hidden shy feeling, a feeling of deep love and faith in the need for and the fact that the Russian people will never sell out, never lose faith in their own power. For they know that their errors are their own, and that if they curse the soviets, they know that they are cursing themselves. "We strike at those we love."

Lenin was the first to understand this feeling, and it was on its basis that he undertook with such confidence and firmness to structure the policy of protecting workers and peasants from European capitalism which was baring its teeth. It was the same feeling that was subconsciously sensed in building of the Shaturskaya Electric Power Plant, believing that the workers will answer the call to work. This feeling was justified by the people who built the Shaturskaya Power Station. However, they faced a wall: the workers were asked not simply for their labor but for heroic labor, for sacrificial labor and, perhaps, for deadly labor. To build without tools, without materials and without bread means marching against the bayonets of the kulaks and fighting steel with wooden sticks. Nonetheless, they did it simply with their belief that they could win, they could break through, peeling off their skins on the wall of impossibility and creating

instead of the former easy slavish labor, when everything was handy, a new labor, a powerful labor which can create everything—red labor, combat labor.

It was only the heroes of the new life—the communists—who were able to organize such a combat labor. The mass of the workers, however, did not in any way fall behind the managers, the communists-engineers, but together with them they hungered and died in the forest swamps and, with equal cunning, learned how to make something out of nothing.

The workers realized the general purpose of the work and consciously marched to success.

There were no leaders or laggards. There were equally stubborn and daring people. It was there that, for the first time, they showed everyone the way one should work now.

From Private Files

'How Beautiful It Is to Struggle in the Open'

From a letter by Engineer V. Sentsov, Uralmash builder, to his wife:

20 September 1928

I am working hard. Recently we were still on the ground and now we are already almost 4 meters above it and proudly look at the crowns of sad barren birches and evergreens which surround us. "Tasty" red brick is laid in even rows. Soon we shall start using reinforced concrete.

Go, go, let us finish faster!

28 November 1928

Winter has come to Sverdlovsk, serious and for the duration. There is frost, moonlit sparkling nights, and the beauty is breathtaking. I have spent an entire month running around Sverdlovsk and am still unable to buy an overcoat. None is to found! Nor are there any sheepskin coats! I am forced to resort to all kinds of "intermediary structures."

3 December 1928

Another painful aspect of the construction project is the developing "haste." Naturally, we are hurrying toward our set objective of catching up with and outstripping Europe, and frequently, thoughtlessly, make errors. That is what occurred at the Mashstroy as well. In one of the shops, on the insistence of the chief engineer, the foundations were improperly laid (the shop for metal structures, which was solemnly inaugurated). Improper planning resulted in major faults.

Naturally, these are merely petty and annoying matters which, frequently, can be quite unpleasant. The scope is gigantic, the course is the right one, all that we need is to pursue it and consider everything thoroughly.

13 December 1928

As I already wrote to you, they want to make me a "rationalizer," and are trying to see in me a person who can connect production assignments with designing. However, I am not abandoning my own construction project. As you can see, there is a great deal to do. I would very much like to introduce aspects of rationalization among the workers. This is necessary.

Yesterday I attended an interesting debate: "Should we allow risk in production?" A number of vital problems were discussed.

2 February 1929

Last Monday I heard the report on the building of the huge plant at Magnitnaya Gora. This is a specific step toward the implementation of the famous Ural-Siberian project. This will mean commissioning a huge plant in the Urals, costing 200 million rubles, which will use Ural ores and Siberian coal! This is splendid.

12 February 1929

The work is proceeding but sluggishly. The circular steel girders are beginning to be assembled at the big shop but, for the time being, the laboratory is dead. Two or three people are tinkering with it. Yesterday I heard with the greatest enjoyment the gentle music played by the Vilom Quartet. The last few days I had been particularly tense and I reacted particularly strongly to the touching melancholy music.

26-28 February 1929

As I wrote to you, a guy came to me last Sunday, who graduated from our institute last February. He came to "find a job." I did not know him from the institute, he is older. This unasked-for acquaintanceship (he is leaving tomorrow, he has found a job somewhere in the Urals) convinced me once again of the sad fact that the public is being "repainted" from the protective coloring acquired in the VUZ to an open, clear and sometimes unpleasant but natural coloring. This one was a typical "specialist."

I must tell you that some among this endless number of engineers are interesting people. I consider as such the exceptionally simple and, it seems to me, quite modern architect Robachevskiy (the chief designer). He has been frequently elected member of the city soviet.

His opposite is Kolyadov, a former contractor, a most clever and cunning individual "in his own way." He is not harmful, there is no question about that, but nor is he sincere, and he is extremely tricky. Superficially, he

looks better than that unfortunate little student who came to see me. He displayed the type of deliberate apolitical attitude toward life which, nonetheless, hides the harmful nature of yesterday's proletarian student, the peevish mentality of an older person, and the desperate aspiration not to sell himself cheaply, but for as high a price as he can get. Unwittingly the idea comes to mind that our VUZs lack something. He will not harm the production process or the "service." But this "red engineer" is cowardly, like a rabbit. Who has given him his high title?

10 March 1929

This is a real revolution! In the next few years we must change both the materials with which we build and the design. One can feel the pleasant inspiration, the novelty and logic of the ideas in their entire magnitude. I particularly liked the idea which V. stressed about the need to create a happy home for the working people. This is a profound truth!

19 March 1929

It is true that I am "incorrigible" optimist! Let me tell you confidentially that this is a difficult period for me. The terror of Mashstroy, chief engineer Fidler, has arrived and today, in one stroke of the pen he "abolished" as unnecessary the concrete plant, which is the first link, the first harbinger of our reconstruction initiatives! This was none of my business but I nonetheless decided to "fight." Although I lose materially by remaining on this job (I could at this point find a better job in Sverdlovsk), I feel a certain satisfaction, roughly like having carried out a combat assignment! We must put an end to everything that is old, naturally after having used all of its positive features! On matters of contemporary revolutionary interpretation of construction work, I deeply feel that I am right.

21 March 1929

There has been a squeeze in credits, added to Fidler's classical "conservatism" in the area of construction processes (he considers possible, given the current development of our disciplines, that a shop could be built of granite, with walls half-a-meter to 1-meter thick!), whereas we had hoped for a substantial subsidy.

23 March 1929

The general uncertainty of expectations, the lack of clarity, the confused situation, are exceptionally unnerving. I have even thought of submitting a request to deal with problems of rationalization and, should I fail to receive a clear answer, ask to be relieved from work in this bureau. However, this is cowardly. Today I saw the movie "Mutiny" based on Furmanov's novel. I found it embarrassing to hesitate in my "peaceful struggle." How beautiful it is to fight in the open, face to face!

4 April 1929

The chief engineer has "switched from anger to kindness," listened to our "fabrications" and kindly approved the draft (sketch) for a concrete manufacturing plant.... I attended a concert given by Neygauz and derived great pleasure from the powerful and touching Beethoven music.

11 April 1929

It turns out that within a 5-year period 600 million rubles will be invested in the Ural-Kuzbass. What a project! What a tremendous and unparalleled scope everywhere! Once again I think that we live in most wonderful and incomparable times.... What a life! And how much remains for the people to do, what great projects for an unclear and challenging future. And what a great and embracing happiness it is to love, to know that one is loved in this great alluring world.

From Memoirs

'No Change As Yet...'

At the Central State Archives of the October Revolution and of the Higher Authorities of the State and State Leadership of the USSR, there is a cable, dated 1935, of a talk with K. Butenko, at that time the technical director of the Kuznetsk Metallurgical Combine. Excerpts from it give us an idea not only of the times but also the concerns, hopes and worries experienced by one of the captains of industry of the period and the problems which confronted the Soviet economy.

Ordzhonikidze made me technical director of the Yenakievo plant. I must say that matters have improved rapidly. In addition to the fact that five blast furnaces have reached their planned capacity, a sixth blast furnace has been commissioned and output has reached 2,200 tons of iron per day. This is unparalleled in the Soviet Union.... Three to 4 months later Ordzhonikidze came. He toured the plant. He liked the collective, including myself, Korobov, the chief of the blast furnace shop, Berlin, the chief of the Bessemer shop and Pyatigorskiy, the chief of the rolling shop. He asked us: "You, comrades, when were you born, in the 19th or the 20th century?"

I answered: "We are all people of the 20th century, born in 1901, 1902 or 1903." This pleased him. He said: "Fulfill the semi-annual program and I shall note this. On the other hand, if you fail, I shall shame you throughout the union without any hesitation."

We fulfilled the program. I received a telegram, a second and a third. Korobov and I were awarded automobiles. All shop chiefs were awarded automobiles.

Ordzhonikidze and I met frequently. Whenever I went to Moscow, I went to his office or, frequently, he would invite me home, if he was unwell or it was his day off. He has a sick heart. Once he summoned me on the red telephone and said: "You must go to Kuznetsk." I asked: "When, how?" "The sooner, the better."

The moment I arrived in Kuznetsk, questions began to circulate: Whom will I replace? There were rumors that I would mandatorily start kicking people out and that I would be bringing with me, from the south, a trainful of people. I said that those who are unsuitable would have to be laid off and those who know their work and do it properly will remain. I knew that in Siberia one does not scatter people. I considered prejudicial to insist on bringing my own people, people from my native area, so that my assistant could be someone close to me, a second assistant also, as well as many other people who may be loyal to me although otherwise worthless. I oppose such nepotism and gangs.

In the final account, people are the same everywhere. All of them must be suitably charged and shown the proper way and after that we must choose among them people who will be appointed to increasingly high command positions, while those who are here for reasons of family connections or for any other similar considerations must be kicked out mercilessly.

It was believed that since this is Kuznetskstroy, it should be given everything. At first the people behaved like heroes but then became dispirited.

During the first years of construction the plant administration machinery became corrupted. In the past Kuznetskstroy was under the personal control of Ordzhonikidze, the party's Central Committee and the Soviet organizations. There were plenty of people, all that it took was to find them jobs. The people became accustomed to the fact that it was sufficient to send a cable and they would receive everything. The situation changed starting with the second half of 1933. All shock construction projects were halted. In order to obtain something it was necessary to submit a request on time and, furthermore, to substantiate it.

The distribution system had to be converted into a procurement-supply, a commercial apparatus. The old tradition remains of waiting for subsidies, waiting for money from Moscow. There is still no turning point, there is no awareness that unless you earn it no one will give you money.

Stakhanovites have appeared among us. But in what area are we lagging? I must say that it is in the wage system. Although we have done a great deal of work on the wage system, we have made it all too scientific and the workers cannot understand it. This matter must be simplified and wages must be based on a progressive scale and paid daily. There should also be daily corrections to the wages for poor work: no payment should be made for defective

products and, following the progressive system, wages for good work could even reach 200 rubles daily. We have no such system as yet and we are only developing it.

We are currently using the following system: anyone who sets a new record is given a prize by a jury and his name is published in the press. The wage system itself should single out such people so that we should not be looking for Stakhanovites, as we are doing now, but look directly at earnings: if a person has earned a thousand rubles monthly it means that he is a Stakhanovite. There is no reason to look for him. His picture should be taken and published in *Bolshevistskaya Stal*, etc.

Another problem is that of high production costs. We must harness materials and determine how many bolts, nuts and screws we have available. It turns out that we have 300,000 rubles' worth, which we do not need. All of this must be determined, put together and put to some use.

Last year there was an outflow of workers. How to keep them on the job? The main thing is their material and, naturally, moral situation and the condition of party and trade union work. I have done something which, to some extent, is illegal: I had granted a number of privileges to the old production workers, such as tramcars, free baths and additional time off. This helped us to keep people but now I have eliminated these benefits as being inconsistent with the spirit of the time. We are now granting privileges to frontrankers not because they have worked 3 to 4 years but for good, for excellent work.... We have no business supporting parasites, and feed them merely because they have lived in Stalinsk 3 to 4 years. We must give preference to those who have distinguished themselves and those are the people who should have priority in housing.

Just A Single Fact

A. Dorodnitsyn, academician, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Computer Center:

Hundreds of books could be written on what the October Revolution gave the peoples of the Soviet Union and other countries. Many such books have already been written. However, the entity consists of individual elements, of separate facts. Occasionally, a single fact could make greater impression than the reading of a thick book with a large number of statistical data.

My working career began in 1929, for which reason I was able to notice both old and untouched aspects of life as well as the first shoots of new developments, practical embodiments of the ideas of the October Revolution.

The first 6 years (1929-1935) I worked in seismic petroleum surveys. We worked in the remote outlying areas of the former Russian empire, in terms not only of the distance from the center but of the level of civilization: the area of the Northern Caucasus, which covers part of

Daghestan, Checheno-Ingushetiya and the southern part of Kalmykiya, the Northern Urals, Bashkiriya, and, finally, Turkmeniya. The "wildest" of all of them was Turkmeniya.

Before the revolution, only 1 percent of Turkmens were literate. This applied essentially to the Muslim clergy and a small percentage of wealthy urban residents. We, survey geologists, however, did not work in the cities. We surveyed territories inhabited by nomads, among whom illiteracy was total.

I was sent to Turkmeniya as chief of expedition, although I was not even 22. I am not implying that you should think, "what a clever person, 22-years old and already made chief of expedition." The point is that at that time our country was still very young. The oldest of my colleagues, a chief of seismic survey expeditions, was 28. It is a fact, however, that I did not have the slightest idea concerning financial regulations. Our entire labor force consisted of nomad Turkmen to whom I paid their wages but who could not sign for them. I kept sending reports with unsigned vouchers to Leningrad, to the Petroleum Geological Survey Institute. When I returned from the expedition, I was presented with a "pleasant surprise:" the bookkeepers had rejected the reports and I was held liable for the missing funds. I went to the chief bookkeeper and explained the situation. "So what are we to do?" he asked. "I do not know," I answered and jokingly added: "Why not sign for my own workers?" "Do you know how to use their alphabet?" "Naturally." I used Arabic lettering (at that time the Turkmens were using the Arabic alphabet), signing for all workers on all vouchers. It was thus that I was exonerated. Naturally, the bookkeeper had broken the law but he understood perfectly that had I been a swindler my financial documents would have been entirely in order.

Although this geological survey stage in my life contributed nothing to my further activities, I do not consider these 6 years wasted. They were of great educational importance.

I must admit that some of our people, the "Europeans," were to a certain extent affected by European arrogance. I must point out that work in expeditions in the distant areas of our country cured me entirely from this fault.

One of our workers was a 19-year old boy name Kurt which, in Turkmen, means wolf. Unlike other nomad workers, who spoke virtually no Russian, Kurt was quite fluent and understood the Russian language although, like all the others, he could neither read nor write. He amazed us with his curiosity. "How can this be: You make an explosion and determine whether there is petroleum or not?" In simple terms, naturally, I explained to him the nature of seismic surveys. He understood and became enthusiastic. He wanted to see quickly whether there was petroleum in their area. He

worked "like a beast," digging holes or setting the charges. "Boss, come on, come on," he urged me on when the surveyors were slow with installing the seismographs.

It was quite interesting to talk with him on general topics, including philosophy and religion. He never said "I do not know." He always had his own views which, naturally, were frequently naive. Occasionally, however, he made amazingly apt remarks and made me think about the accuracy of my own views.

Here is another example. Our explosives dump was guarded by four militiamen on a round-the-clock basis. Their senior spoke virtually no Russian and my discussion with him took place with the help of a Russian-Turkish dictionary (I was unable to find a Russian-Turkmen dictionary and perhaps no such existed at all). One of the militiamen (Babayev was his last name, although at that time nomads had no last names) spoke Russian fluently. Furthermore, he spoke like an intelligent person. In addition to Russian he spoke Farsi. He was used as interpreter in discussing matters with the captains of barges which brought from Persia water to Gasan-Kuli, the rayon center (in his childhood Babayev had been a farmhand in Persia, working for rich landowners).

At one point we received a new shipment of explosives. We delivered it to the dump late that evening. It was precisely Babayev who was on duty. Together we counted the number of cases of ammonal and I asked him to sign the receipt. "I do not know how to write," Babayev said. I was amazed, but in order not to embarrass him, I said: "Well, sign in Turkmen." "I do not know how to write in Turkmen." Only then did it become clear that he was unable to read or write in any one of the three languages which he spoke perfectly. "But how come you speak Russian so well?" "I love to listen to the radio."

All of our Leningrad members of the expedition were amazed to learn that Babayev was illiterate. Unwittingly I thought: Had history been different, what would he have been? Probably an outstanding linguist or diplomat.

Such was the situation then. However, the sun had risen over the horizon. The Gasan-Kuli settlement already had a school and all Turkmen children were learning and helping their parents to read the necessary papers and even sign for them financial documents. In Turkmeniya I met with the first future Turkmen and Uzbek geologists (they were student trainees). Subsequently, my Uzbek acquaintance became a noted scientist and USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member.

Today it is even embarrassing to speak of literacy and the number of Uzbeks, Turkmens and Tajiks and members of all other "outlying" nationalities in our country

with a higher education has by far exceeded the percentage of literacy which existed in the final pre-October days and no noticeable differences may be found in the cultural standards among all of our more than 100 nations and nationalities.

This is merely a single fact but it proves a great deal.

'I Am Not Begging for My Life...'

A volume of A.F. Pushkin's works, held together with wire, was found in a solitary cell in a prison in Kerch, liberated from the fascists. Among the lines, Nikolay Kokarev, a Black Sea fleet seaman, had written his last letter.

14 October. These are the last minutes of my life. I am sitting here waiting for them to come and tell me to get out, and then I shall be shot. Last night they checked my cell six times to make sure that I had not escaped. How much I wish to live! Not because I am afraid but because I have done so little for the homeland. Never mind, my comrades, who are free, will do it for me. Oh, my dear compatriots, avenge us, we, who were shot in German prisons....

It looks as though the time of our death has come. And so, farewell, I am waiting for my death, the time of my death has come. The end will come in 5 to 10 minutes. My grave in the Kerch jail is in the yard, in the corner where a wrecked GAZ vehicle stands. I saw it being dug. If someone would read this please take this to my family and tell my son, he is already 5, that his father died for his happiness and for the happiness of millions of Soviet children in the future.

Death tricked me, it did not come now. I do not know when it will, perhaps in the evening of 15 November 1943. How depressing it is to be alone in this entire jail, with a heap of guards, it is even ridiculous. No, it is better to live than to die. I have lived no more than 25 years and am into my 26th. Oh destiny, there is now not even one chance in a hundred to escape. Well, I shall not die in vain but for our own cause which is just and must win. Farewell sunlight and people, farewell surface of the earth, I am going under you. I do not believe in the miracle of rescue. It is hard to believe in a miracle today and the enemy is merciless and gives no quarter. Nor do I wish such mercy. I am not a beggar begging for life, I am nothing but a Soviet person, simple, proud and independent. I am dying for my friends, the land and the happiness of our people, whose future will unquestionably be happy.

And so, farewell forever.

Nikolay Kokarev, 14 November 1943.

Grains and Shoots

Anatoliy Fedorovich Baka is chairman of the Kolkhoz imeni Ivanenko, Mirgorodskiy Rayon, Poltava Oblast. In talking about himself, he ironically pointed out that "I have spent so much time calling upon others to remain in the village that at one point I myself ended up by linking my life to it." At that time he was a Komsomol official.

"At one point" seems to indicate a random choice. This, however, is inaccurate. Anatoliy Fedorovich, who was born in 1939 in Mikhaylovka Village, like his father and grandfather and his mother, has only continued their work as peasants, grain growers and plowers of the land.

He has been kolkhoz chairman for the past 12 years. The kolkhoz is one of the best in the oblast. Compared with 1985, in 1986 its labor productivity was 20 percent higher; the farm's annual profit is some 1.5 million rubles.

V. Katkov, *Kommunist* correspondent, spoke with A.F. Baka.

Correspondent: Anatoliy Fedorovich, had you been a historian....

A.F.: Why "had you been."... The idea of writing the history of our village has long been with me. Naturally, I have never been nor shall be a professional historian. Such a book could be written by anyone who has lived like I have. Naturally, this is a question of doing instead of shunning it. It would include history, psychology, drama, poetry....

Correspondent: Have you written poetry?

A.F.: I have. Dawn on the fields, the layers of chernozem turned over by the glistening plow, all of this dedicated to my beloved girl. This was a long time ago.

Correspondent: Memory is selective and life, as they say, consists of alternating darkness and light. What shall we begin with?

A.F.: Let us begin with the light, with the hope which is in the people. It is developing in them as a second breath. In the past we could not take even a single step without instructions, for it was said that those in the office knew what to do. Today the people try to understand everything. I recently visited the dairy complex, headed by Yelena Fedorovna Shpotta. It is nice to see the way she is managing. The salting shop she organized at the complex is a net income to the kolkhoz. I asked her what will come next? A bakery, she said: a peasant without his bread is like a shoemaker without shoes....

It is true that it is stupid for the village to feed on city bread. This fact is a social phenomenon, something which, on the surface, looks like a breakdown in the mentality of the peasant. The peasant has always had

good common sense and practical cunning, knowledge of the land, the habit of living in harmony with the laws of nature, the aspiration at all cost to provide for his home, relying on his own hands. In my view, these are untouched reserves for restructuring in the countryside.

If you insist on making a historian out of me, let us go back some, more than 60 years ago: the change from requisitioning to tax-in-kind was a turning point in rural life. The possibility of a choice and freedom of trade revived the peasant farms and the alliance between workers and peasants turned from a shaky slogan to real economic policy. Perhaps it should have been kept longer, and the question of the Food Program would have been different, or else would not have existed at all. What is the point of guessing....

Correspondent: Alas, this did not happen. At this point, obviously, let us consider some aspects of rural life of which little was said until recently.

A.F.: What? Let us recall perhaps essays on rural life by Valentin Ovechkin, which were published in *Novyy Mir*. Or else Aleksey Saltykov's motion picture "The Chairman," which has assumed a particularly relevant meaning today.

Something else, we were trained to think that social development takes place not by solving contradictions but by following a single direction, "from good to better." The results of this are known to all. I personally recall a great deal. I recall the rich harvest of the postwar 1947 and the whip of the mounted police: "We shall bury it in the ground, do not dare touch...." I remember how my fellow villagers worked for nothing, receiving nothing for their labor days and how later, on orders from above, with their own hands they reduced their farm plot to naught, taking milk and meat to the cities....

Today, happily, we live in different times and, as we look at the past, we do not let ourselves be bothered by the bad things. For it is only thus, as we study history honestly, in a party manner, along with our own lives, could we draw useful lessons from it.

The apparent simplicity of rural work triggers the illusion of the simplicity of farming the land. That is probably why the countryside has always received an abundance of "advice" on how to live and what to do: "consolidate—break it up;" "build machine tractor stations—close them down;" "plant grass—do not plant;" "plow the land—use mouldboards." It was this that created the bittersweet peasant folklore: "Where are you going?" "To the city." "Why?" "To be told what to do...."

Correspondent: What is the situation today with rural autonomy?

A.F.: Unquestionably, there have been changes for the better. The old habit, however, of telling the farmer what to do and how to do it, dies hard, and the "dead" are still "clucking at the living." I recently received a document: "The Kolkhoz imeni Ivanenko will plow so much land and use a mouldboard on so much. Procure lumber.... Build sociocultural projects.... Set up units without assignments...." There were 80 items.

What concerns us? The practice of bureaucratic administration is based on a certain mentality, and the habit of command creates the habit of obedience, blind and thoughtless. A paper such as the one I mentioned was issued to all oblast farms and I would not guarantee that some of my colleagues would simply give up, thinking that others know better....

Nothing could be worse for the cause of restructuring than such a voluntary abandonment of independence and the habit which lowers the dignity of the farmer, of relying in everything on instructions from superiors. On the practical level, the task of restructuring can be explained also as follows: developing good and socially useful habits and eliminating those that are harmful and lead to stagnation. When collectivization was promoted, the main difficulty was not that of the mass acceptance of the new principles of organizing farming but changing the mentality of the peasants, and developing the habit for collective work.

Correspondent: We were quite successful in this. The collectivistic morality became the base of the mentality of the contemporary peasant. In itself, this is an accomplishment of tremendous social value. Obviously, however, everything has its price: some attractive features of the toiler of the land were lost. Such features...

A.F.: For ages the peasant has collected from his table bread crumbs. We have somewhat ignored this noble custom. This may not be a very significant example against the background of the great scandals, the nationwide proofs of which we can see on television. The entire matter is that this scornful attitude toward bread, I believe, began when that same crumb of the labor of the peasant was carelessly dropped not into someone's hand but in the slop bucket.

Correspondent: Here is another historical association. The policies of the 1920s, which called for directing everything that was best and most progressive in terms of equipment, technology and culture, to the countryside, sounds quite relevant today. However, the bureaucrat and the conservative are not asleep. Is this not so?

A.F.: Forgive me for resorting to a somewhat incorrect comparison: some managers are like steers displaying a feature well-known to any veterinarian: they will accept 19 other steers but would punch the 20th. We do come across such mentality. For example, this would mean classifying independence into categories: some people are allowed to do something while others are not; a

laggard may be permitted something which would be forbidden to a frontrunner. We may be building a house for a kolkhoz member and selling to him at half price. We then receive a strict reprimand from the rayon executive committee, asking who allowed us to do that? Life, I answer, allowed us. It did not simply allow us but made us do it, for people will not be kept in the countryside with promises alone. And what efforts (and how many years!) had to be invested before a hospital could be built in the kolkhoz? Here again we have the "steer" argument: according to the rayon health department there is a surplus of hospital beds in the rayon. "Our grandmother should not leave Petrivtsev, where she is supposed to receive her medicine, and go to Myrgorod, where she has never been, even to see a fair!" Concern for the grandmother is also concern for her granddaughter. "It is not allowed." We thank the Poltava Party Obkom, where the argument in favor of the grandmother, for the sake of her granddaughter, was found convincing enough....

Correspondent: Obviously, the slogan of everything best and most advanced for the countryside applies to the social area as well. But then there is still the attitude toward the countryside as being the poor relatives, who should be satisfied not necessarily with the best. Peasant labor as well is still not all that aesthetic. In a livestock farm, for example, there is a stench which draws the rural girls to the cities.

A.F.: Is that so? Come and see our dairy complex: there is a sauna, scented baths, water massage, a dental office, a mental relaxation office, and upholstered furniture. What else do they have? They have their own laundry room, ironing boards and irons. They have a beauty salon.

I admit to being proud but not moved. Indeed, no one can forbid you from having a beautiful life (not in the philistine but in the true, the human understanding of the term). This is wonderful! That is what restructuring is all about.... Naturally, we cannot avoid the realities inherent in rural work, in the age-old land. The law of the field is that you will harvest what you sow. The "seeds" which the October Revolution planted in our lives, minds and souls are precisely such. They are great. This is the guarantee for our present and future successes.

From Private Files

'I Want to Help the Sovkhoz'

Letter to Raisa Yemelyanova, agronomist, Marinovskiy Sovkhoz, Akmolinsk Oblast, Kazakh SSR, by Pensioner V.P. Poselskiy:

2 August 1954, Shaturskiy Rayon, Moscow Oblast

Dear Agronomist Raisa Yemelyanova:

I read in the paper about your patriotic accomplishments in developing the virgin lands and I have decided to ask you a question: As other sovkhoses have done, do you intend to raise bees? As an agronomist you must be familiar with plants needed to make honey.

I am 60-years old and my specialty is that of apicultural instructor. I have 40 years of experience. I am now retired but I would like to help the sovkhos in developing beehives and caring for them. I know that there is apiculture in Akmolinsk Oblast. Please discuss this matter with the sovkhos director.

It is necessary for a crop-growing sovkhos to have a pollinating area for more than simply collecting honey. Unquestionably, the sovkhos would have an orchard, which would also require bees. Initially it should buy 50 bee families, which would compensate for all expenditures.

If young people are going into the development of new lands, an old man will not fear to do some work in his own field.

'Our Own Dialectical Law'

From letters by Romualdas Dabkus, graduate of the department of philosophy, Moscow State University, chairman of the Krasnoye Znamya and Zarya Kolkhozes (Lithuanian SSR), to a Moscow comrade, 1956-1960.

Forgive me for leaving without saying good-bye. Do not be offended. It simply happened. The story you got on my appointment was wrong. There was nothing legendary about it. It was precisely the opposite: "It is up to those who are drowning to...." and so on. You remember what happened in our department: in 1954 it was realized suddenly that the country had an overabundance of philosophers. Students in the junior courses began to transfer to other departments. Graduates were assigned at random, even as beach supervisors (such was the story making the rounds in Moscow).

Even before the winter semester, during my fifth year, I had written a letter to the Lithuanian Komsomol Central Committee, describing my problems and asking for any kind of job in the countryside. The answer came quite quickly: I was offered to become chairman of a kolkhoz, in any rayon in the republic, my choice. Naturally, this was a strange offer. But what to do? Actually, I had spent my entire life in a village, I was familiar with peasant labor and had worked some for the rayon newspaper before enrolling in the university.

During the last winter recess I went home and visited the party raykom. I showed them the Komsomol letter and a kolkhoz was immediately chosen for me. Its chairman was a drunk. I never told anyone about it in Moscow, for which reason many people found my assignment unexpected.

The kolkhoz meeting was quite original. Having learned that I am not a devotee to the "green dragon," the muzhiks simply failed to come. Only the women gathered. No one showed any interest in the philosophy diploma. The raykom representative asked: "Who is against?" Silence. "So it is unanimous." "Who is for?" is apparently not customarily asked here.

The feeling here seems to be, the hell with it. The kolkhoz owes 388,000 rubles and 30 tons of grain. It has been years since the roofs of kolkhoz buildings have been repaired and they have become totally unsuitable. Generally speaking, everything has to be started from scratch. Crops have been neglected, people are not going to work but are drinking like hell.

You were asking about banditry. What there was here 5 years ago is no longer. There are no more killings. One of the old "heroes" is still making rounds in the villages to collect protection money. Those who are afraid give him all he asks. The more courageous refuse and he does nothing about it. We met once, and he greeted me very politely. I did not even know who he was.

I still frequently have to use philosophy. At meetings, at gatherings of the kolkhoz board and at casual meetings I am asked questions, such as "what is socialism?" and "how will it be under communism?" I describe to the people the nature of the kolkhoz system and the advantages of collective labor. You have no idea how serious all of this is. Kolkhozes were not established all that long ago in Lithuania and ours is not even 10 years old, while the mentality of the private owner took centuries to develop. On the psychological level as well, everything here is only beginning, so that I essentially practice my own area of training. Today here a philosopher is more useful than an agronomist. Naturally, my present "scientific" exercises are quite peculiar.

Here is an example. A girl joined the Komsomol without asking her parents. The father found this out by accident. That evening he came home drunk and kicked his daughter out of the house. You do not quote the Marxist classics to such a person. I spent an entire evening until nightfall talking to him. I do not know whether anything will come out of it. I have not been lucky. The people had barely begun to work decently and to trust me when we were hit by a horrible autumn. Rain. The winter crops were planted not too badly. Regardless of the difficulties, we were able to issue half-a-kilo of grain per labor day. I know that this is little but it is still more than last year. The weather was better then, but the ration was 300 grams.

My ideological opponent is the local Catholic priest. He looks like our professor Vasetskiy. He enjoys great influence among the people. At one point he started the rumor that the kolkhoz cattle is being kept hungry and within a single night my kolkhoz members removed from the brigade all the horses, everyone taking his own back. And this on the 16th (with the war, the 19th) year

of Soviet system! Can you imagine this? I spent an entire day, together with party organizer Babrauskas, riding from one farmstead to another, persuading and proving. We succeeded. I tried to challenge the priest to an open debate, but he avoided. He is afraid of the Moscow philosopher. At that point, together with the members of the Komsomol, we chose a proper play and somewhat changed the plot to fit local conditions. I was somewhat concerned that our satire would be in the spirit of Sasha Golodko and would not be all that refined. However, the Komsomols did not wish to soften the plot in the least. I took the risk and did not interfere. I did not know how believers would react to it. Everything went normally, and even well. Discussions on the play lasted a whole week.

Winter has come early here. The old people do not recall such a winter. Many kolkhozes were unable to dig the potatoes out. We lost only one hectare under the snow. This is considered a victory. However, a great deal of flax perished under the snow. We are currently trying to save some of it. The mood is disgusting, like after a test on dialectical materialism, as taught by Georgiyev, among first-year students. One feels totally helpless in the face of nature.

You may congratulate me with the greatest victory in the 3 short years of my chairmanship: we completed the building of a power plant. It is small and weak but it is our own. You may not understand my happiness, for how could a Muscovite realize what it means for an electric light bulb to start glowing in the old family home? We thus fulfilled our kolkhoz GOELRO plan, considerably after Lenin's, but nonetheless succeeded. Bear in mind that, as they say in Russia, "the entire world" became involved in its building and no one asked to be paid for it. These subbotniks were like practical exercises for my lectures on communist labor.

The need to go to Moscow is unbearable. I would like to visit the old small department and walk even once down Stromynskiy Hall. I remember less the luxurious hostel on Lenin Hills than Stromynka and the "K-F"—Philosophy Hall, this small departmental library with the highest intellectual density per square meter in the world.

In 3 years pork production per 100 hectares of plowland has nearly quintupled in our kolkhoz.

Do not throw my envelope away for it has my new address on it. The name of the kolkhoz is Aushra which, translated into Russian, means "Dawn." I am called the Gaganov of Utenskiy Rayon. The new kolkhoz is not such a wreck as was my first one, but it is at the bottom of all rayon statistics. Its income does not exceed 303,000 rubles per year. I am planning for 700,000 for the future, which is entirely realistic. As to the Gaganov initiative, it is a simple coincidence. You know my attitude toward initiatives. Honestly speaking, the transfer was the result of strictly personal reasons. The old

kolkhoz had become simply uninteresting. The possibility of doing something serious no longer existed in it or else I could not see it. I don't know. I can take a fresh look at the new place. Here future accomplishments are clearly visible. So, everything starts anew. Once again I am writing you under the light of a kerosene lamp. As we used to say, this is inspiring.

Life has presented me with yet another surprise. One day in June I received a letter from the CP of Lithuania Central Committee. A comrade, whose name was unfamiliar to me, was asking me to come to see him without saying why. In the past I had never gone higher than the raykom. Without wondering further, I went to Vilnius. I went to see the comrade at the Central Committee. Our conversation was short: "Are you the chairman?" "Yes." "Are you not fed up?" "I am not." "Don't you intend to work in philosophy?" "I do not. No time." "Here, however, there is time for thinking. Here is what we have thought about. You are more or less familiar with agriculture and, we hope, you have not forgotten your Marxism-Leninism, for which reason we are assigning you to another work, to the Lithuanian Agricultural Academy, as philosophy teacher. Your refusal will not be accepted. Have I convinced you?"

It is difficult to describe my feelings—both happiness and regret and something else. I had worked less than 1 year in Aushra. I now live in Kaunas and am writing a course of lectures on dialectical materialism. I have forgotten a great deal, and a great deal of material I perceive in a different way. Closest to me of all the laws and categories of dialectics is our own law of negating the negation.

History Must Be Beautiful!

O. Makarov, USSR cosmonaut

I cannot say that I was directly involved with the event I am about to describe, but I was an eyewitness to it. I joined Sergey Pavlovich Korolev's "company" straight from the institute, in the early spring of 1957. Work on the first man-made earth satellite was at its peak. I saw how this amazing thing was being done by very good people simply, with no pump and with true inspiration.

Man was going into the Unknown and, therefore, at every step had to solve problems which no one had considered previously, venturing yet, at the same time, acting quite commonsensically. For example, four sealed openings had to be made in the satellite. In simple terms, four leads had to be put inside, in order for the transmitter to produce the "beep-beep" which subsequently was enthusiastically heard by the entire world, to transmit the signal to the antenna but in such a way that there would be virtually no drain of gas from the satellite. No one in the past had been able to seal something so tightly, nor had this been necessary. In this case, however, control had reached down to the molecular level.

Tolya, a likable boy, was in charge of this sector. It was he who was in charge of installing the leads. He would put one, test it and find that it was not hermetically sealed. He would ring up Leningrad (where the leads were being manufactured): "Help, brothers! There is a leak! Keep trying!" In the evening he would take the train to Leningrad and there everything would seem normal. He would come back, he would install the lead in the satellite, and still a leak. I do not recall exactly how many nights, a week, 2 weeks or more, he spent on the train. Until it has been accomplished, something never appears great. No, sometimes it is only a long, exhausting and frenzied work.

It was decided that the first satellite should be spherical. Why? Because it is precisely a sphere that is the ideal shape for an object which, flying in any kind of environment and experiencing its friction that would allow us to determine its density. At that time we had virtually no knowledge of the upper atmospheric strata. So, it was to be a sphere. The designers designed it quite quickly. On paper everything is simple. But how to make it? Naturally, it should consist of two halves. The halves were made, they had two frames, two flanges, and screws on the outside. They were shown to Korolev. It was at this point that he made his famous statement:

"This is ugly! You are doing something historical; history must be beautiful!"

There are different ways of saying this. In that situation, this was said with the type of intonation which makes people want to pound on a desk. Sergey Pavlovich was not accustomed to concealing his feelings. The designers had a puzzle: the frames and flanges had to be mounted on the inside. They could be assembled but then how to screw them together? They figured something out and showed it. Once again they heard:

"This is ugly!"

As far as beauty was concerned, things were not all that successful. No molds had been made to manufacture such hemispheres. This was not an assembly-line automobile. A wooden dummy was made, lined with aluminum foil to give it the shape of a hemisphere. Naturally, it came out striped, for it had been shaped with a roller. It was more or less smooth, more or less rough, more or less...the next important discussion was as follows:

"How can this be! Could the first satellite in the world be a cripple! It must be a beauty! It must not simply withstand the pressure. It is a symbol! Do you understand?!"

I have no idea how many such talks were held with Korolev. Now, however, in many museums in the country (and not only in our country) the first man-made earth satellite is being exhibited. How many of them were made? A large number, and not only because

Korolev's company all of a sudden had nothing else to do. Today's museum exhibits are only approximations, efforts at reaching the perfection of the one and only, the first....

Anyone who lived at that time will remember the reaction to this flight throughout the world. Actually, it can be most accurately described as "staggering." The Soviet delegation to the United Nations was welcomed with applause. As to what was happening in the country....

This was 30 years ago. Today this event can be assessed more calmly and profoundly. I am speaking of a strictly human assessment above all, rather than a political or a scientific one.

Shortly before that we had developed the atom bomb. Everyone was relieved and our scientists were quite proud. This meant protection from the most terrible thing, a new war. However, I do not recall witnessing a nation-wide endless exaltation. Why? First, because this was a weapon. Second, because it was terrible. We simply had no choice, we were forced to do it. Unquestionably, it was a great accomplishment but not for the heart, but by the force of necessity.

The first satellite and, in general, the first steps taken by our cosmonautics.... In this case the mentality was entirely different, exploding in unparalleled happiness after the Victory, a happiness that was sincere and all-embracing. I have my own viewpoint about it, and here it is:

This began soon after the war. No more than 20 years had passed. Speaking in general, this was the first post-war smile. The people had become tired of fighting. And how much strength, health and nerves had been lost in rebuilding. The people were tired of the cold war, when a new threat was hanging over them like a Sword of Damocles. Yet only 12 years after a terrible war and not entirely smooth domestic events, we could allow ourselves to do something great and absolutely peaceful. If you wish, in terms of postwar necessities, this was absolutely not mandatory. However, it was a confirmation of health, frankness and goodness, for according to the old logic we should have concentrated on developing a more powerful rocket and a more terrible weapon.

Today we are speaking of a new way of thinking. At that time a new perception of the world developed in us. The optimism inherent in Soviet people was given a firm foundation. How fantastically popular were our first cosmonauts! To a certain extent, they became symbols, symbols of wisdom, strength, goodness and the nobility of the socialist system. Our joy was intensified by the fact that after the difficult and dark days of the civil war, after 1937 and 1941, after the concerns of the cold war, finally, the country had been able to invest its intellectual and material potential on that which is inherent in its socialist nature, in strictly peaceful, progressive and humane matters.

In my view, today cosmonautics is accepted as such an ordinary event not only because people have become accustomed to it but also because we have already put a considerable distance between us and the most tragic years in our history. Today something else as well must be demanded of cosmonautics. Whereas during the first years of the space age we could tell the world with full justification, "Look how strong and noble we are," now we must aspire toward having a suitable reason for saying "Look how efficient we are." This is from the economic viewpoint. However, it also has another facet, which is international, global.

Cosmonautics quite clearly proved to man that there is only one earth for all of us. Adding nuclear weapons, cosmonautics proved that, yes, a time has come when the physical possibility exists of losing forever this bit of civilization in the dead infinity of the universe. No, it is not merely a matter of cosmonautics and deadly weapons. Looking from above, from an orbit in space, one can clearly see what is being done with the earth by the huge chemical, power and extracting sectors. From there, from above, one can more easily sense, realize the entire extent of responsibility or irresponsibility of man. Where are we going, toward progress and prosperity or toward catastrophe?

All of us are children of the earth but no one better than the cosmonauts knows how beautiful and unique it is, having hammered out the great miracle of life. Its history and, therefore, our history must, in the final account, be beautiful and therefore human.

From Personal Files

BAM Brotherhood

In 1972 Vladimir Zamulayev, a graduate of Dnepropetrovsk University, went to work at the newspaper of the Metallurgical Plant imeni Petrovskiy. In the summer of 1975, as member of a Komsomol detachment, he went to the construction project of the Baykal-Amur Mainline. Shortly afterwards the detachment went home, but Volodya, as he is known to this day in the memory of his BAM friends, moved to Urgal, to the eastern section of the mainline. There he worked for 2 years as member of Ukrstroy, the special construction-installation train, first as fireman and later, after an incurable blood disease began to affect him, as carpenter. The last 6 years of his life, while he could still fight the disease, in his heart he remained with those with whom he had started, those whom he called his "BAM brotherhood." He died on 6 January 1985.

Recently the journal *Dalnny Vostok* published some of Vladimir Zamulayev's letters. Others are carefully preserved by his friends.

Following are excerpts from them.

November 1975, Station Khummi

Hello dear mother! I am answering your last two letters. My work is not tiring but restful, with a pick and shovel. More specifically: our mechanized column has been laying foundations under the tracks. The main thing is that I am with the people and I can see from the inside that which, had I worked for the newspaper, I would have seen from the outside. I have experienced personally what having a boss means. I can see how the chiefs live and why some are liked and others are not. The boys share their concerns with me and I share mine with them. You were asking about my plans. I shall remain here until the new year and after that I shall go the BAM itself. Do not be concerned. Write, kiss grandmother and grandfather. This summer I shall find some ginseng and bring it to them and they will become rejuvenated. I kiss you warmly.

April 1977, Urgal

Hello dear mother! I writing you in my spare time. For the time being, work at the armatures shop is finished. The next stage is to assemble the structures. Meanwhile, we are building a permanent rayon boiler room. It is the same old casings and panels and after that we shall be pouring the concrete. This will be completed before the armature shop.

Straight down from the settlement, on the side of the tayga, we can see the Ukrstroy buildings. On the other side are the tayga, the tents. This is my Urgal. When I first came here it was all covered in snow. I saw new steep-roofed hostels, like those in the Carpathian Mountains. I heard Ukrainian speech, and I was moved. I decided that I will work here, whatever happens. Naturally, for the time being we do whatever is needed, with hammers or picks but, mainly with shovels.

There will be a celebration for the detachment on 16 April. We will be celebrating the second anniversary of the stay of the Kharkov people in Urgal, such as Kolya Mirchuk. He did his military service in this area, his brother died at the Damanskiy and his grandfather personally knew Ivan Franko. Another one is the oldest, the 33-year old Roman Batyuk, who spent his entire life struggling for peace and who wrote poems about peace and happiness. All of us have felt that here one simply must write poetry! We simply must describe the starry hour of Urgal.

Mother, ever more frequently I believe that this is the best time of my life. Our brigade leader is a good specialist and is not afraid to argue with the bosses. We are pouring concrete on 2-meter high walls. This is my first armature shop!

It is sunny and feels like spring! I was pleased to hear that your wild rosemary has blossomed. Here everyone calls this flower wild rosemary, although Vitaliy says that it is rhododendron. A retired railroad man came here bringing with him 100 rubles' worth of books about Lenin and some apples. He wanted to work in Urgal. However,

since there are no locomotive engines yet, he was offered a job as a fireman. His heart is in it and he was pleased even with this job. He is now an apprentice stone mason. He will work some 3 months and will donate his wages to Ukrstroy. He is past 50. A romantic.

A girl came and asked to be sent to a brigade where people work without pay. Another one of us is Korostylev, a front-line veteran, a former officer, who works as a carpenter. On 8 March he flew to see his wife. These are the people with whom I work. Be healthy.

November 1983, Dnepropetrovsk

Let me answer your jealous question: "How did those friends of yours help you, where is your 'BAM brotherhood?'" I answer: They helped and are helping, they exist, and they live somewhere over there, leading a life which is no longer all that familiar to me but they remember me and consider me one of their own.

My generation is taking over from the previous one and my coevals have already firmly taken control of this world, the responsibility for this country and, finally, for their children. All of my friends have matured, their life has a meaning. This is their time of blossoming, of maximum returns, they have achieved something, they have become firmly part of this endless mechanism which we describe as the state, they have become part of it.

Here is a rather significant paradox: In 1975 I too thought of the machinery of the state, with this life in mind, as I do now. At that time, however, I spoke of my wish, of the wish of this small cog, Zamulayev to drop out of this machine. That is why I went to the BAM. How happy I was to get out of the newspaper cliches, meetings, method councils, and the rut of a career from the newspaper of the plant, to that of the city, the oblast, and so on. I left all of this behind to do what I wanted to do, to build the BAM, side-by-side with people like me, who hated and loved the things I did.

But dropping out of the machine is impossible, for it means dropping out of life. One simply must be stronger. At the BAM, among like-minded people, one simply rapidly matures and becomes wiser. Alone, you fail! It becomes not easier but more difficult and the contrast between light and darkness becomes stronger. I did not imagine that there would be beautiful cities along the BAM. Nonetheless, I wanted something to be left behind us other than buildings and engineering and technical equipment (and monuments to the pioneers).

Born in Krasnaya Presna

N. Kryuchkov, people's actor of the USSR

History lives in everyone of us, differently. This depends on one's age, practical experience and, very much so, on one's profession. If you happen to be coeval of great

events, one way or another, such events will become part of your biography and, perhaps, you will develop a strictly personal attitude toward them.

I was born in Krasnaya Presna. I remember it with the strong memory of a child, as it was before the revolution. My mother and father worked at the famous Trekhgorka. He was in the warehouse and she was a weaver. In a word, they were proletarians. To this day there is something of Presna in me, my roots are there. I remember the building of the cafeteria-kitchen (also known as "The Big Kitchen"), where the headquarters of the uprising was located in 1905, when I made my first appearance on the stage in an amateur play the title of which was "1905," and where, as a 10-year old boy I saw and heard Vladimir Ilich Lenin.

"Heard" is an exaggeration. I heard him but I was too young to understand anything. This occurred on the eve of the fourth anniversary of the October Revolution, after the subbotnik to which my mother went (by then my father had died).

For the subbotnik, we walked from Krasnaya Presna to Serebryany Bor and back. It was a long walk and we were tired. We ate a little and rested at "The Big Kitchen." Lenin was already there and had spent some 40 minutes somewhere nearby. At that time there was no solemn meeting as we understand it today but something like an evening of recollections. There were many children in the hall. Lenin spoke very briefly but then had a long talk with the workers. And although there were some 2,000 people, I remember this evening as one big common family holiday. The Great Revolution was a recent event not only in terms of time, but also as an event which had firmly become part of everyone's life. This could be felt more acutely than is felt today. Today we have become accustomed to many things.

In the 1920s the revolution gave amazing gifts to our workers. My mother was amazed to learn that I had decided to become an engraver-roller. Was this conceivable? In the past such people were considered the aristocracy of the working class, the factory owners built homes for them and they earned in a single month as much as my mother earned as a weaver in 6. This profession was passed on from one generation to another. No outsiders were allowed to come even close to it. And all I had to do was to go to the factory-plant school. No problem. While still in school I had shown a talent for drawing. That is what the revolution meant on the scale of our family, and one can imagine the drama at home, when after working for a few years in such a prestigious profession, the son suddenly decided to become an actor. This was not considered serious...again, judging by customs of olden times.

An actor, and even more so an actor of my age, has a special attitude toward history. I cannot count the number of times I thought of years and decades past and relived my own distant or more recent past. I am saying

this honestly, not to make an impression. Each role, even a small one, and one even based on a routine scenario, somehow goes through you, from your heels to your heart and higher. One plunges into memories and feelings so that one's character may live on the screen. How else could it be? Meanwhile, the movies plunge you from one historical event into another. In short, the past the of the country has lived in me in the hundreds of lives of the peoples I have played on the screen and, naturally, mixed with my own destiny, my own pains and joys. There have been plenty of both.

There is another thing which makes the life of an actor interesting: if you act a great deal and if your characters are scattered in time, you begin to feel things that happened a long time ago as though happening today, as a result of which a particular feeling of history develops, the essence of which I shall not attempt to describe. Try to imagine a person who lives both in the 1980s and the 1940s. An actor, as he creates a character on the screen, must live precisely the life of his character, for otherwise he is worthless. And when different times clash in one's mind and feelings, willy-nilly, one assesses the past in terms of the present and applies to the present and even to the future the yardstick of a heroic or tragic past. Many ordinary matters are looked upon in an entirely different light. A large number of clashes have come out of such a combination of sometimes incompatible things.

It was the summer of 1941 and the fascists were advancing. One would tighten one's fists listening to Sovinformburo, meanwhile one would play the joker with an accordion in the sweet idyl entitled "Hog Breeder and Shepherd." This is an excellent movie and I love it, but try to live simultaneously in that peaceful world and in that terrible war. To anyone other than an actor the happiness of the normal human life of yesterday would trigger now a tremendous deadly hatred!... One feels restless. Meanwhile, there is also the screen and the radio and throughout the country my voice is heard: "The armor is strong in and our tanks are fast." How come I am not involved? The answer to all requests and demands is logical: "We shall release you after the picture is finished." This is followed by the traditional saying of the period: "The front line passes through here as well."

To shoot this picture, Mosfilm built an entire village. Bombs were already falling while we were continuing to film the story of a happy rural life. At night we stood watch, for an incendiary bomb could fall on our set. The filming was completed on 10 October 1941. The fascists had already reached the distant approaches to Moscow. The moment the filming was completed, without even changing, I rushed to join the militia. I was registered properly. They did not let me even to go home to change and pack a few things. That night they woke me up. "Comrade Kryuchkov, your assignment. At 2400 hours..."

It was thus that I found myself in Alma-Ata, immediately filming "Combat Movie Collection." Misha Zharov and I sang chastushki in a duet: "What is this, was ist das, the Germans are clearing out." Meanwhile, the Germans had come very close to Moscow and any serious pulling out was far into the future. You may ask: Did we believe in what we sang? I honestly would answer that we did. More than many others. This was due to purely psychological reasons. Misha and I had relived the revolution as mature men, only 2 years before that, in the movie "The Vyborg Side," and slightly before that there had been my second meeting with Lenin, in "Man with a Weapon," and, at the same time, not chronologically, we had completed the Komsomolsk-na-Amure epic "Komsomolsk." Call it historical feelings or historical intuition, but the confidence was born that they could not defeat us! They could not, and that was that.

The more time passed the greater this confidence became, even in 1942, even before Stalingrad. Twenty-five years of Soviet system blended within me within a single day or, rather, in 26 days of a tireless advance. In the morning we were filming "Kotovskiy" (The Civil War); during the day we were filming "Antosha Rybkin" (a lightweight comedy but nonetheless dealing with the Patriotic War); in the evening and during the night we worked on "A Boy from Our City" (from the days of peace, via Spain, to present events). I could snatch an hour-and-a-half sleep during the trip from one location to another. I could not feel my bruises. The make-up man would powder my face and on we would go. It was a good thing that the final scenes in "Boy" were filmed in a hospital, for I could hardly move. I was left behind in that same hospital after the 26-day marathon came to an end. The diagnosis of the physicians was extreme exhaustion. During the first day I was spoon-fed. On the fourth day I checked myself out.

There are great debates about our history today. This is good and understandable. We are discussing what we thought about ourselves in the past, what we felt. Today this is coming into the open. Everyone had his own experience, sometimes a strictly personal perception of history. Emotions are very important but, naturally, are not the best advisors in assessing contradictory events. But how to avoid them? My profession itself has taught me to judge emotionally of everything experienced. Nor do I claim to do otherwise. But please bear in mind that I am doing this not only on the basis of my own experience but also from the point of view of yet another 100 lives lived on the screen, quite different and incompatible lives. I had played a retrograde during the revolution, and fought the first battle against the fascists at the Brest fortress; I was also a thief in one role as a boss and the embodiment of indifference and cruelty, in another. I have been (naturally, my character) a communist with revolutionary tempering, who was shot by a firing squad, victim of a slander. This was quite an emotional range of colors, a psychological kaleidoscope.

My own private life as well was not one long holiday. I was expelled from the Komsomol. How unfair this was!

It was as though someone had stuck a knife in my heart. I was also kicked out of a filming location, politically labeled a "production disorganizer." This, incidentally, was in 1936. The disorganization case was that I had publicly expressed to the party organizer the indignation of the filming crew. They had shipped to Moscow from Ashkhabad an entire train of sand for shooting the film in a studio. Meanwhile, the Moscow River was being dredged and there were mountains of sand along the banks. The people would have thanked us to remove them. This was the reason for the "political" conflict. I lived in Leningrad in 1937 and 1938 where I acted in six movies. The things I saw I will neither forget nor forgive.

In the more than 100 characters that I have played, not one has been a foreigner and, on the screen, only once have I left the country, in the film "Salavat Yulayev." All the other movies I have played in have been set at home. Some of the movies had no reality. They were cliches. However, some of them were true. Remember Vera Maretskaya in the pre-war movie "Member of the Government." This was honest work. From the very first to the last day of filming, the actress lived in a village and her role encompassed innumerable peasant lives. She had an entirely real prototype, and what great truth she brought to the screen! The character she brought to life at that time was real and most profound. It was the character of a Soviet person, born and molded by the revolution.

As to her famous speech.... "Comrade deputies! Here I am, standing in front of you, a simple Russian woman. Undereducated, beaten by my husband, frightened by the priests, shot at by the enemy, enduring..." This speech is also the history of our revolution. A revolution which is always in motion, like a big river, with an even calm flow, and with rapids, whirlpools and calm backwaters.

Some 2 weeks before we started shooting "Tractor Drivers," I worked as a mechanizer at Guryevka Village, near Nikolayev. I arrived there earlier and did not intend to stay idle. I went to the machine tractor station. What a people! Our brigade leader was Stepka, a young Komsomol member, bearer of the Order of Lenin, who had challenged Pasha Angelina herself. Can we delete from history the enthusiasm of the 1930s? Our history was made by people, by very specific honest people whose conscience, as they say, was clean. They were in the majority.

I have also come across many such people both during tragic or peaceful times, among movie makers. The movie "1941" was filmed on the Turkmen banks of the Caspian Sea. It was during the summer and was terribly hot. Grigoriy Chukhray's wounds, received at the front, reopened. One could not imagine how he could stand it. The doctors' ultimatum was immediately to change climate. To him, there was no difference between front line and filming. He stayed on. He completed everything he had planned, to the very last frame.

And what about Vladimir Skuybin's film "Judgment"...never, neither before nor after the war had I been assigned to play such a tragic role, that of Semen Teterin. A very honest man, strong, a hunter, a man who had wrestled down a bear but who proved helpless in the face of corruption. He destroyed himself and his conscience. I was lucky to experience such an emotion. It makes me experience our current troubles even more profoundly. Volodya Skuybin was young enough to be my son but was also a man raised in the school of the revolution. "Judgment" was his last work. He knew, all of us knew, that it was his last. He began by losing the sensation in his fingers, then his arms and legs and, as the film was completed, his speech. He "talked" with others through his eyes. We understood. I recall how we went to congratulate him on his birthday, he was 34. A few months later he died. Our people are not lacking in courage and civic-mindedness, for otherwise today's restructuring would not happen. It did not come down from the skies but was born within ourselves.

The life of an actor and Lenfilm's production plans have forced me, who is past 75, to go back to my early prerevolutionary childhood. A film is being made of those times, in which I appear in a small role. I live this role, I seek within myself, I remember. I cannot describe the overwhelming feelings with which I can look at the present from the viewpoint of the past. How clearly I recall the main landmark, October 1917. Everything that was before it is way into the past and everything that happened after that, the good and the bad, is all mine, is all part of the present. That is why I accept within the 70-year history of my country, everything that was heroic, difficult and tragic within it as my own personal pride and my personal pain. I live with them.

'I Am Sending You a Cornflower'

Letter by Guards Major D.A. Petrakov to his daughter

My dark-eyed Mila!

I am sending you a cornflower.... Just imagine: We are in battle, enemy shells are exploding all around us, there are craters everywhere and yet here is a flower growing.... Suddenly, another explosion.... The cornflower has been cut off. I picked it up and put it in my pocket. This flower grew, strove toward the sun but was cut down by an explosion and, had I not picked it up, it would have been trampled upon.

Mila! Papa Dima will be fighting the fascists to his last drop of blood, to his last breath, so that the fascists will not do to you what they did to this flower. What you don't understand, Mother will explain.

18 September 1942

This letter from a private file has become a monument. Or, rather, a fragment of the memorial "Soldier's Field" in Volgograd.

At the edge of the field there is a concrete platform, as though blown up with an explosive in its middle. Piled in the crater are cut up mines, bombs, shells, and rusting weapons of the last war. Next to them stand a slim figure of a girl, cast of metal. At her feet is a huge bright stone, shaped like a soldier's tricornered envelope. The letter is engraved on the stone, from the first line to the last. It is a letter addressed to dark-eyed Mila and to all of us living on this earth.

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

05003

The Idea of Revolution in World History
18020004i Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16,
Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) pp 83-91

[Article by Vladimir Nikolayevich Mironov, candidate of historical sciences]

[Text] The 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution is marked worldwide by radical revolutionary processes: the universal-historical conversion from capitalism to socialism, the profound technological revolution and the radical restructuring taking place in the USSR and in a number of fraternal countries. It is particularly clear in our most revolutionary time in the life of mankind that in its essential content universal history is an ascending line of great ages of social revolutions and that the revolutions themselves are the essence of its central features, its locomotive engines. The world is moved by revolutions. Such is the aphoristically concise Leninist formula of progress (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 8, p 401).

A long and painful distance had to be covered before we were able to learn the laws of revolution and begin to apply them. For penetrating into the secret of the revolutionary phenomenon meant knowledge of society in its very essence, which is that of development and change. That is why the level of understanding of revolutions is an accurate criterion of the status of social science, and the scale of the spreading of revolutionary feelings enables us to judge of the development of prevailing social awareness in a given age. Today few words are capable of triggering passionate enthusiasm in some and profound hatred in others, such as the word "revolution." To entire generations of working people, the revolution became the symbol of a better life, a slogan in the struggle for the organization of a society based on justice. Lenin described the revolution as the holiday of the oppressed. To the exploiters, it has always been synonymous with what was the most terrible and disgusting, the bacchanalia of a sinister and bloody carnival, as described by M. Weber, the bourgeois sociologist. At all times the ideological Vendee has tried to slander the idea of revolution and to present it as a hostile individual and, after the defeat of one revolution or another, solemnly proclaiming its irrevocable end.

However, even during the darkest ages, when the victory of obscurantism seemed definitive, this idea did not die. To the credit of mankind, always and everywhere, wherever there have been oppressed, there has been a movement by the oppressed for their liberation. Essentially, history is a grandiose wave of liberation struggle, rising age after age, initiated at the dawn of civilization and reaching its culmination in the establishment of a new, a socialist world. Proud and rebellious, the idea of revolution is an awareness of the great struggle, an expression of the ineradicable thirst for freedom and for the assertion of the dignity of the individual and equality among people.

Marx: From Utopia to Science

The idea of liberation began to take shape in the age of the crisis of the period of slave ownership. The first uprisings of the slaves proclaimed to the world the inevitable truth that the slave had the right to strive for freedom. However, because of the underdeveloped nature of the social awareness of social processes and personal political interests, this was perceived by the masses in a distorted aspect, as theological categories of the struggle between good and evil. Christianity was established precisely as an ideological transformation of the form of protest by the oppressed. Initially it was one of the "most revolutionary elements in the spiritual history of mankind" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 22, p 478). However, as Christianity turned into the ruling religion, it lost its democratic-revolutionary spirit and became a tool of class domination.

The new stage in the development of the idea is related to the emergence of the bourgeoisie on the historical arena. Its revolution, according to Marx, began in the mind of a monk (see K. Marx and F. Engels, *op cit.*, vol 1, p 422). His name was Luther. He realized the existence of a conflict between the old order and newly developing capitalism, albeit in a religious aspect, as a conflict between a church with fettered man and the "true faith," which asserted his worldly activeness. By destroying the authority of the church, Luther released the revolutionary energy of the masses. As the ideological manifestation of the popular struggle against feudal exploitation, the Reformation was the first bourgeois revolution.

The ideological work of the enlighteners of the 17th and 18th centuries replaced the religious concepts related to a social change; people replaced God as the motive force of change. These philosophers substantiated the legitimacy of revolution as a means of achieving the good of the people. Their activities were the ideological fuse which lit the French Revolution, which discarded the religious clothing and within which, for the first time, the struggle was waged on openly political grounds. However, the tempest of this revolution quite quickly brought to light the catastrophic lag of theory behind the headlong dynamics of the struggle. This gave birth to the famous statement by Saint-Just: "The force of things

leads us, apparently, to results of which we could not even conceive." It was as though the revolution crashed against the thick wall of history: reality "opposed" the embodiment of revolutionary ideals. All efforts at breaching this wall through terror led only to the fact that the bloodied love for freedom became mired in its own blood. The Jacobins raised the idea of revolution to the level of tragedy, the tragedy of revolutionary thinking, which turned out incapable of understanding the merciless logic of history.

Meanwhile, in neighboring Germany, a group of people was following the development of events in the turbulent city of Paris as tensely as though it were a question of their own life or death. These were the German philosophers. They interpreted the main clash of the French Revolution in terms of moral categories. According to Kant, for example, the revolution was a factor of moral progress. Its element, however, was violence which led to despotism. This contradiction accurately reflected the real antinomy of the bourgeois revolution which, on the one hand, is the democratic struggle waged by the oppressed and, on the other, the establishment of a new system of exploitation. Kant theoretically came across the same problem which had faced Saint-Just. The solution that the uncompromising practical revolutionary and the old professor of philosophy reached was strikingly similar! Both the Jacobins, who did not dare to rely entirely in their struggle on the plebeian masses and reduced the violence of the counterrevolutionary coup, and Kant, who feared the invasion of the masses in politics, in the final account rejected the revolution in favor of reform. It was thus that the practical and theoretical limitations of the bourgeoisie, which abandoned the revolution because of its fear of the people, were manifested.

The emergence of the proletariat in the world arena made a scientific understanding of revolution not only possible but also vitally necessary. As Lenin wrote subsequently, "the greatest liberation movement in the world of the oppressed class, of the most revolutionary class in history, is impossible without revolutionary theory" (*op cit.*, vol 27, p 11). Even before the proletariat had won its initial victories at the barricades, it proclaimed the advent of its domination through a series of intellectual victories. Its revolution "began in the mind of a philosopher" which Karl Marx was destined to be.

As a theory of the revolutionary struggle, Marxism arose as a result of the implementation of a grandiose thought formulated by Marx, that of the liberation of man. This liberation was possible "from the positions of the type of theory which proclaims man as the highest essence of humanity" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *op cit.*, vol 1, p 428). Having determined that the essence of man lies within himself, Marx established that man had become alienated from his nature. Based on his view that this nature was expressed in tangible-sensory activities, i.e., labor, he defined the alienation of man as the conversion of his labor into something alien to himself and labor results as

a power dominating and hostile to him. This self-alienation of labor is caused by private ownership. Consequently, in order to liberate labor it is necessary to eliminate private ownership which expresses the relationship between the class of exploiters and that of producers. This elimination is what the socialist revolution represents. It was thus that Marx's thinking quickly became revolutionary and, as such, made a new leap, assuming a humanistic dimension: the political emancipation of the workers through revolution "contains the emancipation of mankind, for the slavery of mankind as a whole is contained within the attitude of the worker toward the production process and all relations of slavery are merely variations and consequences of this relation" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op cit., vol 42, p 98).

Gaining political power is not the final objective of the proletariat but the first and necessary step in the historically lengthy process of achieving a state of freedom and mastering social relations and regaining man's essence. It is only after the total elimination of the vestiges of the division of labor which enslave man, "when man will find and organize 'his own forces' as social forces and, for that reason, will no longer separate himself from the power of society, in the guise of a political force, only then will the emancipation of man be completed" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op cit., vol 1, p 406). Marx describes this entire process as a communist revolution, the final objective of which is the free, the whole man.

Attaining this objective is the content of the historical mission of the proletariat. In other words, the interests of mankind, i.e., the interest of every individual in freedom and self-realization can be achieved only through the struggle of the working class, through the crucible of revolution. Therefore, the proletariat is the first class in world history whose class interests are those of man. Proceeding in his analysis from the social individual to the class, before returning to the individual, Marx linked within a single entity the liberation of the toiling masses with that of the individual. It is thus that humanism was substantiated as the revolutionary program of the class struggle.

Having philosophically substantiated the communist revolution, Marx undertook to provide political and economic proof of its legitimacy. By linking the outbreak of the revolution to the contradictions between production forces and production relations, he discovered that in terms of their historical-economic content revolutions are a conversion from one socioeconomic system to another, to a higher one. This discovery explained the mechanism of and reasons for the revolution and put the revolutionary idea on an objective scientific base. It is thus that it became part of the system of the dialectical-materialistic understanding of history and constituted the completed expression of this concept. Henceforth the tasks of revolutionary thinking became to bring to light the trends which lead to revolution and a determination of the means of the struggle for their full realization. It is thus that an integral science of revolution developed at a

headlong pace, a powerful apparatus of categories for the theoretical analysis of reality and the special "mechanisms" of direct practical application: the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary class.

The Marxist theory of revolution is not only the result of the development of social thinking but also of the universal historical liberation struggle of the masses. It was crystalized from the entire content of universal history and the totality of revolutionary experience and thinking of all nations. It can be said that mankind experienced Marxism as a scientific revolutionary theory. The further development of the idea required its implementation. The weapon had been hammered out. Now it was a question of using it.

October: Practical Implementation of the Idea

The solution of this universal historical problem, and, therefore, the further development of the idea, are inseparably related to Lenin.

Lenin made profound inroads into the revolutionary-critical nature of the Marxist way of thinking, according to which it was a matter less of explaining than changing the world. Furthermore, in Marx's thesis on Feuerbach, Lenin singled out a thought important in terms of the active nature of Marxism: the world can be explained only by changing it. To Lenin the theoretical understanding of the problem was inconceivable outside of its practical solution and inseparable from it. He always brought theoretical debates to the practical level and never allowed in his activities a gap between the theoretician, who proclaims what must be done, and the practical worker, who turns this idea into action.

V.I. Lenin was a "battlefield" theoretician, a political philosopher, whose entire being was involved in the element of struggle. Lenin converted philosophy into a powerful weapon of practical struggle and combined revolutionary theory with revolutionary policy. The alliance between philosophy and politics—the great idea of the young Marx—was manifested in practical terms in the full unity of thoughts, words and actions consistent with the ideas of action. It was precisely this unity that is the reason for which Lenin's Marxism was both orthodox and antidogmatic. It was orthodox because it was revolutionary and antidogmatic because it was inseparable from practice. It was Hegel who said that philosophy is an age expressed through an idea. Leninism is our age, expressed in revolutionary thinking and revolutionary action. Lenin provided a brilliant example of how to use Marx's method in the interpretation of the new age and the solution of its problems. He showed his followers (including us, the present generation of Marxists, who are facing new historical tasks) how creatively to address ourselves to the great doctrine during crucial periods in history. This model is the greatest contribution to the development of Marxist philosophy. The new age set the task of the practical implementation of Marxism. This created a number of new problems, some of which

theoretical, the avoidance of the solution of which, as was the case with the Mensheviks, who worried about the "purity" of Marxism, would have meant the destruction of its living soul. Lenin's innovation was that, while aspiring toward revolution, he provided an essential solution to the new theoretical problems related to the practical application of Marxism. His greatest theoretical accomplishments are his doctrine on the party, the theory of imperialism, the concept of the victory of the revolution in a single country, the concept of the Soviet state, and the theory of the building of socialism. These ideas raised Marx's theory of the revolution to a qualitatively new level and, at the same time, were the landmarks in its implementation. They meant the embodiment of theory in practice and raised revolutionary thinking to a higher standard.

In the course of the struggle waged by Lenin the overall problem of the revolution was concretized as a question of mass political action. Realizing that the masses will support the revolution once they have developed a revolutionary awareness, he proved that it was only a revolutionary party that could instill such an awareness in the proletarian masses. Armed with progressive theory, the party can combine the labor movement with scientific socialism and thus fulfill its vanguard role, without which the socialist revolution is impossible in principle. Therefore, the creation of a bolshevik party was the most important step in the practical implementation of the idea.

As the revolutionary situation aggravated, the confrontation with the exploiting power encouraged the unification of the masses within instruments of the class struggle—the soviets—which were the foundations of the future proletarian state. Within the soviets, the revolutionary energy of the masses assumed an organizational aspect. During the October days the idea of the revolution spoke with the voices of millions of people: the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" became its specific practical expression. This tremendous move turned the mass movement of soviets into a center for shaping a political will and an alternative to the bourgeois state. It was thus that the question of power, which was solved through the armed uprising, became the basic question of the revolution.

The Great October Socialist Revolution as a whole was a powerful invasion by the organized masses, seized by a revolutionary idea, into politics and the elimination of all barriers which separated the people from the power and the self-organization of the ruling people. This offered a full confirmation of Marx's definition of the revolution as being "a shifting of the power to the popular masses themselves, who replace the organized power of their oppression with their own power..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, *op cit.*, vol 17, p 548). The masses themselves began to solve all problems of social life and took over the building of socialism. It is thus that rule by the people—the practical manifestation of the revolutionary idea—was achieved.

The conversion of an idea into a norm of collective action is an intrinsic stage in its history and, at the same time, a time when the very idea, implemented in practice, becomes part of history. The conversion of an idea into a tremendous historical event, such as the October Revolution, confirmed its scientific nature. Through this act mankind became the master of its history: for the first time it attained the ability to make it in accordance with an ideal. For that reason our revolution is the greatest turn in world history, which triggered the great wave of 20th century revolutions.

The October Revolution was the first universal historical step in the implementation of Marx's humanistic program. This step eliminated the exploitation of man by man and established the rule of workers and peasants, which initiated the process of withering away of the state. It led huge masses of people to independent creativity and became the greatest moral revolution against the violation of human dignity. It inaugurated the process of advance toward communism, in the course of which, as Lenin thought, society will "undertake the elimination of the division of labor among people and the education, training and preparing comprehensively developed and comprehensively trained people..." (*op cit.*, vol 41, p 33). It is thus that Marx's humanism was actually embodied in Leninist morality: moral is that which serves the building of communism.

However, the relatively low stage of Russian capitalism did not permit an immediate conversion to socialism, which would develop on its own basis. Our revolution was forced to solve problems which capitalism had failed to solve during its own time. It faced the need to surmount technical and economic backwardness and to make major changes in the national economy. Those were the features governing the establishment of socialism in Russia, as indicated by Lenin: "If the building of socialism requires a certain cultural standard..., why should we not start by acquiring, through revolutionary means, the prerequisites for such a specific standard..." (*op cit.*, vol 45, p 381). Piercing through the decades, Lenin felt his way to a kind of level in the development of the new system in which the main accomplishment of the October Revolution in the area of governmental power will be set on a corresponding base consisting of developed productive forces and high standards of the masses. This was to create conditions for a new stage in the liberation of the individual and the implementation of the revolutionary idea.

Restructuring: New Standard of the Revolutionary Idea

It is precisely such a stage that we are entering today. It is based on restructuring which has developed in the USSR, which is a real revolution in the entire system of social relations and in the hearts and minds of the people. As M.S. Gorbachev said, the question of the nature of change in a country which has experienced the greatest revolution and in which socialism has been built, is not only theoretical but also one of great political

significance. What is the essence of restructuring as a revolution and what are its specifics compared to the familiar types of revolutionary processes?

Restructuring has a number of generic features inherent in all revolutions. Whereas the October Revolution led to a structural reorganization of production forces on the basis of their industrialization, the purpose of restructuring is to reorganize them on a higher technological basis, on the basis of the NTR. To this effect it must resolve the contradiction which has developed in recent times between the tremendously grown production forces and the nature of production relations which developed as early as the 1930s, in which excessive centralism and bureaucratic administration were inherent, separating producers from the decision-making mechanism in the exercise of ownership. The breakdown of the mechanism which obstructs socioeconomic development and replacing it with the mechanism of acceleration ascribe to this process its revolutionary nature. The effect of the obstruction mechanism, which developed in recent decades, was objectively manifested in holding back the growth of production forces for the sake of weakening their pressure on obsolete production relations, which are the material foundation of bureaucratic distortions and conservatism.

This mechanism can and must be dismantled by revolutionary means. To begin with, the revolution wrecks the very foundations of what is old and obsolete. The "main factor" which must be eliminated within the obsolete social forms is, precisely, the obstruction mechanism. Second, this mechanism can function only if the masses remain passive. Therefore, it can be destroyed only by enhancing the energy and involving the masses in social management, which can be achieved through the mechanism of acceleration. Consequently restructuring, as a set of reforms, albeit radical but made without the direct participation of the entire people, is impossible.

It is on the basis of such contradictions that an alliance of forces developed, capable of achieving a revolutionary restructuring. The progressive detachments of the working class, who have reached a high cultural standard and can achieve self-government in production, were the political army for renovation. The desire to live in a new way strengthened in society and so did the aspiration to participate in decision making on all levels. The demand for social justice aimed, on the one hand, against equalization and, on the other, at establishing socialist equality, understood as the absence of illegal privileges, became particularly pressing. These elements are becoming dominant in the social awareness in periods of revolutionary upsurge. Therefore, restructuring was not only an objective necessity but also a subjective need of the people.

Under those circumstances, the CPSU acted precisely in the quality in which it had to act, as a party of revolutionary action. It found within itself the strength and courage critically to assess the situation, take the course

of restructuring and organize a revolutionary type of work. The party displayed deep faith in the revolutionary spirit of the people. A creative attitude toward theory played a tremendous role in this case. Theoretical studies enabled us to formulate a cluster of ideas for revolutionizing social development. It is thus that the CPSU asserted its vanguard mission, without which no change is possible.

Such increase in the mass activeness of the function of the vanguard has been present in all great revolutions. Lenin frequently emphasized that the art of political leadership consists of formulating the type of slogans which would lead the masses to revolutionary action. Today they include democratization, glasnost, and self-government. It is only through democracy and thanks to democracy, the party emphasizes, that restructuring is possible. It is a question of radically expanding democracy: the masses themselves not only make changes but actively participate in the management of society. Restructuring is based on the powerful revolutionary democratic tradition of the people who are creating a new type of democracy—the democracy of soviets.

Today it is a question of the redistribution of many excessively centralized functions of the state and the drastic enhancement of the soviets. This is a manifestation of the specifics of restructuring compared with the revolutions of the past which, as a transition from one system to another, solved the main problem of replacing the old state with a state of a new type. Restructuring does not raise the question of power: this question was solved once and for all 70 years ago with the October Revolution. It changes power relations not in the class but in the functional sense, for the forms of its implementation become different. Democratization strengthens the people's nature of the soviet system precisely as a system of soviets. That is why *in the political area* restructuring asserts and intensifies the class solution of the problem of the power assumed by the masses in October 1917, giving it a new democratic content consistent with the contemporary standard reached in social development.

The main trend in our revolution is *the spreading of democracy in production*. The appearance of agencies of worker democracy is an essential feature of all socialist revolutions. An experience in acquiring such a system in our country is found in the factory and plant committees which were set up by the proletariat in 1917. "Let each factory-plant committee," Lenin asked, "to feel itself not only involved in the matters of its own plant but also as an organizational cell in the structure of all governmental life" (op cit., vol 35, p 147). Restructuring creatively follows this experience under the new circumstances. As M.S. Gorbachev pointed out, granting general meetings and councils of labor collectives the right to solve production problems will become a major political step in the conversion, as Lenin said, "to a real self-government by the people."

These authorities have a tremendous revolutionary potential. It is thanks to them that the workers are completing the historical process of mastering production forces: whereas the October Revolution solved the problem of the ownership of means of production, the purpose of restructuring is to solve the problem of having all working people control these means. It is only when the working class undertakes actually to solve by itself and, together with its comrades, all problems of plant life that it will develop a feeling of proprietorship and the mentality of producer, which alone can lead to a labor productivity higher than under capitalism, and to the full utilization of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution. The most important line in restructuring, which will become irreversible after it has been crossed, will occur when the councils of labor collectives undertake truly to participate in management, at least in the majority of the largest enterprises in the country.

The radical expansion of democracy at work revolutionizes the *economic sphere*. In this case the type of ownership does not change. It remains socialist but becomes qualitatively closer to producers: it is precisely the labor collective that becomes its real master. Control over this ownership, which is based on a combination of centralized management and self-government by the labor collective, changes radically and so does the role of the state in the economy. An economic mechanism is developing, which will lead to a sharp increase in the number of people managing the economy, and link more strongly the individual interests of the working person with collective production. It is thus that the awareness of the producer will become a powerful factor of economic development. Obviously, it is precisely through such a humanizing of the economy that today revolutionary thinking should seek the answer to the main and most difficult problem of the theory and practice of socialism, which was formulated at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum: how to develop on a socialist basis more powerful incentives for economic and social progress compared to capitalism and how most fully to combine planned management with the interests of the individual and the collective.

In the spiritual area restructuring means a grandiose cultural revolution in the age of the NTR. No less radical than the post-October cultural revolution, it is developing on three levels: first, a change in education, making the entire population "literate" from the scientific and technical viewpoint, and training workers who can manage modern production facilities. Second, making every citizen a competent social activist. Third, the spiritual emancipation of the individual and the assertion of a feeling of human dignity, which is the moral foundation of any revolution.

Therefore, as a set of structural reorganizations, restructuring means converting from one type of development to another: in the area of production forces, from the industrial to the scientific and technical phase and from

extensive to intensive growth; in production relations, from administrative management to full cost-accounting; in the political area, from rigid centralism to a new level of socialist self-government; in the spiritual area, from the abstract person to the specific individual. The supreme objective of all of these changes is man in his integrity as worker, citizen and individual.

Restructuring brings to light the humanistic potential of the October Revolution which, by virtue of a number of historical factors could not be immediately manifested to the proper extent. It is a new step in the implementation of Marxian humanism and the all-round development of man. In solving the contradiction between man as the supreme objective of socialism and any kind of practice which treats him as a tool, it restores the live awareness of the connection between individual labor and the development of society and the individual. It is precisely these humanistic changes that are the essence of the contemporary socialist revolutionism. Since October 1917 our country has been the spiritual focal point of progressive ideas, for we had the honor of being the first to begin to put Marxism to practical use. Today the spirituality of Soviet society is becoming qualitatively intensified, for restructuring totally directs our entire system of life toward the individual.

As a whole, restructuring means *a transition from one stage of development of socialism to a higher stage*. It asserts the most progressive socialism today—the socialism of the age of NTR. In the new stage, initiated by restructuring, its generic features as a system of and for the working people obtains a qualitatively new expression. This is what the implementation of the formula of "more socialism" will mean. This also confirms and largely sheds a new light to the great meaning of the October Revolution. Essentially, restructuring and the October Revolution are a single revolutionary entity which, as it develops, dialectically rejects the organizational structures created during previous stages, replacing them with new ones, which can "encompass" a growing autonomy and self-government by the masses.

By taking the path of restructuring, socialism proved a historically unparalleled ability for self-development and advancement. It is a question of a *unique type of revolutionary process*. Above all, it marks the disappearance of the antagonistic nature of this process, for the struggle between the old and the new does not have the nature of a class struggle. For that reason restructuring is not a political revolution which leads to a change in class domination. This confirms Marx's idea that: "It is only when there will no longer be any classes and class antagonism that *social evolutions* will no longer be *political revolutions*" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op cit, vol 4, p 185).

An essentially new correlation develops between the conscious and the spontaneous factors. As a spontaneous phenomenon, restructuring is absolutely impossible. It is a conscious revolution of the people in power in a society

which is consciously developing itself. This justifies Engels' prediction that in the future "the people will be informed in advance of the need for a change in the social system..., triggered by changed relations, and will desire such a change before it has been imposed upon them regardless of their awareness and will" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op cit., vol 20, p 639). Consequently, the changes will be planned rather than spontaneous.

What also changes is the correlation between reform and revolution: under socialism the opposite of revolution is not a reform but the obstruction of development. Restructuring gives the latter a revolutionary acceleration, for society reaches a *qualitatively* new standard.

Therefore, restructuring is a new stage in the development of the revolutionary form of dynamics. It exceptionally enriches our concepts of revolutions, renovates the creative spirit of Marxism and rejects dogmatism and the ossification of the mind on the level of already surmounted phases in the development of history. It clearly proves that the freezing of revolutionary theory, which is the greatest intellectual capital of mankind, leads to stagnation in the practical building of the new society. At the same time, the concept of restructuring itself, having become a powerful force of renovation, constitutes the development of the ideas of the revolution under the conditions of socialism which is undergoing radical changes.

Since restructuring, as a new step in the implementation of the ideas of the revolution, is only gathering strength, revolutionary thinking faces radical problems. As M.S. Gorbachev pointed out, we must make an essential breakthrough on the theoretical front, based on the strict analysis of all social life and a scientific substantiation of the objectives and prospects of our progress. Clearly, the possibility for such a breakthrough, which can constitute a historical step in the development of Marxism, is related to the new stage in world history, which has come under the influence of the NTR, the drastic increase of the role of consciousness in the social movement and the qualitative changes in the place of man within all systems of relations between man and man, man and society and man and nature. Essentially we are entering a period of revolution in the very method of our thinking, in the development of the dialectical method of Marx and Lenin.

The idea of the revolution has passed the test of history. Born in the first battles between oppressors and oppressed, it marched through millennia and confused dreams and utopian illusions, turned into a powerful force which is transforming the world. Its development reflects the real development of the revolutionary form of historical dynamics, which has reached its maturity in our age. With the conversion from one socioeconomic system to another, as a historical phenomenon, the revolution rejects obsolete forms and becomes enriched with a new content. The mass of people who act as

independent makers of history increases. The significance of the subjective factor and the consciousness and will of the progressive classes and the role of revolutionary theory become qualitatively enhanced.

The humanizing of the revolutionary form of dynamics enables us to formulate a new type of political thinking, which is the greatest accomplishments of contemporary revolutionary thought and its creative development in the nuclear age, when the bourgeoisie, using the threat of world war, is trying to create a nuclear blood clot on the path of progress. Its ultimatum to history is simple and clear: either preservation of the social status quo and a world of exploitation and injustice or the death of mankind.

The international working class rejects the efforts of capitalism to stabilize its internal contradiction through confrontation with socialism. It calls for the right of nations to choose the way of their further development independently. That is why ensuring a nuclear-free world in international relations creates optimal conditions for the broad masses to develop their struggle in the capitalist countries, lifting the burden of fear of the danger of universal death.

The new style of thinking brings to light with particular emphasis the humanistic meaning of Marxism, which blends the interests of the proletariat with those of mankind, for the supreme objective in the philosophical system developed by Marx and Lenin is the free and self-realizing individual as part of mankind. That is why peace, as the protection of mankind, and revolution, as its liberation, are as one and are not conflicting. It is the working class that can achieve this unity, for it alone can turn from a class "within itself" and a class "for itself" into a class for all mankind. Today revolutionary humanism directly confronts man-hating in its extreme, nuclear aspect. In our time the great idea of Marx—that the proletariat become the rescuer and liberator of man—becomes reality.

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

05003

The World of Socialism on the Road of Restructuring

18020004j Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 16,
Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) pp 92-102

[Article by Oleg Timofeyevich Bogomolov, academician, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System]

[Text] The history of the socialist world, which today consists of a group of countries in Europe, Asia and Latin America, began with the October Revolution in Russia. The revolution marked the beginning of socialist changes in society, changes which, after World War II,

spread to other countries. The victory of the Soviet people in the war and the real experience of the new social system played a most important role in this case.

The development of socialism as an international system was deeply influenced by Lenin's ideas and by the specific example of the first victorious worker and peasant revolution. A great deal of our practice in social change became the guideline for other countries and was enriched by them under different historical circumstances. Thanks to the collective creativity of different nations, socialism has acquired its present aspect, proved its advantages over capitalism in various areas of life and become one of the leading forces in the system of international relations.

History confirmed Lenin's initial concepts on the variety of national forms and ways of establishment of the new system, the manifestation of its fundamental principles, the inevitable incompleteness and one-sidedness in the experience of individual countries, the international cooperation among nations building socialism and the importance of voluntary participation, equality, self-determination and coordination of interests for the sake of strengthening their unity and cooperation.

The road covered by the socialist world was neither easy nor straight. In the postwar years the socialist countries substantially strengthened their economic and scientific and technical potential, implemented major social programs and achieved convincing results in establishing a socialist way of life. Nonetheless, complexities and difficulties were found in their social development (and, here and there, stagnation phenomena as well) which, in some cases, even led to critical situations. The management mechanism proved to be insufficiently flexible and responsive to the demands of scientific and technical and social progress and slowed down the self-advancement of society. All of this determined the need for restructuring and renovation of social relations. Today the socialist countries are experiencing a turning point in the search for new solutions.

Restructuring objectively assumed its place on the agenda but, naturally, it is perceived and developed differently in the individual countries, depending on specific conditions, past experience and the seriousness of existing problems. All of this is an international process, in the course of which socialism should reach a new qualitative condition.

It would be no exaggeration to say that a collective search is underway for a new model of socialist society, consistent with the contemporary age and its revolutionary changes in technology, culture and extent of information of the people, the need for a new political thinking and for the democratization of social life and international intercourse.

No full unity of views has been reached as yet concerning this model. The practical experience of the individual countries varies and is assessed differently. The main thing is clear, which is that in order to answer the call of history socialist society must accept the challenge of our time. It is a question of the destinies of socialism. However great the force of stereotype, traditions, and dogmatic prejudices may be, the situation demands new daring revolutionary steps. They are justified and necessary, for they strengthen socialism in action, i.e., they lead to improving the situation of all working people, ensure the all-round and free development of every individual and create great opportunities for the upsurge of the economy, science, technology, culture and the arts.

The Soviet policy of restructuring is triggering lively interest in the public of the other socialist countries, for it answers their questions as well. They too are seeking a new model of society. Despite the dramatic turn which such a search has assumed at times, an exceptionally instructive international experience has been gained.

According to V.I. Lenin, the socialist social system will assume its mature aspect as a result of international cooperation, the synthesis of national approaches and efforts and the elimination of their inevitable incompleteness. Under contemporary conditions we see particularly clearly, on the one hand, the growing variety of approaches taken by the individual countries in solving pressing problems and, on the other, the stronger reciprocal influence among national forms of social change.

Could we see in restructuring universally valid features and determine that which, sooner or later, will appear in all socialist countries? Yes, we see behind national specifics and the variety within the general picture of the socialist world trends which, in all likelihood, will determine its new aspect. They have already become topics of scientific and political debates in individual countries and are determining the nature of economic and political reforms under way. Although the individual countries frequently emphasize the specific nature of their reforms and caution against their mechanical duplication, some summations are, nonetheless, already possible.

New Model of the Socialist Economy

In the economic area the main trends of change have become particularly clear. The conversion from primarily command-administrative and mobilization-ordering management methods to economic methods which influence the interests of enterprises, labor collectives and individual workers, is assuming the most essential significance. Noneconomic coercion is increasingly becoming not the standard but the exception in management. This releases the creative potential of society and activates personal and collective interests as a motive force of economic progress. The economy is abandoning its

former rigidity, which was the result of excessive regulation. It is becoming flexible and acquiring the ability to adapt more rapidly to changes in equipment and technology and to demand on domestic and foreign markets.

In frequent cases the decision-making process has been decentralized within the new mechanism. Substantial rights and privileges have been reassigned to lower-level organizations, based on the extensive development of a commodity-oriented economy and market relations and cost-accounting, which allow the enterprises to operate on the basis of self-financing and self-support. Also changing is the old concept of planned control of economic life from the center by issuing mandatory assignments which must be implemented at all costs, even to the detriment of producers and consumers. Increasing proof is being provided that as a result of the use of commodity-monetary instruments and standards and regulations set by the state, planning does not lose its efficiency but, conversely, improves it. The experiment in replacing state mandatory planning with a guiding plan, which is not an assignment but a guideline for the enterprises, has been justified in its essential lines in Hungary and China. Such planning contributes to improving the quality parameters of economic development and intensification, for it releases the initiative and enterprise of economic organizations and increases their material responsibility for working at a profit.

Although the majority of socialist countries have taken the path of expanding the freedom of economic activity, they have not established definitely the extent of democratism and centralism within this freedom. Many differences remain in this area, determined by the aspects of the economic situation and the policies adopted by the individual countries. Increasingly, however, reality calls for strengthening the democratic foundations on which the socialist economy functions. The experience of Hungary, the GDR, Czechoslovakia and China in the management of agriculture, the light and food industries and services confirms the unquestionable advantages of economic compared to administrative methods. It is no accident that in a number of countries it was precisely agriculture that marked the starting point of the economic reform and the use of market control mechanisms. The successes achieved in this area made a relatively fast impact on the living standard of the population and prepared the soil for the application of economic management methods in other sectors as well.

The new model of socialist economics also allows us to speak of substantial changes in ownership relations. They are now freed from bureaucratic distortions and made consistent with the actual level reached in the socialization of production forces. The practical experience of many socialist countries proves the expediency of combining the various forms of social ownership of tools and means of production with individual, family and small-group ownership which, without rejecting the leading role of public ownership, allows mixed forms, such as state-cooperative, state-private, state-capitalist (involving foreign capital) and others.

Such variety is consistent with the requirements of the law of consistency between production relations and the nature of production forces. If the latter do not appear and are not developed on a large scale and become highly concentrated, their conversion to state or national ownership remains formal. Actually, instead of socialization unnecessary administrative-bureaucratic superstructures developed which lower production efficiency. The direct and natural dependence which develops between ownership and appropriation of the results of its use, which is the very essence of ownership relations, is violated. If ownership of means of production is totally unrelated to the acquisition of goods and to increased consumption and income, it is meaningless. In this case state ownership is considered as being "nobody's," which is a quite widespread phenomenon. This leads to the flourishing of irresponsibility and waste, in which no one is concerned with the people's good.

The purpose of restructuring of ownership relations is to eliminate the alienation of the producer from the means of production and make the well-being of the collective and the individual working person clearly dependent on the condition and extent of public ownership. Self-financing, self-support and self-government of enterprises essentially separate the functions of the owner from those of the user of the means of production. It is as though state ownership is leased to the collectives of enterprises which become materially responsible for its efficient use and increase. Being not only under the control of the state but also in the hands of the collective which enjoys extensive economic independence, property acquires a specific owner—the labor collective.

A cooperative form of work also encourages a proprietary attitude toward property. Based on the voluntary combination of means of production and joint labor, full democracy and autonomy in management and market relations with the entire economy, the cooperatives have considerable opportunities for development. The experience of many socialist countries proves the efficiency of such cooperatives not only in agriculture but also in industry, trade, transportation and services. It is precisely this that explains the revival and development of cooperative ownership in the aspect described by Lenin in his article "On the Cooperative."

The example of a number of countries has indicated that leasing state premises and minor equipment to cooperatives, families and individuals helps significantly to improve trade and services to the population and to satisfy better their needs for public catering. Naturally, at the same time economic, state and other types of control must be established for such activities in order to prevent abuses and the earning of illegal income.

The problem of the correlation among the different forms of ownership is solved according to the extent to which each one of them helps to awaken the labor activeness of the people and to open the broadest possible scope for accelerating the growth of output and

upgrading its efficiency. It is not abstract or theoretical postulates that become criteria in the choice of forms of ownership but the way they practically combine personal with social, national, local, sectorial and individual interests. The errors of the past caution us against formal statification which inevitably brings into action the obstruction mechanism and triggers bureaucratism and numerous administrative superstructures which order everything without bearing any material responsibility.

The practical experience and the development of theory in a number of socialist countries indicate that in them economic restructuring is related to the restoration of commodity-monetary relations, the law of value and a planned and controlled market. Increasingly, socialist planned production is considered a commodity production in kind. The plan becomes less frequently pitted against the market, which is an inseparable part of a planned economy. The latter demands not pseudocommodity relations, in which money performs only the official role of unit of accountability, but real trade and real money, which is used as the actual purchasing instrument. Practical experience proves that the law of value should control trade and prices not in theory but in practice. State planning cannot do without the objective consideration of value ratios in the national economy, for it is they that play the most important role in the production process.

It is already clear today that in the new model of the socialist economy economic activities will be oriented toward the consumer, the market, which will begin to set the tone to a large extent. The market regulated by the plan will assume its proper place and strengthen all its specific institutions and mechanisms. In a number of countries the task has already been formulated of developing a broad nationwide area of commodity turnover, in which not only solvent population demand and generated commodities and services should come together, but also where wholesale trade in the means of production would be developed.

The main function of the socialist market will be to determine the true consumer value and, therefore, the value of commodities and services, and to develop objective price ratios. Otherwise voluntarism and, sometimes, gross arbitrariness on the part of a pricing department or ministry become inevitable. In order for this function to be implemented, the size of the market must be sufficiently large; its participants must be varied and customers should hold a dominating position. We cannot entirely separate the socialist from the world market, any more than we can do without a developed trade and transport infrastructure.

Naturally, the rules governing the functioning of the socialist market must be set by the state. It is the state that places its orders in accordance with the state plan, controls prices within certain limits, regulates monetary and credit emissions and the rate of exchange, and so on. The state has adequate instruments for influencing the

market but, as collective experience has taught us, they should not be such as to emasculate the very essence of market relations and turn us to rationing the means of production through a system of material and technical procurements. The laws of the market demand a confrontation between supply and demand and the freedom of the participants to trade within the range of the decisions which have been made and a competitiveness among them. The diktat of the producer, who holds a monopoly position on the market, under socialism as well deforms commodity-monetary relations and weakens the influence of the market on lowering production costs and upgrading quality.

The new model of the socialist economy is oriented toward reducing the costs of production and turnover and upgrading overall public labor productivity. This is the main meaning of the conversion from extensive to intensive development. Whereas the cornerstone in a planned control is meeting requirements and cost is ignored, inevitably some of the planned needs are not met because of shortage of working time. When the production of goods regardless of outlays of socially necessary labor is given priority, grounds appear for waste, higher prices and increased above-norm stockpiles. Incidentally, this is largely the reason for chronic shortages of most important types of goods in an extensive-type socialist economy. The consistent observance of the law of time-saving in the national economy, i.e., subordinating it to the demand of maximizing the created national income, is increasingly proving to be the decisive prerequisite for accelerated economic development. V.I. Lenin emphasized that in the competition with capitalism, the main argument in favor of the new social system is the advantage it provides in public labor productivity. That is why in the course of the reform the socialist countries are trying to eliminate once and for all the "outlay" mechanisms which raise the cost of production and building and make the increased growth of efficiency and profitability the mandatory law of activities of each social cell. To this effect they strengthen the role of cost regulators and criteria in economic management.

Another essential feature of the current restructuring in the socialist economy is the systematic elimination of equalization in wages and assigning to enterprises stocks of scarce raw materials in the redistribution of their revenues and losses. Distribution relations are becoming increasingly free from distortions caused by bureaucratic intervention and are following their own internal laws.

In most socialist countries there is increased differentiation in the income of the working people, based on the quantity, quality and national economic significance of their labor. There is a trend of lifting artificial wage ceilings for work noted for particular intensiveness, skill and conscientiousness. At the same time, the wages of some workers become ever more closely dependent on

the profitable work of the entire labor collective and the efficient use of the means of production assigned (leased) to it: land, buildings, equipment, etc.

Compensating for the losses of poorly working enterprises with the income of society conflicts with the laws of distribution according to labor and violates social justice. That is why we are revising the mechanisms of taxation, budget financing, crediting, procurements of scarce types of raw materials, and rates for setting enterprise development and material incentive funds. In other words, voluntarism is being eliminated in distribution relations and the law of objective economic criteria is enhanced. The goods created within the national economy must go above all wherever their use will yield maximal economic and social results from the social viewpoint. The socialist countries are closing down with increased frequency losing enterprises which cannot be improved and, after the necessary retraining, the thus released manpower is put to efficient use in other areas of activity.

Naturally, achieving the strict correlation between wages and productivity is no easy matter. However, economic practice urgently seeks a self-tuning market mechanism which, whatever the circumstances, would materially interest workers and labor collectives in increasing output and improving production quality. The purposefulness with which this is being done is a guarantee for future quality changes in distribution according to labor, under socialism.

Reorganization of the Political Superstructure

Over a long period of time the advancement of socialism was exclusively related to the development of its material and technical base. Subsequently an understanding was gained of the need to reorganize economic relations and economic mechanisms. Today many socialist countries feel the need for restructuring political mechanisms and social relations, without which changes in technology and economics may remain nothing but pious wishes. This, incidentally, has frequently happened in the past. The changes which these countries are making and proclaiming in the superstructural area indicate the appearance of a new approach to political life. In this case the prime role is assigned not only to collectives but also to individuals and their self-realization, rights and freedoms. The main guidelines of the new approach are self-government, social accord, conscious discipline and enhanced moral authority of policy, rather than simply administrative power.

To a large extent impetus comes from the national economy which demands fast decision making, flexible adaptation to changing circumstances and the efficient appointment of capable and knowledgeable managers. The economy objects to bureaucratism, arbitrariness, collective irresponsibility and incompetence, which are common aspects of departmental activities. It demands democratic procedures in the formulation of the most

important decisions, personal responsibility and increased public control over administrative activities, which alone can truly protect us from errors and blunders. It has also been noted that whenever the political atmosphere in the society favors innovation, the formulation of daring ideas and the appearance of talent, when it encourages enterprise and readiness to take a risk and punishes lack of initiative and conservatism, the rhythm of economic and scientific and technical progress becomes faster.

Yet another lesson stems from the difficulties experienced by a number of socialist countries: an economy cannot be managed with methods which are not inherent in it, by steadily expanding the bureaucratic apparatus and intensifying administrative coercion. It is inadmissible to turn the superstructure into an obstruction mechanism. Its most important economic function is to contribute to the full identification of the possibilities of the main production force, man, and to ensure the steady advancement of all organizational relations.

Naturally, however, the reforms in the political superstructure are not dictated by economic needs alone. We must take into consideration the new social realities, the fact that the level of social awareness has risen and many social interrelationships have become more complex. Some old theoretical views notwithstanding, as socialism becomes more mature its social structure is not simplified but, conversely, becomes more complex. Under the pressure of reality, utopian concepts of the lack of problems and conflicts in political life and the possibility of total unanimity on all matters have now been dropped. It has become clear that as it develops, socialism rejects uniformity, which means that it is not intensifying in the least within the individual countries or the entire socialist system. Conversely, social processes are becoming increasingly varied; socioeconomic structures are becoming more complex; the interests of individual groups and strata multiply and spiritual life becomes richer. As acknowledged by the noted American political expert A. Schlesinger, reality is striking one blow after another "at the myth cherished by right-wing forces that communism is a monolithic totalitarian society, uniform from the viewpoint of its dogmas and their implementation, unreceptive to historical changes and vicissitudes and impermeable to change."

The resolutions of the 27th Congress and January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum most clearly earmarked the high road of political restructuring: the further development of socialist democracy. This line can be clearly traced also in the policies of the ruling parties in many other fraternal countries and today a significantly more profound meaning than in the past has been invested in it. It can be said that a contemporary concept of socialist democratism is being formulated.

As they improve their political system, the socialist states are trying to find mechanisms which can take into consideration the pluralism of interests and reduce them

to a specific common denominator and broaden the base of social harmony. Situations of crisis, which developed in several countries, indicate how dangerous it is to push social contradictions back and block their normal outlet. Typical of all socialist countries is the aspiration better to organize the work of representative authorities and popular and national fronts and the allied parties and public organizations within them, and to make their activities richer, more varied and more efficient and consistent with practical needs, and changing for the better the style of formulating and making political decisions. More extensive use is being made of various forms of direct manifestation of the will of the people—national and local referenda, public opinion surveys and consultations. The idea of creating parallel task forces in charge of finding alternate political and economic decisions is becoming popular. The question is being raised of improving the mechanism for coordinating national interests.

In addition to the tradition, new institutions have appeared in some countries, such as a variety of movements (cultural-political or ecological), informal associations, foundations, political clubs, consultative authorities officially recognized by the law, and others. Such new developments do not question the political objectives of socialist society and, thanks to them, the structure of socialist democracy becomes substantially richer and allows all citizens and their voluntary associations, which accept and observe constitutional principles, freely to express their views, to participate in the dialogue with the state authorities and the ruling party, to suggest alternate solutions and variants and, within the constitutional framework, to defend their interests and rights. In this connection, the Polish and Hungarian communists are speaking of socialist pluralism, by which they mean not the notorious "free play" of political forces but broadening the platform of national concord, under the leading role of the party.

Frequently pluralism is understood as one of the features of bourgeois society. In recent years, however, scientists and politicians in the fraternal countries have tried to find a constructive content to the reality of multiplicity of the interests, views and positions, and to reflect it more fully in the mass information media, the political system and, above all, the elective authorities.

One of the determining features of democracy is glasnost, which submits the most important aspects of social life and the life of the party, the state and its authorities to the judgment of public opinion and public control. The mass information media are becoming energetic promoters of glasnost. It is only a fully and objectively informed person who can be a conscious and active participant in political and economic life and can make responsible decisions within self-governing structures.

Today the word "glasnost" is understood throughout the world without the need for translation. This is an acknowledgement of the serious nature of the changes it

implies. The extensive and comprehensive information of the public of all problems, open arguments and exchange of views on most painful problems inherent in political life have taken place in the other socialist countries, particularly in Poland, Hungary and Yugoslavia. It is indicative that in not a single one of them has glasnost undermined the foundations of the sociopolitical system or compromised it in the eyes of the international public. Those who feared such a development were mistaken. The broadening of glasnost strengthens the prestige of socialism. This is confirmed by the activities of the ruling parties which have abandoned the "propaganda of success," stopped concealing their problems and errors and taken up the truth, albeit not always pleasant.

Socialist democracy acquires new features thanks to the elective and periodical replacement of leading party and state cadres. In some cases this is done more firmly and consistently; in others, the situation calls for certain caution and a gradual approach. It is already clear, however, that perfecting these mechanisms will be of essential significance in the renovation of the political system.

Control over the legality of activities of officials and the apparatus and the constitutionality of the decisions which are being made is being strengthened. Increasing attention is being paid to the practical guaranteeing of the rights and freedoms of citizens: to this effect, "public defenders" and special commissions for the protection of civil rights are functioning in a number of countries.

The restructuring of the political organization of society cannot ignore methods of party work and the implementation of the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party. As the practical experience of a number of socialist countries proves, the critical study of relations between the ruling party and the state and between the party and society at large has become particularly relevant. Some parties have been forced to draw far-reaching conclusions from their weakened ties with the masses, which is a situation fraught with social crises. Increasingly, discussions and social experiments are dealing with possible forms, means and approaches with the help of which the party's leadership can be on the level of the new requirements. An active search for constructive solutions is taking place in Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Hungary and China, where a political reform is being drafted.

Some countries are displaying a growing tendency to revise methods of party leadership of the state, which are inconsistent with the spirit of the time, for in the recent past in frequent cases the party's apparatus had become the main instrument of full power, both on the national and local levels. The party committees had the final say in solving the majority of problems which officially were within the range of competence of state authorities. With such practices, the state authorities became simple executors of commands "from above." Still quite widespread

is a situation in which the personnel of the party apparatus interfere in all details and issue instructions on all subjects without bearing responsibility for possible errors. Bureaucratism and formalism had sunk roots in the party and state apparatus and occasionally an atmosphere which favored the undiluted power of a small circle of people or even a single person was created.

Today increasingly the strengthening of party leadership means not duplicating or substituting for the activities of various administrative mechanisms but upgrading ideological and political influence. The party formulates and executes policies consistent with the party principles, engaging in purposeful ideological and educational work among the masses, the youth in particular, and creating the type of moral political and ideological climate needed in attaining the set objectives. It trains and selects the more capable and authoritative managers. The purpose of restructuring is to shift the center of gravity in the activities of party authorities from petty control over each step taken by the state apparatus to the implementation of strategic political decisions. The principal means of influencing the various types of establishments and departments is the personal authority of party members employed in them. These concepts trigger increasing interest in the socialist countries, enriching not only the arsenal of ideas but also existing specific experience in the renovation of the socialist political system.

Opening to the Outside World

The new social system is developing and strengthening under the conditions of growing internationalization of various aspects of social life. The interdependence among countries is intensifying in politics, which is facing the global problem of the survival of mankind and the prevention of its nuclear self-destruction; in economics, where the division of labor and trade have become intrinsic prerequisites for growth; and in culture, in which there is an intensive enrichment of the nations with knowledge and intellectual values. All of this has brought to life a new phenomenon of extensive international contacts among people and the fast dissemination of technical achievements and all types of information. In a number of respects the world has turned out to be more integral and indivisible than in the past and socioeconomic progress has become faster. It is clear that the subsequent advancement of the socialist system must follow the line of this global process of internationalization.

For the time being, however, the socialist countries are insufficiently involved in it, not only because of the political hostility of the leading capitalist countries. This is also the result of internal economic problems and the delayed reaction to the new international situation. The socialist countries account for more than 12 percent of global trade, which is quite inconsistent with their production and scientific and technical potential. The rates

of expansion of foreign economic trade, including reciprocal exchanges, is lower in such countries compared to the industrially developed countries in the West. The scale of contacts among the populations of these countries and cultural and scientific exchanges among them are also below global criteria.

That is why a greater openness displayed by socialist society to international intercourse clearly becomes one of the features of its renovation and advancement. Such a line is being pursued most consistently by Yugoslavia, Hungary and China, which are trying to make their economies competitive on the world markets and to make full use of the advantages of the international division of labor. The Soviet Union and several other socialist countries are taking energetic steps significantly to enhance their foreign economic activities.

Both the theory and study of reality indicate that differences in social systems do not justify traits of isolationism. In the final account, alienation from international trade and communication means falling behind. We must not forget, for example, that the CEMA member countries account for quite a significant share of the global industrial and agricultural output but are far behind in the production of high technology items. Correspondingly, our opportunities for assuming leading positions in terms of production technology and costs is limited in many areas. This makes international division and cooperation of labor vitally necessary.

Now, when global socialism has gained adequate political, economic and military prestige, its gains are well-protected. Extensive participation in international cooperation and in human contacts, which in the past fed a variety of fears, are becoming mainly a means of strengthening socialism and a channel for increasing its influence in international developments, as well as a factor of trust among countries with different social systems and a prerequisite for their peaceful coexistence.

Naturally, particularly favorable prerequisites for all-round interaction are developing among countries following the socialist path. Indeed, in the postwar period large-scale integration relations have been developed within CEMA. Close political and military cooperation has been developed within the Warsaw Pact and bilateral and multilateral relations are intensifying in virtually all areas. Nonetheless, many opportunities for further progress, related to the internationalization of social life, remain unused.

They are obstructed by the political and economic mechanisms which developed in the past, most of which performed passive functions. Today they are being reorganized and several socialist countries have already accomplished a great deal in this respect. A reform in cooperation within CEMA is being undertaken. However, a qualitative change is as yet to be made. It is related to reaching a higher level of export orientation and

competitiveness of national economies, gradual introduction of convertibility of national currencies and establishing a collective currency for CEMA countries, the extensive development of multinational and mixed enterprises, granting greater foreign export autonomy to enterprises and eliminating bureaucratic restrictions on the exchange of information and private travel.

It would be difficult to imagine that the increased role of the socialist world in the global economy will take place without the counteraction of some capitalist forces, without aggravations in the competitive struggle for markets and recurrences of policies of embargo and trade discrimination. However, on a large-scale strategic basis, a greater openness of socialist society will introduce an important element of stability in international economic and political life. This is consistent with the interests of the countries belonging to either social system.

Consistent internationalism and need for international cooperation are inherent in the very nature of the new society. The full and actual utilization of these features will enable it to reach higher standards.

The changes occurring within the socialist world are taking place in the course of the struggle between the new and the old and the painful elimination of inertia and the opposition of forms and mechanisms of the social system which had exhausted their usefulness and turned into hindrances. This international process of renovation is difficult, uneven, and lengthy. It would be quite difficult to trace, not to mention to predict, its main trends, forms and stages with sufficient accuracy. Clearly, errors will be made. There will be breakdowns and, therefore, checking and rechecking decisions. Nonetheless, the study of the new phenomena occurring in the lives of the socialist countries leads to the conclusion that irreversible revolutionary changes are taking place, in the course of which the advantages of socialism will become increasingly apparent.

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

05003

Communists in the World of New Realities

18020004k Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) pp 103-112

[Article by Grigoriy Grigoryevich Vodolazov, head of the Department of World Politics and International Activities of the CPSU, CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, doctor of philosophical sciences]

[Text] The present situation in world developments was characterized by the 27th CPSU Congress as a turning point. "In recent years," its documents noted, "the communist movement has encountered a number of new realities, tasks and problems. All of this indicates that it

has entered a qualitatively different stage of development." Turning points in historical situations are always difficult. It is no simple matter to lift the barriers erected by new problems. Theoretical considerations are needed as well as a sober assessment of achievements and shortcomings, and the harnessing of forces for the practical implementation of the new stipulations.

Such are the tasks which are facing today the international communist movement. From the viewpoint of the general historical trend, it has developed upwards. Whereas in 1917 there were 400,000 communists in the world, by 1946 there were 78 communist parties with a membership of 20 million; today there are more than 100 communist parties with over 85 million members. In 1960 there were 2.5 million communists in the nonsocialist countries, compared with about 5 million in 1987, and so on. However, if we consider a shorter time segment such as, for example, the last decade, we cannot fail to note a certain decline: at the start of the 1980s membership in a number of parties declined and so did their support by voters; correspondingly, the number of communist representatives in parliaments declined, differences within individual parties intensified, and so on.

This decline is a reflection of the fact that a number of new vitally important realities were not given a sufficiently convincing interpretation by the communists; for the time being no suitable theoretical interpretation has been given to phenomena such as the establishment of an interdependent and conflicting yet largely integral world based on the drastic leap in the development of global production forces; the contemporary stage of the scientific and technical revolution and the changes, under its influence, of economic relations and social structure within bourgeois society; the multinationalization of capital and neocolonialist forms of exploitation; aggravation of global problems, etc. Failing to find from the communists practical and convincing answers to the challenges of our time, many people have turned other interpreters of new phenomena in global social developments.

As acknowledged by many communist parties, the 27th CPSU Congress provided an incentive for the development of active theoretical work within the communist movement. It is a question not of changing particulars or secondary details and individual aspects of strategy. Today theory must develop (and is, partially, already developing) along the entire front in essential and basic directions and, consequently, should become not only theoretically and politically but also psychologically ready for the appearance of new major theoretical concepts. In other words, it is a question of fundamental matters, such as the formulation of a new style of political thinking, the entry of the communist movement into a new stage of development, and an upsurge in the entire strategy of the struggle on the level of the new tasks.

In the past 2 years the communist movement has done a certain amount of work in the interpretation of the new realities and in formulating corresponding tactical and strategic objectives. However, a great deal more remains to be accomplished.

The Struggle for Peace and the Class Struggle

In this area a number of very essential aspects have appeared in communist strategy.

“The new quality of mass destruction weapons and the related threat of the death of mankind in a nuclear war,” the German Communist Party notes, “makes it necessary for all political forces to adopt a new approach to the problems of war and peace. The revolutionary worker movement, which has always marched in the front line of the fighters against imperialist wars, is not avoiding to answer this question. In the past the task of preventing an imperialist war was related to an orientation toward converting it, should it nonetheless break out, into a revolutionary civil war against imperialism. Under contemporary conditions, when a world war would inevitably develop into a nuclear catastrophe, there can be only one overall task, that of preventing the outbreak of such a war.” Yes, today there are no other alternatives or possibilities, no other variants. That is why the question of peace has become the basic question of our time, for today it is a question of safeguarding the very foundations of human civilization and the survival of mankind.

This is an exceptionally important new feature of the contemporary situation. Hence the need to solve an essentially new problem: to achieve a unification of forces which would be much more varied than in the past, and the range, power and influence of which would be able to make today an international nuclear conflict *absolutely* impossible. Naturally, this struggle is incomparably greater than that waged by the world revolutionary forces directly against capitalism. It is described in the CPSU program as the “struggle between the forces of progress and reaction in the contemporary world,” and characterizes the basic forces promoting the safeguard of peace and the lifting of the threat of war as “the main motive forces of social development,” which are world socialism, the worker and communist movements, the peoples of the liberated countries and the mass democratic movements. They include, therefore, the forces of the global revolutionary process, which are acquiring some new features within the context of the universal struggle for peace, as well as a number of new peace-loving and democratic forces which are making the contemporary struggle for peace particularly widespread and are giving it additional scope. What is especially relevant today is that despite ideological differences which remain among such forces on sociopolitical matters, to ensure their unity of action in the main sector, in the struggle for peace.

Yes, today the separate significance of the question of peace and its importance in the general struggle waged by the democratic, communist and revolutionary forces in the contemporary world have increased drastically. However, the struggle for peace is not turning into some kind of isolated task, unrelated to the social battles of the present. It is inseparable from the overall movement for social progress. It is not reduced to abstract appeals and humanistic declarations. It means above all a struggle (waged, naturally, with political means) against the political and social forces which are interested in the arms race and in maintaining international tension.

An increasing number of communist parties are reaching the conclusion that the center of gravity in the study of this problem today should be formulated as the right correlation between the struggle for peace, social progress and socioclass changes. The main idea of all such searches is to find areas, arenas and targets of struggle in which the demands of peace and socioeconomic progress operate as a single and intrinsically interrelated set of demands. The fullest possible implementation of this unity, in the view of many communist parties, can be attained in the struggle against the militarization of the economy, which is the source and the reason for the increase of the threat of war and of the worsened working and living conditions of the broad toiling masses. Theoretical research in this area has already resulted in the formulation of quite substantive and promising formulas and concepts which reflect the link between the struggle for peace and that for socioeconomic progress. Such are, for example, the concept of the “economics of peace” (Belgian Communist Party), the “bloc of change” program (Austrian Communist Party), the “coalition of peace and reason,” and “partners in security” (German Communist Party), the “non-nuclear government” concept (Japanese Communist Party), the “merger of leftist forces on the basis of peace and social progress” (Spanish Communist Party) and others.

It is within the framework of such concepts that the communist parties formulate the task of fighting for limiting war production and gradually converting the war industry to civilian production. The “economics of peace” program, notes L. Van Geyt, the chairman of the Belgian Communist Party, “presumes making use of the overwhelming share of material and financial resources, removed from the arms race, from a war economy” for satisfying the individual and collective needs of the people (*Problems of Peace and Socialism*, No 9, 1986, p 12).

This is a very fruitful beginning for the development of new concepts. Their further development is related by communist theoreticians to the need for a more substantive refinement of the content of the political mechanism, which could ensure a conversion to the “economics of peace.” There is increasing talk of the fact that the idea of struggle for “economics of peace” should be

supplemented with the idea of the struggle for the type of transitional political system which could be described as a "democracy of peace" or as "antimilitaristic (antiwar) democracy."

The new approaches to the struggle for peace and the concept of a particular stage in the social struggle at which peace-loving and socioeconomic demands merge within a single entity, the stage of the "economics (democracy) of peace," also determine the appearance of new features in the strategy of alliances. For example, the Belgian communists point out that we should aspire to make alliances against the militaristic faction of the bourgeois class as broad as possible. This would even provide the "opportunity of cooperating with certain bourgeois circles, including even members of multinational capitalism, whose interests lie more in the area of economic exchanges and peaceful development than in war production and the armament industry" (*ibid.*, pp 14-15). As they develop these ideas, the communists see their source in Lenin's famous strategic stipulation which was formulated in 1922: to be able to distinguish between the "pacifistic camp of the international bourgeoisie" and the gross-bourgeois, aggressive-bourgeois and reactionary-bourgeois camp (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 44, p 408).

Furthermore, in connection with the task of organizing broad antiwar coalitions, many communist parties draw analogies between the present situation and the situation which prevailed during the struggle against fascism in the mid-1930s, and between the scale and significance of a turn in strategy, the need for which has become crucial, and the turn which was taken at the 7th Comintern Congress. It is thus that innovation and tradition become intrinsically combined in the searches of the communist parties. Their initial conclusions have still not been subjected to a serious and comprehensive investigation in the course of the struggle. Initial successes, however, already achieved by the communists in several Western European capitalist countries, have confirmed the extensive opportunities provided by the new strategic formula, expressed as follows: through a democracy (economics) of peace to further socioeconomic and political struggle against monopoly capital (within the framework of a "democratic turn," "democratic alternative" or "antimonopoly democracy") and subsequently to revolutionary socialist change.

Contemporary Capitalism and Communist Alternative

The content of the socioclass struggle itself is currently undergoing major changes in connection with the appearance of the new realities in the development of capitalism. The majority of communist parties are noting that capitalism has entered a qualitatively new period. One of its most important distinguishing features is above all the drastic leap taken in the development of production forces. "The contemporary technological change is more important," notes the Italian Communist

Party, "than the first industrial revolution." The communist parties also note the new aspects and important changes in the nature of labor and production relations within capitalism as a whole. They include the increased army of hired labor of a new type—highly skilled mental work—serving the contemporary automated and computerized equipment and, fully in accordance with the familiar prediction of Karl Marx, no longer directly involved in the production process but standing "alongside it" as controllers, tuners, originators of new ideas, and so on. The appearance of large masses of such workers introduces great variety in the system of relations within contemporary hired labor. Another very essential new aspect is the growth of production internationalization (based on the development of the scientific and technical revolution) and the increased international division of labor and systematic conversion of multinational corporations into the dominant operational form of monopoly capital.

How are such changes reflected in the formulation of alternative programs and strategic concepts by the communist parties?

Today the multinational monopolies are considered in the programmatic documents of communist parties, such as those of Finland and Austria, the most viable part of the capitalist economy, accounting for an increasing share of the production and marketing of commodities and contemporary technology. This is an important and realistic awareness of the adaptability of capitalism, countering the still occasionally encountered naive and sectarian views within the labor movement that capitalism has fully exhausted all of its possibilities.

Nonetheless, the communist parties also try to avoid overestimating the forces and possibilities of contemporary capitalism. The reserves used by capitalism do not lead to the real resolution of its contradictions. Furthermore, as the communist parties emphasize, multinational capital is creating a set of new contradictions and difficulties, the explosiveness and threat to mankind of which are vastly superior to the older ones. This applies, in particular, to the unprecedented growth of the militaristic nature of the production process; unemployment, which does not disappear during periods of economic upswings and which increases during periods of crises; the widening economic gap between developing countries and monopoly centers and the increased neocolonial exploitation of third-world peoples.

In analyzing the set of new contradictions, the communists are reaching the conclusion that despite the occurring changes, the entire logic of development of the global economy and of national production forces in the capitalist countries requires a planned social production, developing in the interest and under the control of the toiling man. In other words, it demands socialism.

This is an essential conclusion. The point is that of late (as a reaction to sectarian calls for making preparations for the direct revolutionary overthrow of capitalism) voices are being heard with increasing frequency and loudness, according to which since capitalism is "finding survival reserves" and since the stock of such reserves is far from being exhausted, a direct struggle for socialism is a task for the very distant future. Therefore, it is claimed, would it not be expedient for the time being to drop the slogan of the struggle for socialism and to concentrate on the struggle for the solution of social problems within the framework of capitalism. Let us note that the communist parties have disagreed with the logic of such views. Thus, in summing up the results of one such debate, the leadership of the Italian Communist Party firmly proclaimed its "irreversible aim toward socialism" (*L'Unita*, 15 Dec 1985). The French communists emphasized at their 25th Congress that "progress toward socialism is... a ripe necessity" and that "France needs socialism." This too is the common position held by the communist parties.

In other words, no single communist party has dropped from its banner the slogan of the struggle for socialism as its future objective. However, a variety of approaches may be found within the communist movement in the assessment of the time needed and the ways and means of achieving it.

Naturally, it is not a question of revolutionary changes within a specific time segment. The communists realize that changes depend on a number of objective and subject factors, the pace of development of which cannot be mathematically computed. This separates the Marxists from various sectarians and conspirators who, as Marx said, are the "alchemists" of the revolution. Nonetheless, having a general concept of approximate time limits of the struggle and deadlines for achieving one social level or another, are not objects of futurological entertainment but something entirely realistic and necessary. Such concepts substantially influence the type, means, nature and energy of the current struggle and the content and forms of its ties with long-term final objectives and, therefore, are a necessary part of theory. That is why the worker and communist movements are discussing the question of the way the new realities of capitalism are influencing the approximate historical time for its defeat: do they postpone (significantly) or bring it closer? This is a complex problem and the questions are difficult. A search is under way, the results of which have still not been summed up.

Some theoreticians, as they point out the significant reserve for "survival" at the disposal of capitalism, emphasize that the content of the struggle in the next several decades will consist of actions aimed at reform within state-monopoly capitalism. Other theoreticians, while acknowledging that the struggle for socialism in the developed capitalist countries is not an immediate item

on the agenda assume, however, that it would be important to ensure its real development and make it maximally broad for the time being, and only then determine the necessary time, as the situation develops. We believe that this approach contributes to a greater extent to initiative and encourages energetic steps (which does not prevent them from being realistic). The struggle for restructuring in our country, incidentally, and its successes are assessed by the communists in other countries as one of the new realities which ascribe an additional attraction to socialism in the eyes of the entire world, and provide a new impetus in the struggle for socialism.

Internationalism Today

The 1980s became a landmark in which the strict and comprehensive interdependence among countries and nations was clearly manifested. This is the first time that such interdependence has appeared. Today the tasks and problems which cannot be solved on the national level have become particularly pressing. Agreement and coordination in the efforts of all mankind are needed. The communists have actively undertaken to develop and write this new chapter in the theory and history of internationalism.

The communists formulate as one of the most important tasks that of developing international cohesion and firm international relations among all peace-loving forces on earth. Their combination, as was noted at the 27th CPSU Congress, would constitute a "tremendous potential for peace, reason and good will." The ways of blending together the "peace initiatives of countries which have taken the socialist path" with the "activities of nonaligned countries and other major social and political forces within the entire popular movement for peace" were discussed in detail at the 25th French Communist Party Congress. The concept of this new type of international cohesion and its content and forms and the interrelationship between the social and political forces within it are the focal point of the closest possible attention of the contemporary communist movement. The economic interdependence among countries in the contemporary world which, as is the case with the establishment of a universal economy (both integral and conflicting), as an answer to the requirements of contemporary production forces, set new and serious international tasks for mankind. Their development calls for a drastic intensification of the conscious, the democratic principles in controlling the global economy.

The danger that in a part of the world production forces, which are becoming the increasingly united and interrelated possession of all mankind, are being used as private property by monopoly circles is becoming greater, threatening the lives of all countries and peoples and all economic life on earth. The communists point out this threat, calling upon all democratic and progressive forces to unite in the struggle for its elimination. The CPSU has suggested the convening of a world congress on problems of economic security, which would be an international

forum for all democratic forces on earth, to discuss anything which obstructs global economic relations. This is yet another important aspect of international cohesion today.

Having determined the new forms of international cohesion, in the development of which communists and communist parties must participate (as one of the leading forces), they naturally faced the following question: how are such new forms correlated with the communists' traditional international cohesion of the working class?

This question proved to be as complex as that of the correlation between the struggle for peace and the socio-class struggle for socialism. Here as well two trends have appeared. The trend of absolutizing the struggle for peace led to the conclusion that the socioclass struggle must be halted and postponed for "later," and that we must also drop the slogan of proletarian internationalism as one of direct struggle against capitalism, the time for which has not yet arrived in the developed capitalist countries.

The other trend is based on the concept that the main feature today is a socialist revolution which, as a supreme objective, should predominate over the struggle for peace as a secondary target, setting proletarian international cohesion as the center of the international strategy of the communists. At the same time, the international cohesion in the struggle for peace would be considered "non-class" or ascribed a strictly secondary role.

Life and practical experience, however, proved that both approaches are one-sided. As the connection between the struggle for peace and the struggle for social progress (and, in the future, for socialism) became increasingly clear, a greater awareness was also reached of the connection between the new and the old forms of international cohesion. Since the struggle for peace is also a struggle against the militaristic and most reactionary part of the bourgeoisie and, consequently, since it potentially includes antimonopoly and antibourgeois, i.e., socialist, trends, a similar connection must be inherent in all forms of international cohesion.

At the same time, in order for international cohesion among peace-loving forces not to turn into a helpless and discordant pacifistic movement, it must have an active nucleus which could give the movement a streamlined nature, strength and confidence. However, the exceptional importance of the new forms of international cohesion does not mean in the least that worker cohesion in itself becomes unnecessary. Furthermore, without it the new forms can simply not be efficient. On the other hand, the establishment of a close, an organic link between international proletarian cohesion with other forms of internationalism dictates to the working class the need to avoid any excessive alienation and closeness "within itself," or rigid contraposition between itself and the other forces of progress and peace. It can even be said

that one of the most important trends in strengthening worker cohesion today is the joint, the coordinated activities of the working class in different countries in strengthening and developing a wide international movement for peace. An interesting summation was made by G. Val, member of the Norwegian Communist Party Politburo, at a roundtable meeting held in Prague, in 1986. He pointed out that through the active participation in the struggle for peace the workers are gaining a more profound understanding of the socioeconomic contradictions within contemporary capitalism and a realization of the need to wage a political struggle against capitalist exploitation and oppression.

Achieving the organic unity between the worker and anti-war movements is an important task formulated by communist parties. Its successful solution will largely depend on the ability to structure relations with allies largely in a new way: to engage in debates, to defend one's views, not to lay a claim on having the monopoly of truth, not to raise demands on management and leadership as prerequisites for participation in alliances, not only to teach others but to learn from them as well, and so on.

These features of the new policy of alliances are formulated in the programmatic documents of many communist parties. "By participating in alliances," emphasizes the FRG communist program, "the German Communist Party does not claim leadership. It intends to earn respect and prestige only through its initiative in the development of joint movements and actions, and only through its energy and the consistency of its members."

"Working together as allies and friends," delegates to the 22nd U.S. Communist Party Congress said, "we must strive further to master the art of debate rather than argument.... We must always, whenever possible, meet the people halfway in order to win them over to our side and convince them that it is possible, necessary and even pleasant to work with us, even though our opinions may differ." In characterizing the style and methods of such discussions, the French communists note that "it is necessary less to expose than to explain; less to criticize than to suggest and not only explain and suggest but also build, achieve, implement and concretize. Such should be the rule governing the actions of communists today in all areas."

Thus, the international cohesion of the working class, as part of a broader context of international solidarity, is open to other forms of internationalism, i.e., it must become incomparably more flexible than in the past. This, however, is only one aspect of the novelty. The other is that in a number of respects the internationalism of the working class should be incomparably firmer than in the past. Why is that?

Above all, because international cohesion in the upper levels of the bourgeois class has strengthened. In the past, the working class in different countries was subjected to

exploitation mostly by its own bourgeoisie and national capital; today, it is frequently exploited by multinational capital. For example, General Motors exploits workers in the United States, the FRG, Great Britain, Argentina, Brazil and many other countries. This united front of multinational capital is opposed by weakly interconnected and largely isolated detachments of the working class. Such confrontation, the communist parties note, does not promise anything good to the working class. Whereas several decades ago international cohesion was highly desirable for the national detachments of the working class, today it is absolutely necessary, for without it no fruitful struggle is possible. The communists are speaking no longer of the basic theoretical solution of the problem of correlation between national and international tasks in the struggle against the multinational corporations but of a specific program of action and practical steps to be taken in the struggle waged by the working class with the multinational bourgeoisie in the international arena. The communists actively support the international strikes of workers, which are proving their great possibilities. A noteworthy example is the fact that the personnel of the multinational concern for man-made materials (AIZO) simultaneously "stopped the pulse beat" of the concern's enterprises in Belgium, Switzerland, the Netherlands and the FRG, as a result of which it forced it to forego steps taken to reduce output, which could affect 6,000 jobs.

With a view to strengthening the international unity among workers, the communist parties comprehensively stimulate the internationalization of trade union activities. They firmly support the appeal of the World Federation of Trade Unions, submitted to the UN Commission on Multinational Corporations, which called for codifying the right of trade unions to engage in talks within the framework of several countries on all problems related to employment and working conditions. The communists also encourage the creation of international "action committees" within the multinational corporations, which should coordinate the views of trade unions in different countries and the actions of workers employed in the enterprises of a specific company.

The communist parties realize that the struggle against the capitalist leadership, which is rallying on an international scale, is both economic and political. For economic activities pursued by capitalism in the world arena in the contemporary world, at which point there should be no illusion whatsoever, illusions which are disseminated by liberal and reformist circles, are well-protected politically as well. The multinational corporations have at their service the political and military might of the United States, the political mechanisms of the "Seven"—the seven leading capitalist countries which regularly coordinate their views, the political instruments of the European Parliament and the EEC and, finally, NATO, which is the main military-political force which stands behind the multinational corporations and contemporary capitalism in general. That is why the communist parties pay a great deal of attention

to political "support" of the economic programs they formulate in the struggle against capitalism and the political forms under the protection of which an economic offensive could be mounted against multinational capital. This is a new matter for the communists for which reason, naturally, here as well different approaches exist.

Some theoreticians (in EEC countries, for instance) assume that because of the great economic, political and military and strategic interdependence among bourgeois European capitalist countries, progress toward socialism, not to mention the victory of socialism in any one of them, is unlikely and that one should concentrate on all-European actions by progressive forces and on their more or less simultaneous victory in a number of Western European countries. The positive aspect of this view is the critique of national exclusivity and limitations, and an orientation toward an all-round strengthening of coordinated international activities by communists and their allies. However, it also includes a certain over-assessment of the significance of international aspects; such a concept, if systematically implemented, could lead to restraining domestic revolutionary initiative and develop into a strategy of reciprocal expectation of unified action.

The reaction to such a view has been the development of the opposite viewpoint in which the emphasis falls on national tasks and possibilities, loosely tying their solution within a global context. Naturally, this is an active and specific position which, unfortunately (as practical experience in recent years has indicated) is ineffective. The efforts of left-wing forces in some countries, relying on parliaments, municipalities and even governments, to restrain big monopoly capital in their own country (ignoring its international relations and possibilities) have failed, for it turned out that such capital is international in nature. It easily avoids nationalization and democratic control by shifting to other countries, and its responsive and internationally coordinated economic and political actions put the country and the left-wing forces in a difficult position.

As always, however, life corrects theory. Those who emphasize the international factors realized through practical experience that a substantial influence on the correlation of forces on an international, an all-European scale, can be achieved by changing the correlation of forces in one's own country. Supporters of "national emphases" realize that European capital united within the Common Market is a reality, that the agencies of the EEC and the European Parliament are a significant force, and that it is only a struggle which takes into consideration these realities and forces that can be successful. The practical experience gained in the struggle and comradesly discussions are bringing such positions closer to each other. This became particularly clear at the 1985 Paris Conference. The very fact that such a meeting was held with the participation of the absolute majority of Western European communist parties and

the exchange of experience in the struggle and the similarity of basic positions (despite the entire variety of views) is an exceptionally important indicator of the increased communist leaning toward systematic international contacts and actions, which would clearly show an understanding of the significance of international tasks and respect for the national specifics for their implementation by the individual parties. Today the communists are working on combining flexibility with firmness, as they develop and enrich the theory and practice of international cohesion. They are engaged in an active search, testing and selection of new forms of international contacts which would ensure exchange of experience and coordinate the struggle of the communist parties while, at the same time, preserving their autonomy and independence.

"The CPSU," reads the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th Party Congress, "does not dramatize the fact that no full unanimity exists among communist parties always and in everything. Obviously, there can be, in general, no identity of views on all problems without exception." The communists share the main final objectives which define and unite them: peace and socialism. Progress toward them must be varied and multifaceted. "In the same way that unity has nothing in common with uniformity, hierarchy and interference by some parties in the affairs of others or the aspiration of any given party to hold the monopoly on truth, the communist movement can and must be strong in terms of its class cohesion and equal cooperation among all fraternal parties in the struggle for common objectives."

The objective need for strengthening proletarian solidarity and developing new international fronts of activities—the struggle for peace, for the solution of global ecological problems and for a new global economic order—are contributing to the ever more profound realization by the communists of the need to strengthen unity within the international communist movement. A while back a number of communist parties believed that the best forms of contacts among communist parties are exclusively bilateral meetings, as most consistent with the requirements of equality and independence. A current trend is that of increasing multilateral international meetings. Particularly fruitful of late have been regional meetings among communist parties in Asian, Latin American and Western European countries, and the collective study of common problems of social struggle in one area or another and the aspects and nature of relations between national and regional problems, and the status of a given area within the system of global relations and contradictions. A number of communist parties have called for holding regular international meetings with the participation of other left-wing forces and the development of international forms of contacts which would ensure the flexible combination of cohesion with autonomy. The international cohesion among communists is not a state but a process in the course of which differences in approaches and in opinions may (and do)

appear. However, this neither could nor should be an obstacle to strengthening the international unity within communist ranks, which today can be nothing other than unity within variety.

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

05003

The Creative Potential of Socialism

180200041 Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 16, Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) pp 113-118

[Text] In the words of V.I. Lenin, the Great October Revolution accomplished "the greatest universal historical deed," and "now the entire world has become different" in the aftermath of its victory ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 45, p 99; vol 41, p 85). This renovation of the world is continuing to this day, 7 decades after the October days of 1917. The renovation of current reality must be consistent with the dynamics of Marxist-Leninist thinking, which stems from and enriches practical experience. In the past 70 years there have been many difficulties and obstacles in the development of revolutionary theory and socialist practice. However, the inexhaustible creative impetus of the October Revolution is so powerful and the intellectual potential of Marxism-Leninism is so tremendous that even decades later our great doctrine is not losing its constructive power. Today, when a revolutionary restructuring is taking place in the land of the soviets, and when the processes of renovation are spreading in the socialist countries and in the entire system of international relations and interrelationships, Marxist-Leninist theory acts as the methodological foundation for progress and in the struggle for strengthening peace and preserving the values of civilization.

The international conference dedicated to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, on the subject of "The Creative Development of Marxism-Leninism," sponsored by the journal *Nowe Drogi*, the theoretical and political organ of the PZPR Central Committee, took place in Warsaw, from 22 to 24 September. It was attended by representatives of the party journals of a number of socialist countries, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia and *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, the theoretical and information journal of communist and worker parties.

The delegations submitted papers at the conference, presenting their views on a wide range of problems. An exchange of views on the topical problems of the lives and struggle of the peoples for peace, democracy and socialism took place in the course of lively debates.

Following is a report by S. Kolesnikov and G. Chernyko, *Kommunist* special correspondents, on the proceedings of the conference.

Seventy Years of the October Age

The process of building a world set on the principles of social justice was initiated during the unforgettable days of the Great October Revolution. This was mentioned by all participants in the meeting. History proved, said G. Bednarski, secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, the realistic nature, firmness and depth of the cause of Lenin and the bolsheviks and of the worker, peasant and soldier masses and the peoples of the former Russian empire, oppressed by tsarism, the cause of turning a backward bourgeois-land owning state into the vanguard of social progress.

J. Vorholtzer, deputy editor in chief of *Einheit*, the journal of the SED Central Committee, pointed out that the victory of the socialist revolution was a victory for the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin, which showed mankind the prospects for its national and social liberation. All essential historical processes which are taking place in the arena of the class struggle are related to the Red October, one way or another.

P. Nikicel, representative of *Era Socialiste*, the journal of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee, described the October Revolution as an event the impact on social development of which goes far beyond the range of a single state and significantly influences the history of mankind.

The influence of the ideas and example of the Great October Socialist Revolution on the destinies of the working people in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America were described by P. Perenley, deputy editor in chief of *Namyn Amdral*, the journal of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee; M. Orabun, deputy editor in chief of *Alun May*, journal of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee; Kan Sohn-Sop, deputy editor in chief of *Kyllochzha*, journal of the Korean Labor Party Central Committee; Haile Demse, representative of *Meskerem*, journal of the Ethiopian Labor Party; A.W. Kasem, editor in chief of *Qadaya al-Asr*, journal of the Yemen Socialist Party Central Committee; E. Del Llano, director of *Cuba Socialista*, journal of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee; and J. Barrios, member of the editorial council of the journal *Problems of Peace and Socialism* (representative of the Salvadoran Communist Party).

The October Revolution is of permanent significance. It taught historical lessons in dialectics, which are a manual for action for any truly national, socialist revolution. This was the topic of the speech by N. Iribadzhakov, responsible editor of *Novo Vreme*, theoretical organ of the BCP Central Committee. He emphasized, in particular that on the basis of the experience of the Great October Revolution and the first years of building socialism in the land of the soviets, Lenin introduced the exceptionally important law of the historical role of the

people's masses in building the new society. Until recently, however, the speaker said, the role of the masses as the subject of social management and independent and creative activities remained somehow on the periphery of theoretical thinking. The crucial stage which has been initiated in the USSR and the other socialist countries by virtue of historical necessity, as a renaissance of Leninism and the continuation of the socialist revolution, takes us back to the question of the true origins of its invincible force, creative enthusiasm and scope. Today the Soviet Union is no longer an isolated island surrounded by hostile capitalist countries. A significant percentage of mankind is marching under the banner of the October Revolution. The revolution opened to it new prospects, set new objectives and tasks, and brought in the historical arena previously unknown forces, inspiring them to engage in radical changes in their own lives.

In his presentation on the same topics, G. Bednarski, secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, particularly emphasized the need for consistency between the means of building socialism and its stages, and the fact that socialism becomes covered by schematism in the course of the combination of ossified theory with static practice; contradictions appear between proclaimed objectives and steps taken, between words and actions, and between intentions and implementations. The experience of the October Revolution, the speaker emphasized is, on the one hand, a source of determining the principles governing the transition to socialism and its growth from an idea into practice and from theory to reality and, on the other, an example of the utilization of such principles under conditions specific to each individual country and separate stage.

Today, the PZPR Central Committee secretary went on to say, socialism is facing tasks equal in scale to those which determined the crucial nature of the revolutionary initiative of the bolsheviks in 1917. The revolutionary process entered its second stage after 1945. Socialism became a global system. This stage could be described as the second revolution. Today we need a third revolution, which would make possible the definitive victory of socialism over imperialism in terms of the level of labor productivity, the pace of scientific and technical progress, the quality of life of the people and the humanism and wealth of the individual. Today to be for socialism means actively to support radical change in economic and political life, ideology and education.

Continuity and Innovation

The processes which are currently taking place in the socialist countries were described at the conference as being truly revolutionary. This is a reflection of the continuity of revolutionary ideas. Such ideas inspired the masses during the October Revolution and are a source of constructive energy today.

The reports and speeches by the participants in the conference discussed the specific experience of their parties in managing the building of socialism. Thus, M. Orabun (*Alun May*) reported on the resolutions of the Fourth Congress of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party. In formulating and concretizing its general line, the party congress defined the main trends and tasks of the transitional period to socialism and the program for the socioeconomic development of Laos during the second 5-year period (1986-1990) and the period until the year 2000.

Nguyen Van Dang, deputy editor in chief of *Tap ti Kong Shan*, organ of the Vietnamese Communist Party, noted that Vietnam is still in the first stage of the transitional period. Although achievements in various areas are unquestionable, the country is facing numerous and very serious difficulties. At its sixth congress, the VCP spoke out in favor of a Leninist approach to the problem: "We must openly look the truth in the face and honestly assess and tell it." The party forum, which analyzed the weak aspect in the life of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and which drafted measures to eliminate the errors and mistakes which were made, concluded that a comprehensive renovation in all areas of social development was needed.

The 19th Congress of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, said the representative of the journal of Mongolian communists, became a most important landmark in the progress of the country toward completing the building of socialism. The course charted at the congress is entirely consistent with the strategy of accelerating economic and social development, formulated by the CPSU. The need for accelerated progress in the national economy of the Mongolian People's Republic is explained both in terms of the historical features of the transition to socialism, bypassing capitalism, as well as the overall law of equalizing the economic levels of the socialist countries.

The entire Mongolian experience proves that, guided by a Marxist-Leninist party, and with the support and aid of the socialist community, countries which were previously backward socioeconomically have the possibility of building socialism despite the level reached in their socioeconomic development at the time of the revolution.

This topic was reflected also in the statements of the representatives of the journals of the Yemen Socialist Party and the Ethiopian Labor Party. In order to surmount the difficulties which are facing these countries, which have chosen a socialist orientation, as the vanguard force of revolution change, the ruling parties must study and take into consideration in their activities both the positive and the negative experiences of other countries.

E. Del Llano (*Cuba Socialista*) spoke on the party's work in guiding the building of the new society, in implementing the party program adopted at the Third Congress of the Cuban Communist Party.

The representative of the journal of the Romanian communists said that the Romanian Socialist Republic has entered a new stage in building socialism. As stipulated by the 13th RCP Congress, by the end of the present decade Romania must advance from the stage of developing to that of averagely developed socialist country and subsequently become a comprehensively developed country. This presumes a conversion from extensive to intensive development in industry, agriculture and other sectors of the national economy. Achieving a higher quality of labor and living standard is possible only as a result of the scientific and technical and agrarian revolution and revolutionary changes in the organization and management of the entire society.

J. Vorholtzer (*Einheit*) depicted the course charted by the SED for intensification of the national economy. It is aimed at pointing more actively scientific discoveries toward economic and social progress and combining as closely as possible the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of socialism. The fast growth of contemporary production forces, related to the planned development of all areas of socialist society, called for improvements in production relations. In the GDR the building of the new socialist system has been accompanied by extensive development of socialist democracy, which is vitally necessary to socialism. "Work, plan and manage" are the constitutional stipulations which are being systematically implemented in the republic today.

The higher the political and socioeconomic standard of society becomes, the more difficult problems must be solved by the ruling party. The immutable and permanent demand in this case is to be guided by the laws governing the development of socialism as a system and to take into consideration the specifics, the characteristics of the country and the conditions under which the new social system is being built.

The resolutions of the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the 27th Congress of the Leninist Party, which substantiated the need for a course of acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development, and which inaugurated an essentially new stage in the development of Soviet society, were cited as examples of loyalty to the ideals and the creative spirit of the October Revolution.

The participants in the conference noted that the restructuring taking place in the USSR is having an ever increasing influence on the situation in their own countries. We, L. Tomasek, deputy editor in chief of *Nova Mysl*, organ of the CZCP Central Committee, noted, welcomed the radical reforms in the Soviet Union and support them sincerely. The interdependence among the

strategy of acceleration, the restructuring of social relations and the development of socialist democracy is a major methodological starting point in these reforms.

In Romania, P. Nikicel emphasized, the efforts of the Soviet people to eliminate the negative phenomena inherited from the past and to accelerate socioeconomic development are followed with lively interest and sympathy.

In characterizing the 27th Congress as the most important event of the 20th century after the October Revolution and the Great Patriotic War, the representative of the journal of Vietnamese communists said: Whereas the October Revolution means a discovery in the field of theory and practice after Marx, the course of restructuring and of comprehensive and intensified renovation of Soviet society is a discovery called upon to raise socialism to a qualitatively new stage after Lenin.

According to P. Perenley, restructuring in the USSR is an example of the creative development of Leninism and the ideas of the October Revolution in solving the key theoretical and practical problems of building socialism under contemporary conditions. It is of exceptional importance not only to the Soviet Union but also to the entire socialist community, including Mongolia.

The study of the various aspects of restructuring in the USSR and renovation in Poland was provided in the statements by representatives of the PZPR, who included Professor S. Opara, editor in chief of the journal *Mysl Marxistowska*, J. Lipec, Jagellon University professor, S. Zawadski, Warsaw University professor, and S. Rainko, docent at the PZPR Academy of Social Sciences Institute of Philosophy and Sociology.

In listing the prime tasks of restructuring, S. Opara particularly singled out the importance of the systematic implementation of the economic reform. In his view, it is a question of perfecting socialist production relations and finding new opportunities for the development of production forces within the framework of socialism. A conversion from extensive to intensive economic management methods, improving qualitative and quantitative production indicators, upgrading efficiency by lowering material and energy consumption, developing innovation and enterprise and ensuring a better application of the achievements of scientific and technical progress are considered the main tasks today.

Professor J. Lipec expressed his viewpoint on restructuring, describing it as a turning point in a search conducted on a historic scale. In his view, the means for the implementation of a socialist system applied previously have exhausted their possibilities. According to the Polish scientist, it is a question of two ways of making the changes. The first is related to the Polish experience, in which the starting point was the influence of the masses, worker masses above all, who indicated through their behavior the existence of faults in the functioning of the

system. The second characterizes the state of affairs in the USSR, where the idea of restructuring was formulated by the leadership of the Communist Party. However, this should not lead to the conclusion that in the second case the concept of restructuring appeared "from above," suddenly and without preparations. To the contrary, it was a qualitative leap in terms of previously increasing changes and contradictions. It took a long time for the problem to mature and restructuring could become an objective fact only after two political factors were combined: decisive action, relying on the authority of the leadership, and the support of the masses.

Restructuring and the renovation of socialism are inseparably related to the development of democracy. In his report, Professor S. Zawadski raised the question of the possibility of political pluralism in a socialist society. In Poland, the scientist noted, there is a conceptual pluralism. This is one of the trends of the party's course, which could be described as socialist pluralism, expressing the variety of existing interests in society and their comprehensive consideration. Its purpose is to strengthen the positions of the PZPR in the state and in social life. This pluralism, which has nothing in common with the bourgeois concept of the "free play" of political forces, rejects political antagonisms. It is concentrated on strengthening the leading role of the PZPR along with a radical expansion of socialist democracy.

Closely related to this problem is the attitude of Marxist-Leninist forces toward religion and religious believers in contemporary Poland. According to Professor A. Lopatka, PZPR Central Committee member and director of the Polish Academy of Sciences Institute of the State and Law, beliefs or religious convictions of individual citizens do not predetermine their simple attitude toward socialism. One cannot build a policy in matters of religion on the basis of the concept that it should not exist under socialism. In itself, A. Lopatka concluded, religion is neither a poison nor a panacea. The political evaluation of religion by the party should be determined primarily by the political line followed by religious associations. This assessment will be negative if they serve the reaction, and positive if they serve progress, liberation and revolution.

From Scientific Theory to Revolutionary Practice

The successful implementation of the qualitatively new tasks in building socialism is possible only if the ruling parties make use of collective experience and combine it with the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory as applicable to the contemporary stage in social life. This thought was found in many of the addresses presented at the conference.

The representative of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party said that the successes achieved by the revolution are inseparable from the overall successes of the Great October Revolution. They are the result of the enrichment of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine with the priceless

experience of revolutionary struggle and the result of the joint victories achieved by the entire socialist family and the forces of peace and progress.

Today, the representative of the SED Central Committee journal said, Marxism-Leninism is manifesting its vital force through its ability to answer the new questions of our age, the further establishment and strengthening of socialism and the universal struggle for peace and social progress.

The contribution made by the social sciences to the processes currently occurring in the socialist countries was the topic of the report by L. Tomasek, deputy editor in chief of the journal of Czechoslovak communists. He spoke in favor of interpreting Marxism-Leninism as a live and dynamic system of ideas, principles, categories and laws, which dialectically reflect social reality in the unity among the past, the present and the future, with emphasis on the present and the historical future, conceived without feelings of adventurism and utopia.

In speaking of the topical tasks of the social sciences in our crucial time, L. Tomasek particularly emphasized the need to determine why the previous reforms failed and the nature of the new quality of restructuring, and what to do to make it successful and irreversible.

On the basis of past international experience, R. Varro, deputy editor in chief of *Társadalmi Szemle*, journal of the MSZMP Central Committee, concluded that this is not the first time that we have had to acknowledge the lagging of Marxist ideology behind practical requirements. Theory cannot develop without arguments and discussions. As proof, she cited Lenin's thought expressed as early as the year 1900: "We consider one of the shortcomings of the contemporary movement the lack of open polemics between clearly diverging views and the aspiration to push back differences affecting quite essential problems" (op cit., vol 4, p 331).

Consequently, she concluded, polemics are needed and justified today as well, if motivated not by petty personality quarrels but by the search for acceptable alternatives. It is on the basis of discussions and debates that the majority determines which of the suggested theories is more viable and acceptable for implementation. It also follows from this that ideological unity means taking Marxism-Leninism as its foundation, acknowledging exclusively the further development of this theory and considering its principles mandatory only as long as they function and can serve the cause of the people and progress. Within the framework of an essential unity we must preserve the right to hold different views, for without this there would only be the appearance of unity which would conceal constant ideological dissension.

Frequently, R. Varro said, we expect of theory the actual confirmation of current policy rather than its principle-minded substantiation and interpretation. This may seem paradoxical, but the greatest danger for an ideology

which is directly related to daily practice, is that of blending it with practice. For without maintaining the necessary distance, ideology loses its ability to evaluate, abstract and sum up current processes. Such an attitude toward the interconnection between theory and practice raises political and tactical slogans of the moment to the level of theory. Such was the case, in particular, with the concept of "developed socialism."

In conclusion, R. Varro expressed her belief that the great restructuring, which has been initiated in the Soviet Union and in other socialist countries, despite a variety of differences in the ways and means of its implementation, creates a historical opportunity for renovation of ideological life as well. The positive social atmosphere opens the way to the restoration of the old critical and stimulating development of Marxism.

G. Bednarski, PZPR Central Committee secretary, spoke of the wide program for intensification of the theory of socialist society. He particularly emphasized among the main trends in such activities the study of economic relations, socialist economic management methods, and problems of socialist democracy and of the entire political mechanism under socialism. He stressed the need for the all-round study of social relations and the working class, and of the social contradictions within socialism and the means through which the party can implement its leading and guiding role in the state and society.

The imperative of the time in which we live, the PZPR Central Committee secretary emphasized, includes the strengthening and expansion of cooperation among the socialist countries, concentrated on the problem of the renovation of socialism. A new stage in socialist economic integration and interaction in the political-ideological area is as needed as a new quality of cooperation in the theoretical area, a new stage of reciprocal information on research and a new level of summation of practical experience.

The active and efficient political and ideological links among parties today are not only a factor of the new dynamic development of Marxist-Leninist theory and an important manifestation of internationalism, but also a potential source of priceless impetus for the enrichment of political, economic, social and educational practices in the individual socialist states and the entire community.

In considering problems of theory and practice of socialist building, the participants in the conference noted that the course of social renovation depends on the level of management of society, and the role which the public organizations, the party above all, play in the process of socialist democratization of the state.

The practical experience of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Kan Sohn-Sop (*Kyllochzha*) noted, indicates that the true way for the systematic defense of the

revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism and their implementation is, in the course of the intensification of the building of socialism and communism, to strengthen the party even further in its ideological and organizational area, and tirelessly to increase the party's political leadership.

The continuing extensive development of the national economy and the means of controlling it, L. Tomasek said, have always created prerequisites for abandoning the Leninist platform of social management. A duplication occurred in the activities of the party and the state, and the identification of politics with economics, which lowered the initiative of individual elements within the political system and of society as a whole. Today it is a question above all of the party to implement under the conditions of restructuring its true vanguard role and lead the masses in a Leninist way, through the power of ideas, programs, concepts and the informal authority of each one of its agencies.

In this area, the representative of the journal of Czechoslovak communists emphasized, a dialectical connection is manifested: the party plays the role of initiator of constructive processes, the role of a political force which is always at the head of such processes and which, at the same time, renovates its quality as a revolutionary vanguard under the influence of such processes. Scientific communism can make its creative contribution to the study of the conditions of restructuring of party work itself, and of the content and means of implementation of the role of the party under the new historical situation. This precisely is the nucleus of the restructuring of Marxism-Leninism and all of its structural parts. Addressing ourselves to the sources of Marxism-Leninism is the first prerequisite for all positive changes. However, this is not simply a case of addressing ourselves to the past of our doctrine. It is also a process of revolutionary renovation, of freeing the interpretation of Marxism-Leninism (in theory and in practice) from subjectivism and ensuring its creative development.

Socialism and Peace Are Indivisible

The cause of the Great October is continued under contemporary conditions as indicated today by the new political thinking displayed by the CPSU in international problems. All progressive forces on earth consider such thinking an efficient factor for the preservation of civilization. It is inspired by the fact that in the awareness of the peoples and in political and social forces, whatever their orientation and outlook, there is a growing conviction that the very existence of the human species is threatened, for which reason the time has come to give priority to the universal values of peace.

In discussing this problem, J. Vorholtzer said that the basic contradiction between socialism and capitalism, which determines the nature of our age, is shifting into an area in which another contradiction operates, the solution of which will determine the very survival of

mankind. A deep contradiction exists between the vital interest of peoples and states, on the one hand, and the objectives of a small handful of most aggressive and reactionary imperialist circles, on the other, a contradiction which has assumed a global nature. Therefore, the historical mission of the working class, which is consistent with the objective and legitimate needs of progress and is based on Marxism-Leninism, the class which was, and remains, the frontranking fighter for peace among nations, has acquired a new dimension.

Today the question of war and peace, J. Vorholtzer went on to say, has become the most important, for a nuclear war would not only entail the most terrible consequences to individual countries and nations but would destroy all mankind. The GDR actively supports the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union.

The GDR considers as a substantial contribution to safeguarding peace the joint document drafted by the SED Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences and the Commission on Fundamental Values of the West German social democrats, entitled "Struggle Between Ideologies and Joint Security." This document is an example of the fact that despite all conceptual and social differences and contradictions and despite all differences in solving major political problems, joint action on the main problem—life and the future of all mankind—is not only necessary but possible. The concepts included in the document on actions to be taken for peace, for halting the arms race and for detente are consistent with the peace program of the socialist community and the resolutions of the Berlin Conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact.

The representative of the journal of the Romanian communists called for a reconsideration of the entire problem of war and peace, which presumes theoretical work consistent with the contemporary realities and firm rejection of old and obsolete concepts.

Dialogue and cooperation on the matter of peace, said G. Bednarski, PZPR Central Committee secretary, are not one of the possible but the only means of normalizing relations with the capitalist world. Referring to the concept formulated at the 27th CPSU Congress to the effect that the struggle between socialism and capitalism today could take place only and exclusively in the form of peaceful coexistence and peaceful rivalry, the PZPR Central Committee secretary emphasized that Poland fully shares in the peaceful offensive mounted by the Soviet Union and the entire community, supporting it with its own initiatives.

The new political thinking, he noted, is dictated by the characteristics of the contemporary age, marked not only by contradictory interests and sharp conflicts but also

the increased interdependence among countries and peoples. Capitalism no longer can and socialism is as yet unable to solve global problems, such as ensuring the availability of food and sources of energy and eliminating disease.

At the same time, as was said at the conference, the foreign policy practiced by the socialist countries and the new style of thinking are class oriented in content and based on Marxist-Leninist ideology. That is why, taking into consideration present-day realities, such as the multidimensionality and interdependence among the part of our contradictory yet largely integral world, the communists support Marx's forecast on the future of mankind, united on a communist basis.

In our days the struggle for peace is becoming increasingly interwoven with that for social progress and the actions of all forces of liberation and mass democratic movements are becoming increasingly aggressive. The dynamism and power of contemporary social processes confirm the creative power of Marxist-Leninist theory and the dialectics discovered by the classics of scientific communism of the advancement of mankind toward more perfect forms of social organization.

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

05003

Summing Up Priceless Experience

18020004m Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) pp 119-122

[Review by A. Kozlov, professor, doctor of historical sciences, Rostov-na-Donu, of the following books: "Istoricheskiy Opyt Trekh Rossiyskikh Revolyutsiy" [Historical Experience of the Three Russian Revolutions]. Book 1. "Generalnaya Repetitsiya Velikogo Oktryabrya. Pervaya Burzhuazno-Demokraticheskaya Revolyutsiya v Rossii" [Dress Rehearsal for the Great October. The First Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution in Russia]. Moscow, 1985; Book 2. "Sverzheniye Samoderzhaviya. Vtoraya Burzhuazno-Demokraticheskaya Revolyutsiya v Rossii" [Overthrow of Autocracy. The Second Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution in Russia]. Moscow, 1986; Book 3. "Korennoy Povorot v Istorii Chelovechestva. Velikaya Oktyabrskaya Sotsialisticheskaya Revolyutsiya" [Radical Turn in the History of Mankind. The Great October Socialist Revolution]. Moscow, 1987]

[Text] The 70th anniversary of the October Revolution has been noted with the publication of extensive scientific historical-revolutionary works. This includes the completion of a major three-volume work which meets an old and pressing need to sum up the historical experience of the three Russian revolutions. Published by Politizdat, this is essentially a first complete clear conceptual work of its kind in the field of Soviet historiography.

Let us most definitely say that such a complex and comprehensive study cannot be assessed in simple terms. It will justifiably assume its place in the growing library of works on the history of the Russian revolutions, although, in our view, it is not free from errors and shortcomings, some of which grave. Above all, in a certain sense it is the offspring of its time, which has influenced not only the science of economics and the national economy but science in general, historical and social in particular and, naturally, work on the history of the Russian revolutions.

The work under review was written precisely during that time, but published when a restructuring, revolutionary in spirit, has developed in the country, criteria have become stricter and approaches in assessing the past have changed. In his meeting with the heads of mass information and propaganda media, in February 1987, M.S. Gorbachev emphasized: "At this turning point, more than ever before we need an objective, a comprehensive vision of reality. The truth must be complete. Only then does it become constructive." If we consider this work from this strict yardstick, which is the only true one, we must admit that by no means do all of its aspects meet contemporary requirements. The accelerated development of science requires a major reinterpretation of the works of our historians. More than ever before, today we need a full return to the Leninist evaluations of the history of the Russian revolutions. We must reject the simplification of the revolutionary process, characteristic of historical research in recent decades.

Let us note the rather uneven scientific standards of the various parts of the work. Some are masterly (such as parts of the second book on the revolutionary events in Moscow), and can be unquestionably rated as research accomplishments. Others are clearly abstract in terms of their presentation of events and unrelated to reality.

Others again are burdened by still extant and quite simplistic concepts, including those which developed under the influence of the cult of Stalin's personality. Finally, others include concepts which are documentarily poorly substantiated. The problem approach applied by the authors has enabled them to single out the most important scientific areas. However, this has resulted in frequent duplications in the interpretation of events and data. Nonetheless, as a whole, the authors have unquestionably been able to accomplish a great deal in interpreting the revolutionary process in Russia, to improve the level of summation of many problems and to introduce in scientific circulation interesting factual data.

The authors have extensively analyzed the results of the activities of several generations of historians: each volume begins with a historiographic survey. Nonetheless, the reader is not provided with comprehensive information on the state of scientific development of the history of one revolution or another for, as a rule, the surveys are general with a predominance of uncritical presentations of one-sided views expressed in the past, persistently

avoiding controversial problems. Footnotes refer to publications based on some accepted but scientifically groundless concepts without, however, this being stipulated. Nor are the books in which such concepts have been criticized, named. No mention is made of works by authors who have held different viewpoints. Within the sections themselves historiographic topics are mentioned extremely rarely and events of a more or less isolated nature which, however, have had different interpretations, are presented without mentioning the controversy surrounding them.

Whether deliberately or not, revolutionary history is presented as though developing only in terms of quantity and its presentation itself is considered the ultimate truth. Neglect of other viewpoints and of their constant clashes and comparisons impoverishes historiography and does not contribute in the least to the intensification of historical self-awareness and the political standards of the people. However, the party calls upon us to learn democracy, the ability to engage in debates, to extract from the various viewpoints anything that is useful and valuable and to analyze the views held by our opponents, even if the criticism comes from our class enemies abroad.

Some of the theses of the historiographic surveys do not present the authors' thoughts with sufficient clarity. For example, the need for further active and thorough scientific work on the theoretical activities of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party "in the period of preparations for and victory of the October Revolution" is indicated in the third volume (p 18). This is an objective and just acknowledgement of the poor state of affairs which prevails in one of the most important areas. However, it does not quite aptly reflect, or disavow to a certain extent, the idea which we read on the preceding page 17: "The most important achievement of Soviet historiography... is the establishment of Lenin's concept of the Great October Revolution." In any case, such a concept requires an explanation: when did this occur and how, and to what extent has it been established. Furthermore, many historians believe that some aspects of the accepted concept disagree with the actual Leninist views, because of a still extant simplistic interpretations of the 1930s.

In describing the prerequisites and patterns of the Russian revolutions, the authors actually ignore the level reached in the scientific development of such problems. Nonetheless, the study of these problems has itself a long history which sheds light on their contemporary interpretation. The study of the problems has involved arguments from the very beginning, in the course of which the Marxist-Leninist concept became gradually but steadily crystallized. In the 1930s the creative process was essentially blocked, and the "only accurate" concept which was presented in the "Short Course" "won" and became dominant and unappealable. After the 20th Congress Soviet scientists undertook the study of the prerequisites for the revolution with a new burst of

energy. Unfortunately, later, in the 1970s, many of them were classified as supporters of the so-called "new direction" (P.V. Volobuyev, K.N. Tarnovskiy and others), which became the target of administrative pressure.

The supporters of the notorious "exclusively accurate" concepts rejected the new and, in our view, fruitful approaches to assessing the socioeconomic prerequisites for the Russian revolutions and the victory of the October Revolution and, in particular, the idea of a different order in developing within Russia a system of large industrial output and a different sequence in the industrial and agrocapialist change, compared to other countries which had taken the path of capitalist development much earlier. Also ignored in this work is the viewpoint according to which, unlike the situation in the West, the industrial change in Russia was preceded by an agrarian change, which was not completed by the time the October Revolution broke out. Objectively, the result was that the Russian proletariat outstripped the bourgeoisie in its political consolidation. That is why its party appeared earlier than the bourgeois and petit-bourgeois parties. Naturally, one could disagree with such views but we should not behave as though they did not exist at all. It would have been more accurate for the authors of such studies to opt for a straight and open debate.

Nor is the detailed interpretation of the socioeconomic contrasts within Russia at the turn of the 20th century, as a result of the lengthy interweaving of developing capitalism with vestiges of feudalism, free from one-sided concepts which ignore other viewpoints. The first among them is that of the prevalence in the Russian countryside of an alleged "Prussian" variant of capitalist modernization (see vol 1, p 78), although Lenin, who made a special study of this problem, held a different viewpoint. In Russia, he wrote in 1909, the historical struggle between the American and the Prussian ways of development has not ended. It is continuing (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 47, pp 226-232).

The second and by no means unquestionable claim deals with the study of the struggle waged by the Russian proletariat simultaneously against the vestiges of feudalism and those of capitalism, the importance of which Lenin repeatedly emphasized. This line is followed throughout the work. In pointing out the radical and decisive nature of the proletarian revolution in eliminating the vestiges of feudalism, noted by Lenin (see op. cit., vol 44, p 136), nonetheless the authors somewhat overestimate, it seems to us, the degree to which this problem was solved (vol 3, pp 481, 483, 505, 532). The impression develops as though the moment it broke out, the revolution immediately put an end to anything related to feudalism. The real facts, however, prove that the situation was much more complex.

In emphasizing that we had brought the bourgeois-democratic revolution to its completion, in October 1921 Lenin urgently warned against overestimating the accomplishment: "We are moving forward, to a socialist

revolution, quite consciously, firmly and steadfastly, with the knowledge that it is not separated by the Wall of China from a bourgeois-democratic revolution, and aware of the fact that it is only the struggle that will decide the extent to which (in the final account) we shall be successful in advancing, what part of this extremely broad task we shall be able to implement and what share of our victories we shall be able to secure. The future will show" (op. cit., vol 34, p 145).

By giving its due to the results of the struggle waged by the proletarian revolution with the vestiges of feudalism, Lenin did not exaggerate in the least what had been accomplished and achieved, assessing it realistically and critically, emphasizing what remained to be done (as of the end of 1921) in that same area. Later on, however, Lenin's warnings and instructions were not properly taken into consideration. Vestiges of feudalism in the sociopolitical and sociopsychological areas were not uprooted promptly and completely. To this day their disgusting features show up in social life. The CPSU Central Committee Resolution "On the Work of the Kazakh Republic Party Organization on the International and Patriotic Education of the Working People" lists among the reasons which led to the familiar ruinous consequences the still remaining feudal-bay mores and patriarchal-clannish customs and traditions, which were actually supported and even encouraged and unconsciously exploited for selfish purposes by elements alien to socialism, who hypocritically presented them as national features.

The specific nature of the "coupling" of different social forces has been insufficiently clarified in this work on the historical experience of the Russian revolutions, although valuable views on such coupling were expressed as early as the turn of the 1970s. At that time, it was pointed out, in particular, that highlighting the features of the capitalist evolution of the country provides a comprehensive theoretical interpretation of the revolution with all of its subjects and elements in their interaction and interdependence, identifying their patterns and inevitability and their common and specific features. However, the development of these areas was held back for a full 15 years.

An effort to correct this has been made in the third volume: two important sections have been included: on the sociopolitical prerequisites and on the role of the subjective factor. This goal, however, has not been achieved, for the authors have proceeded from obsolete views which, until very recently, had been rated as "accomplishments." Quite recently, as late as 1981, it was unequivocally said in the book "Rabochiy Klass v Pervoy Rossiyskoy Revolyutsii 1905-1907 Gg." [The Working Class in the First Russian Revolution of 1905-1907] (some of its authors are among the writers of the three-volume work) that "some fundamental problems of Russian history at the turn of the 20th century" were scientifically explained and clarified only with the

"Short Course," for that work eliminated (!) "differences in understanding the question of the level and nature of Russia's capitalist development" prior to the Russian revolutions (p 15). According to such an essentially mechanistic approach, the pattern of the Russian revolutions is determined directly by the level of development of capitalism. At the same time, the consequences of politics, of the most important factors of a sociopolitical nature, which led to the extreme aggravation of social and capitalist contradictions and which took Russia to the brink of catastrophe, were gravely underestimated.

Consequently, as P.V. Volobuyev recently remarked in his book "Vybor Putey Obshchestvennogo Razvitiya: Teoriya, Istoriya, Sovremennost'" [Choice of Ways of Social Development: Theory, History, Contemporaneity] (Moscow, 1987), we have fallen behind the demands of our time in mastering the Marxist legacy of the multivariant nature of sociopolitical development and in the development of the Leninist concept of the change which took place in the epoch of imperialism of the single direction in the process of capitalist evolution, giving it an alternative and thus turning into reality the possibility of a socialist choice, the practical implementation of which was achieved in Russia for the first time, in 1917. It is only such a conceptual approach that, in our view, clearly and convincingly brings to light the tendentiousness of the so-called "alternative theory" (meaning capitalist) in the development of Russia, which is being puffed up in contemporary bourgeois Sovietology, in an effort to ignore objectively existing laws and choices.

Having set as their objective the elimination of some simplistic views on the development of the revolutions, which appeared, in particular, in the reassessment of the spontaneous actions of the masses and in underestimating the role of the organized conscious elements (vol 2, p 8), in our view, the authors of this work have been unable to find the optimal variant in depicting the correlation between spontaneous and planned acts. The spontaneous movements, peasant actions, soldier mutinies and anarchic trends, which were widespread by the turn of the 20th century throughout Russia among the primarily petit-bourgeois population, were insufficiently interpreted, although the practical experience acquired by the Bolshevik Party in the course of such complex and most difficult conditions is of truly permanent significance.

It is pleasing to note that in this three-volume work we find names of fighters of the revolution, including some who, until recently, have been ignored. It is true that in this respect the "unluckiest" were those who were in the front line in the struggle for the victory of the armed uprising and headed the building of socialism: the members of the RSDWP(b) Central Committee, the Military-Revolutionary Committee of the Petrograd Soviet, the first Soviet government, set up by Lenin, the VTsIK, the Higher Council of the National Economy, set up at the 2nd All-Russian Congress of Soviets, and others. Some

personalities, as has been the practice since the 1930s, continue to be presented exclusively in their negative aspects. But we fail to understand, in that case, why and for which ones of their qualities did Lenin and the party give them responsible assignments and promoted them to most important positions. Others, conversely, have been depicted exclusively in positive terms despite, as is well known, the grave errors they made (which remain virtually unmentioned), including some in essential matters. Others, which is even worse, are not mentioned at all. Clearly, such a tendentially selective "method" is worthless.

The third volume suffers from a worse "depopulation" compared to the others. The feature of the "nonperson," which is inherent in many of our works, has not been eliminated in such a major study as well.

The work analyzes in detail the tremendous revolutionary experience of the working people headed by the Bolshevik Party, led by Lenin. It properly states that in Russia this experience was exceptionally varied in terms of nature and form, and acquired under the conditions of both peaceful and violent struggle and against the vestiges of feudalism and capitalism. Such experience includes economic and political strikes, marches and demonstrations, mutinies and uprisings. Its permanent value lies in the historical victory of the proletariat and the peasants over the exploiters, which became a turning point in the destinies of Russia and the entire planet.

The triumphal march of the Soviet system, which took place under circumstances marked by sharp class conflicts, frequently armed, and which developed from the very first days into a civil war against the enemies of the revolution, who openly opposed the will of the people, was the gem of this comprehensive experience. The authors explain the reasons for this. Nonetheless, in our view, their explanations are insufficiently clear and convincing, probably because they have essentially avoided the question of the outbreak of the civil war about which, as we know, there have been violent disagreements. The authors should have presented their own scientifically substantiated position. Actually, it is only incidentally and vaguely that they voice a single remark which leads us to conclude that the war broke out in the summer of 1918, when the overthrown classes gained the decisive support of international imperialism (see vol 3, p 410). However, was it not the opposition of the capitalists and landowners, the elimination of which was undertaken by the proletarian revolution starting with 25 October 1917 and which, since that day, began to receive aid by the Entente, albeit still limited but of priceless importance to them and a threat to the revolution, another factor which led to the outbreak of major centers of the civil war.

Lenin invariably considered as part of the civil war and until they were totally defeated the struggle against Kerenskiy, Krasnov, the Ukrainian Central Rada, Kaledin, Dutov, Alekseyev and Kornilov. As early as 29

October 1917, at a conference of regimental representatives of the Petrograd garrison, he explained that "...the political situation has now assumed a military aspect" (op. cit., vol 35, p 37). Less than 10 days after the October Revolution he said: "An insignificant handful of people started the civil war. It has not ended yet" (ibid., p 53). On 28 November the head of the Soviet government signed a "Decree on Detaining the Leaders of the Civil War Waged Against the Revolution," according to which the local soviets were assigned the duty of keeping particularly under surveillance the Cadet Party, because of its connections with these counterrevolutionaries (see ibid., p 126). In the resolution on the decree concerning the Cadet Party, which was promulgated on 3 December 1917, it was noted that a fierce civil war broke out under Cadet leadership "against the very foundations of the worker and peasant revolution" (ibid., p 138).

Lenin's remarks, which are objective, realistic, specific and scientifically weighed, bring to light the meaning and nature of the class struggle in Russia during the period of the triumphal march of the Soviet system and are a source of essentially important conclusions. To begin with, the civil war in the country started during the first days of the revolution. Second, it was initiated by the bourgeois counterrevolution, headed by the Cadet Party. Third, the new worker-peasant system was faced with the need to answer force with force. Fourth, the historical blame for the grave consequences of most violent armed clashes falls entirely and fully on the capitalists and the landowners. This exposes the conciliationists and, today, their defenders, who have tried and are trying to shift the entire blame on the revolution in order to defame it. Fifth and final, the condition of civil war entirely predetermined the ways and means and direction of activities of the Soviet system. It is impossible comprehensively to sum up the real revolutionary experience without taking the decisive factors of the end of 1917 and beginning of 1918 into consideration.

Although they lower the value of this work, such shortcomings by no means reduce the significance of this extensive and painstaking effort of the authors under conditions which, frankly stated, did not encourage daring and depth of scientific research. Unquestionably, this work on the historical experience of the Russian revolutions includes important and broad scientific observations and conclusions. Although the value of this study is somewhat debatable, it nonetheless reflects the difficulty of still largely unsolved problems which are facing the science of history in the period of restructuring. The further pace of acceleration and the degree and power of the moral impact of scientific developments depend on the realized social need for maximally locating the priceless revolutionary experience. To historians, this is what matters most.

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

05003

**The October Revolution and the Motion Pictures;
On Problems of Historical-Revolutionary Films**

*18020004n Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16,
Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) pp 123-127*

[Review by S. Freylikh, doctor of art studies]

[Text] "The revolution gave me the most important thing in my life—it made me an artist." How frequently we quote these words of Eyzenshteyn, on anniversary occasions, paying no great attention to their practical concreteness. Yet they express the entire program of the artist at a time of drastic social changes. This does not apply to the past only. It rises again precisely today, when revolutionary changes in society are having a decisive impact on art. I am confident that the future historian of the motion picture will name those who have "become artists" today. This will not apply to those who are responding to restructuring with hasty fakes but those who have expressed the present situation through their works, many of which have seen the light only now, those who help society to realize the need for change.

Was this also not the case at the time when the Soviet cinema was born? There have been many circumstantial responses to the October Revolution, which have now disappeared. However, those who were "turned into artists" by the revolution, people such as Eyzenshteyn, Dovzhenko, Kuleshov, Vertov, Pudovkin, Shub, Shengelaya, Bek-Nazarov, Kozintsev and Trauberg created masterpieces of permanent value.

Those masters took from the revolution not only its topic, having felt the most important changes in history, but also made a revolution in the motion picture itself, in its language and style, making the people the main characters. This became the foundation of their striking artistic discoveries. They broke the barrier separating life from the screen, a barrier which existed until that time in the conventional and illusory world of naive sentimental melodramas, titillating adventures and purely entertaining comedies. All of this dispersed like smoke when the life of the people burst on the screen, with their true passions, suffering and struggle. The masses realized their role in history and the very depiction of this aspect demanded new peaks and denouements in art.

I

Movies about the revolution played a tremendous role in shaping the new type of cinematographic ideas. It was thanks to art that the revolution became part of the awareness and emotions of the Soviet people. Historical-revolutionary films assumed a universal significance.

In this sense the fate of "The Battleship Potemkin" is phenomenal!

In his novel "Success," Lion Feuchtwanger dedicates a large chapter to Eyzenshteyn's film. Scene after scene, the writer describes the film as perceived by the former

Bavarian minister of justice Klenk, who, believing that motion pictures stir things up, went to see the movie with a skeptical prejudice and came out confused. No, he did not take the side of the mutinied Russian seamen but was extremely displeased with the behavior of the officers who, in their blind rage, were unable to understand the events and themselves stirred the seamen to action. In the motion picture Klenk realized the unfairness of those with whom he should have sympathized and accepted as inevitable the actions of those he considered alien to himself. We believe that this type of approach to the study of a complex and contradictory mentality of the viewer should teach something or other to our sociologists, who prefer surveys or oral questions but who, alas, frequently make mass surveys to "fit" easily predictable desired answers. But why was it that Feuchtwanger selected for such a psychological analysis precisely the Soviet "Battleship Potemkin?" In this film the revolution is presented not only as a plot but also in terms of feelings. Everything that is true in the revolution is also true in the film, which is the artistic analog of reality.

Bertold Brecht presented the content of "The Battleship Potemkin" (I am referring to his poem written in prose) as objective reality. Nonetheless, what is it that drew his greater attention: was it the events of 1905 themselves or the artistic version presented by the film? Both, for today both exist inseparably in our lives, thanks to the movie.

In the same way, theater directors have frequently developed stage settings based on Eyzenshteyn's pictures.

We also know that later, in 1933, "The Battleship Potemkin" had such a strong influence on the seamen of the Dutch cruiser "Seven Provinces," which was part of the colonial fleet, that they, finding themselves in a situation similar to the one depicted in "Potemkin," not only refused to suppress a mutiny in the Indonesian port of Surabaya, but even themselves mutinied.

Such is the power of true revolutionary art. "Potemkin" began by "quoting" history and then history "quoted" it. The feeling of social justice is universal and it is precisely that which the film tells us. It does not stand out outside Soviet cinematography but, conversely, it determined the direction which we subsequently followed.

In the 1930s historical-revolutionary films developed in a variety of genres. We see as the direct continuation of the epic motion pictures of the preceding decade the films "We From Kronshtadt," made by V.S. Vishnevskiy and Ye. Dzigan, and "Shchors," by A. Dovzhenko. Movies based on novels included B. Barnet's "Outskirts," G. Kozintsev's and L. Trauberg's "Maksim Trilogy," Ye. Gabrilovich's and Yu. Rayzman's "The Last Night," and A. Zarkhi's and I. Kheyfits's "The Deputy From the Baltic." Combining the epic power of cinematography of the 1920s with dramatic action, the brothers

Vasilyev introduced in "Chapayev" the main character as though extracted from that same mass which had been depicted in the films made during that period with such great talent.

A particular interest in specific historical lives, developing in a historical conflict, was manifested in films about Lenin. It was precisely Lenin who became the personality concentrating within his thoughts and actions the basic problems of the 20th century. A. Kapler's and M. Romm's "Lenin in October" and "Lenin in 1918," and N. Pogodin's and S. Yutkevich's "Man With A Weapon" became the most important landmarks in that area.

II

Both life and art seem to be structured in such a way that, if successful, those who lead get the glory if they succeed and assume the burden of failure in defeat. When negative phenomena in social development, related to that which later began to be described as the "cult of personality," became particularly apparent in the second half of the 1930s, the crisis in cinematography affected most clearly and painfully precisely the historical-revolutionary films, films about Lenin above all. This is understandable, for a violation of the Leninist norms of life also indicated violations of the views on the role which Lenin had played in the revolution. Gradually, side by side there mandatorily began to appear the figure of Stalin, which later totally assumed the foreground. At the same time, many of Ilich's active revolutionary fellow-workers were pushed into the background and, in some cases, into oblivion.

This was a falsification of history and we should not blame all cinematographic sins of those difficult times exclusively on M. Chiaureli and his film "The Great Glow." Both the two-part movie made by A. Kapler and M. Romm and the film made by N. Pogodin and S. Yutkevich ascribed to Stalin a role inconsistent with the one he played at that time. But why is it that the former were shown while "The Great Glow," which was also made in the second half of the 1930s, went into the archives? In the first two one could easily cut out extraneous yet at that time mandatory scenes and the concept contained in these films is accepted to this day, as is most clearly seen in the way Boris Shchukin and Maksim Shtraukh play Lenin. The concept itself of "leader-people," in M. Chiaureli's "The Great Glow" is false. Here the cult of the leader is shown, belittling the role of the masses, something which would become programmatic for the director in subsequent pictures, such as "The Oath" and "The Unforgettable 1919." It is hard to believe that such decorative and ostentatious films, made in a spirit of false classicism, were the work of a master who had once created outstanding works, such as "The Last Masquerade" and "Arsen;" also unlikely was the fact that after the view on history was "corrected" subsequent to the 20th Party Congress, he could become his true self and in 1958 make a humanistic film, such as "Otarov's Widow."

In periods of deformation and crises, history makes the artist as well either to make errors or simply to abandon his ideals. And if we, movie makers, wish to present the history of our domestic motion picture in its true light and in such a way that it can be read with interest (it is precisely for the creation of such type of history textbooks that M.S. Gorbachev recently appealed to our social scientists), we must abandon our academic self-control, the calm enumeration of professional successes and failures and the custom of classifying the masters into those who are referred to only in enthusiastic terms and those who can be criticized, for in such an approach we lose the truth of the most complex events of the historical process, depriving it of the drama of unforeseen circumstances and contradictions, the very solution of which is the essence of art searches and dynamics.

In this case grave dramas and crack-ups could not be avoided. Some historians describe them as "negative phenomena," asking us to avoid drawing special attention to them. This is a strange formulation of the problem. It is strange because in itself the drama of life is described in the simple and dispassionate term of a negative phenomenon. Is such an appeal not a vestige of the past, the straight line, the conflict-free way of thinking?

The historical-revolutionary film was the motor of the Soviet cinema as long as it raised and interpreted the most crucial problems of history. Whenever not objective contradictions motivated the action but exclusively the subjective wishes of the character, while the personalities surrounding him became obedient executors of his will, while the people became little cogs in the state machinery, a stagnation developed in the art which, in turn, was a reflection of the stagnation in social life itself.

In discussing this fact, the easiest thing would be to label a film such as "The Unforgettable 1919" "antihistorical." Would this tell us all we would like to know about this film and about Vs. Vishnevskiy, the author of the scenario, the same person who had already created truly classic works on historical-revolutionary themes, such as the play "Optimistic Tragedy" and the scenario "We From Kronshtadt?" Was this film a sincere error or a compromise with reality? This is no meaningless question when it pertains to a writer who actively participated in the civil war, the Spanish epic and the Great Patriotic War. The hardships of Aleksandr Dovzhenko indicate what could be for that time the best result of independent thinking. After the collapse of his film "Michurin" and after a few already initiated projects were stopped, one of the then successful directors explained to him with cynical frankness that he, Dovzhenko, was to blame himself for not depicting Stalin in the film "Shchors," sacrificing to him some ten meters of film (he literally said "you should sacrifice ten meters of film to him").

Naturally, the crisis in the historical-revolutionary pictures was not only related to who would be the character but the way life was depicted. As depicted on the screen,

reality had been hermetically sealed; the exceptionally rational actions of the characters excluded the possibility of any surprise whatsoever. A style developed which we have described as false classicism, and there is nothing shameful to undertake, finally and objectively, its special study.

Like Soviet cinematography as a whole, historical-revolutionary films were given an incentive for renovation only after the 20th Party Congress. At that time very important gains were made which, however, were not properly pursued in the 1970s and beginning of 1980s. Conditions for this matured only after the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The 27th CPSU Congress and the January 1987 Central Committee Plenum played a decisive role in eliminating dogmatism in views on history and in asserting the Leninist understanding of the dialectics of the revolutionary process. An essential reassessment of values took place and some works buried in files saw the light of day and, finally, the question of A. Askoldov's film "Commissar" was solved in principle, which intensified our concept of historical-revolutionary films and their ideological and artistic objectives and structural principles.

III

When conditions for the development of the arts are favorable, the form does not restrict the content. Furthermore, the strict demarcation of the content can only make it more flexible and expressive, which helps the basic presentation of the idea. However, when the form itself becomes a stereotype, it no longer "shapes" but begins to "suppress" the content. This occurred during critical times in the development of the arts. The fact that we anathemize a phenomenon changes nothing. What we need specifically is its constructive criticism. It is only constructive thinking that can provide solutions to crises, as it is able to understand their nature.

In my view, a historical-revolutionary film can no longer exist in the same form in which it appeared in the 1920s and was subsequently established in the 1930s. The point is not only that at some point its historical content became twisted. We should also bear in mind that even an accurate content can be distorted by an obsolete form. The development of art is the development of artistic forms within a changing content. We have frequently heard that the very genre of the historical-revolutionary motion picture has become obsolete. Let us note that not the form of expression but the content itself is claimed to be "old-fashioned," i.e., no longer interesting. Films kept being made but few people went to see them. There was talk of civic apathy, particularly among the young. The facts indeed indicate this and we are as yet to interpret the alarming sociological data showing a drastic decline of interest in films on historical-revolutionary subjects. Could it be that the rejection of such type of traditionally presented films was sometimes less a symptom of civic apathy than a civic stance, a rejection of falsehood and clichés?

The standardization of means of depicting the revolution, again and again taking up the same events, situations and characters, and plots with similar developments and endings and repeated culminations, all set our teeth on edge and it was at that point that we began to question the very concept of the "historical-revolutionary motion picture." It was thus that the same genre which had been fruitful during a period of upsurge in the arts began to be rejected during the period of stagnation. On the other hand, it was becoming increasingly clear that both in terms of content and form "Potemkin," "Chapayev" and "We From Kronshtadt" were much greater and broader than what we had begun to see in movies on the same theme at a later date.

We usually say that the critics were slouching. No, many practical workers and critics had noted both the growing contradiction between the essence of the historical-revolutionary film and the interpretation which had been given to it. Not so long ago, the critic N. Potapov deemed it necessary to remind us that the playwright Nikolay Pogodin, author of the famous trilogy about Lenin, had firmly objected to having his plays classify in the category of historical-revolutionary works, claiming that "they do not contain history in its pure aspect but its spirit, the spirit of the time." Why was it precisely this thought of the playwright that the critic had cited? Because it proved to be timely and consistent with the present. Equally relevant today is the statement by movie reviewer N. Zorkoy: "...There are no boundaries in historical-revolutionary films, and we can easily widen them should this be required by cinematographic practice."

Let us recall the areas in which historical-revolutionary motion pictures were modified and, whenever possible, revived in a great variety of forms.

It is precisely by rejecting the stamp of "history in its pure aspect" while retaining its spirit and atmosphere, that G. Chukhray's "Forty-One," and V. Basov's and M. Chorchagin's "School of Courage" were made by the turn of the 1960s. This also includes A. Alov's and V. Naumov's trilogy ("Alarming Youth," "Pavel Korchagin" and "Wind"). This was an important trend although it not always led to great accomplishments: the young cinematographers were fighting the prejudice both against so-called enclosure and psychologism, and the custom mandatorily to depict in films on the revolution the main characters of history, which, in a number of films, had been furthermore ascribed exaggerated dimensions. Giving priority to the ordinary participants in the revolution stimulated the making of a noteworthy motion picture, such as G. Panfilov's "There Is No Pass Through the Fire."

No complete idea can be obtained on the searches conducted in this area if we ignore the films produced by the national cinematographies (frequently through the joint efforts of masters from different republics), such as

"The First Teacher" (filmed in Kirghizia by A. Mikhalkov-Konchalovskiy, based on a novel by Ch. Aytmatov), "Children of Pamir" (filmed in Tadjikistan by V. Motyl, based on the poem by M. Mirshakar "Lenin in Pamir"), two Estonian films—"Ask the Dead the Price of Death" by K. Kiysk, and "Christmas in Vigala" by M. Soosaar—and G. Shengelay's Georgian movie "The Travel of the Young Composer." A special study should be made of the spiritual closeness shown in the interpretation of the same theme—the 1905 revolution—by Estonian and Georgian cinematographers. In contrasting the ideal of the hero with reality, they touch upon the profound dramatic meaning of the revolution. To each one of them, the revolution is a theme of high tragedy.

The crisis in the contemporary historical-revolutionary film was manifested precisely in the fact that it assumed a shallow, an entertaining nature. However, by suppressing the tragic motif of the revolution, we could no longer hear within it Beethoven's sense of joy.

This does not imply in any way any kind of arrogant attitude toward the entertainment genres. Conversely, let us emphasize that the breaking of stereotypes of the historical-revolutionary film also affected the various genres. Reality, which was enhanced by the revolution, offered many opportunities for seeing within it events from unexpected angles, such as the tragicomedy "Burn, Burn Star of Mine," by A. Mitt and "The White Sun of the Desert" by V. Motyl, which is a parody of the American Western, and a mixture of Russian folklore and popular writing, as well as N. Mikhalkov's "At Home Among Strangers and a Stranger at Home," in which adventure and, once again, a parody of a Western are combined with the accurate depiction of the atmosphere and the people of those years. Abusing the genre is a different matter, when its purpose is self-seeking. Unfortunately, the "Westernizing" of the historical-revolutionary movie has become a widespread phenomenon, as was already pointed out by G. Kapralov in the article "Horses Jumping on the Screen" (*Pravda*, 4 January 1980), who criticized V. Lyubomudrov's film "Seek the Wind." What happened then? After that movie, the director filmed a movie on the famous First Cavalry Division, in which once again cavalry battles were the only subject of the picture. Nor were we all that pleased with the three-part television series about Frunze "No Rank" (Sverdlovsk Studio). The need is here, however, to draw the best creative forces in filming a series on "Lives of Outstanding People." In this area television has priority because of its ability to combine a study of an age in depth and a thorough study of the life of a character. It was precisely for television that the 7-part motion picture "Karl Marx. The Young Years," was made by L. Kulidzhanov, a series which earned extensive recognition.

IV

Documentary dramas played an important, one could even say a crucial role in the development and renovation of the traditions of contemporary historical-revolutionary films. It was precisely this genre that was able to

master, as N. Pogodin said, history in its pure (i.e., documentary-event) aspect while, at the same time, depicting its spirit, the spirit of the time. Noted phenomena in this area were both the artistically and socially important productions which embodied M. Shatrov's drama principles in the motion picture ("July 6th," directed by Yu. Karasik) and, on television, the four-part "Features in the Portrait of V.I. Lenin" (directed by L. Pchelkin). Since this is merely a story about features, why did it take almost 20 years before this film could be shown? Nothing in the production was imaginary and virtually every single word was taken from documents. The reason was that we had become accustomed to take from Lenin's legacy only that which appeared necessary at any given time. Today Lenin comes to us in the entirety of his views and his character, as presented in the four-part television series by Mikhail Ulyanov, is also integral, rough, unedited, for which reason it excites us as it did in the past. It is thus that through art as well our time comes closer to the Leninist period in the country's life.

The documentary has turned us back to the realities of history. The very definition of "documentary" has not been entirely researched. Documentary does not mean photographic. It is not deprived of artistic imagination. It is precisely the opposite that is true. Whereas in classical movies the actors playing Lenin were mandatorily made up (initially the public had to become convinced of the similarity between the character and the familiar photographs), now we come across cases in which the actors aptly play Lenin without makeup. This occurs not only in theater (Oleg Yankovskiy in the production of "Blue Horses on Red Grass") but also in a television film: I refer to the serial "V.I. Lenin. Pages From His Life" (directed by V. Lisakovich, in which actor Nikolay Gubenko reproduces not only Lenin's words but also Lenin's concentration, willpower, excitement and motivations, which is what makes a character. Naturally, this method of performing without makeup, albeit successful in this case, could hardly be considered predominant in contemporary plays. Ilich's life features convincingly come to us in K. Lavrov's traditional makeup in G. Tovstonogov's production of "Recounting..." and A. Kalyagin's in the MKHAT production of "Thus Shall We Win!" arranged by O. Yefremov and Yu. Kayurov for stage and screen.

Naturally, it would be erroneous to absolutize the significance of the documentary drama. It does not end with searches in the theater and the motion picture but, we believe, merely opens a new stage in the depiction of the revolution.

Our descendants will be grateful to us for having resurrected names of historical personalities, which had been ignored, and for having shed light on events and facts without the knowledge of which that age would have been sterile and dead, deprived of color or sound. Nonetheless, this alone is not the purpose of art, for

otherwise it would be merely a means for the rehabilitation of lost reality. Nor is it, in the least, its task now to exclude in historical-revolutionary films events and people which were the exclusive subjects of attention in the past, for this would make us swing like a pendulum from one extreme to another, rewriting history every which way. Modern thinking objects to this. The truth is not found in the middle, between the two extremes. The truth itself is the cutting edge of realism. In highlighting a contradiction to its very core, the artist can see in the historical event the other side, in its full dimensions. Motion pictures such as "Run" and "Agony" are also works on the revolution as well as historical-revolutionary films, as are Romm's "Lenin in October" and "Ordinary Fascism," which are revolutionary pictures of the same nature. In the former, the artist has described what is loftiest in history, and, in the second, what is lowest. The point is, however, that in the second film as well art ennobles us, although people who check works against life with the help of a mirror would find this difficult to understand.

As a theme, "October and the motion picture" is much broader than "October on the screen." The October Revolution continues to influence all aspects of the cinematographic process. It is precisely in this sense that we have discussed the significance of the documentary film as a scout for new ideas and forms. Today a complex synthesis of types and genres is taking place on the bridgehead captured by documentary makers. This is a process similar to science in which new directions develop at the point where different areas of knowledge cross and decisive discoveries are made. Another feature of the contemporary cinematographic process is the revolutionizing sociologization of art. Only 2 years ago it would have been impossible even to imagine T. Abuladze's "Repentance" or Yu. Podniyeks' "Is it Easy to Be Young?" These works appeared on the basis of the revolutionary changes of our time.

A new screen version of Gorkiy's "Mother" is being made. I am referring to the movie "Forbidden People," directed by G. Panfilov. This idea is not accidental to this director (who filmed Gorkiy's "Vassa") or to contemporary cinematography in general. Gorkiy wrote that before the novel he was not a revolutionary and that he became a revolutionary as he worked on "Mother." Here again we have an exceptionally important acknowledgment of the feedback in reaching an idea, the feedback which the artist gives to life. The founder of Soviet literature found the sources of the gigantic historical processes which are today spreading throughout the world through the fate of a simple working woman. How superficially we "went through" this novel at school and how important it is that the screen intends (let us hope, successfully) to charge millions of people with its creative energy, as was accomplished by Pudovkin at the dawn of Soviet cinematography.

If a great deal of what is happening in contemporary art reminds us of the searches in the 1920s and beginning of 1930s, the reason is that we must continue and develop

that which, unfortunately, was interrupted for many decades. October and restructuring are words understood throughout the world. They indicate two profoundly interrelated aspects of our history.

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

05003

Chronicle. Meetings with the Editors

18020004o Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 16, Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87) p 128

[Text] In accordance with the plan for interparty exchanges, M. Orabun, deputy editor in chief of *Alun May*, journal of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee, and journal associate S. Takunsuk visited the Soviet Union from 1 to 12 October, in accordance with the plan for interparty exchanges between the CPSU and the LPRP. In addition to a talk with the editors of *Kommunist*, the Laotian journalists held meetings at the Moscow Higher Party School, the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System and the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the World Socialist System, and visited Kiev where they studied the work of several party, soviet and economic organizations and the journal *Kommunist Ukrainy*.

At a meeting between the editors and a delegation of the Yugoslav League of Communists, headed by M. Zuvela, member of the Croatian League of Communists Central Committee Presidium, problems of journal activities were discussed on covering restructuring in the Soviet Union. The guests were also acquainted with the course of the implementation of the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the journal *Kommunist*." Views were exchanged on the participation of mass information media in the work of the CPSU and the Yugoslav League of Communists, aimed at accelerating the socio-economic and political development of society and the soonest possible solving of existing difficulties, shortcomings and stagnation phenomena.

Kommunist was visited by E. Salgado, member of the Argentine Communist Party Central Committee Political Commission and director of *Ideologia y Politica*, the analytical and debate journal of the Argentine Communist Party. In the course of a talk with the editors, questions related to ideological aspects of restructuring in the USSR and intensified cooperation between the journals were discussed.

Henri Alleg, a communist, and an author of the books "Investigation Under Torture" and "SOS, America!," which have been published in our country as well, visited the editors. He shared his creative plans and impressions of the dynamic changes occurring in the Soviet Union.

A talk was held between the editors and the rector of Zagreb University, Academician Vladimir Stipetic and Miroslav Kurelac, director of the History Institute (Yugoslavia). They discussed problems related to restructuring of the economic mechanism and the development of democracy and glasnost in Soviet society.

The editors were visited by a group of West German journalists from the Friedrich Ebert Foundation (Social Democratic Party of Germany) who are visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Union of Journalists. The guests were interested in problems of the development of culture in the USSR at the present stage and prospects for the further enhancement of Soviet-West German cultural exchanges.

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

05003

Publication Data

18020018p Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 16, Nov 87 (signed to press 26 Oct 87)

English Title: *KOMMUNIST* No 16, November 1987

Russian Title: *KOMMUNIST* 16 (1314), Noyabr 1987

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, V.P. Trubnikov, P.N. Fedoseyev, S.F. Yarmolyuk.

Publishing House: Izdatelstvo "Pravda"

Place of Publication: Moscow

Date of Publication: November 1987

Signed to Press: 26 October 1987

Copies: 1,065,000

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

END

10

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names which are rendered phonetically or transliterated by FBIS/JPRS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Africa (Sub-Sahara), Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically. Current JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcovers or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate

command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.