JPRS-UKO-89-007
7 APRIL 1989

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

KOMMUNIST

No 1, January 1989

Soviet Union
KOMMUNIST
No 1, January 1989

JPRS-UKO-89-007 *7 APRIL 1989*

CONTENTS

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

sense, industriousness, caution and responsibility to have their say. We can and must learn how to build our lives in such a way that nowhere, never and no one would have to be rescued from the wreckage of unreliable structures.

The thunder of the earthquake awakened the mind, conscience and sympathy of many people. Once again we felt the brittleness and pricelessness of each human life, and how poorly protected we are today in the face of the elements of nature. We drew strength from the cohesion and mutual aid of envoys from all mankind. We must not lose this valuable feeling of human community and unity and we must remember that, above all else, we are people, we are children of a single earth family....

Could we live a worthy life in the future if we forget all of this?

The KOMMUNIST Collective passed a decision to contribute a one day salary as aid to the victims of the Armenian earthquake.

Socialist Political Economy: Perestroyka Raises Problems

18020007b Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 5-14

[Article by Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Auzan, candidate of economic sciences, senior instructor, Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov]

[Text] Political economy has entered a new complex period of development. The credit of social trust has clearly become exhausted. A wave of blunt criticism is rising on the part of the broadest possible social circles. This democratic interference in political economy is introducing not only a live breath of economic reality but also stereotypes and prejudices of the ordinary consciousness, as well as a charge of nihilism.

In order for political economy to be able successfully to perform its positive research functions, it needs not rejection but treatment: we must determine the reasons for its present condition, cleanse the theoretical system from dogmatism, and compare its most important and fundamental ideas with practical experience, from which it was alienated for a long time.

I

The accusation directed at political economy of scholasticism, dogmatism and apologetics and of alienation from reality and dealing with petty dissertation themes is just. However, we must not only note this unhappy fact but also understand the reasons for the ills. If scholasticism strikes an entire science, we see an obvious inconsistency between a historically obsolete form of development of scientific knowledge and its changed content. Contemporary political economists are studying less new facts than interpreting the views of their great teachers. A certain role in this case was played by the lack of civic courage and scientific objectivity, which were needed in order to formulate dangerous critical conclusions on the condition and trends of development of the socialist economy. However, objective reasons to this effect existed as well.

The theoretical upsurges in political economy have historically always followed successes in specific economic studies—statistical, historical-economic, and so on. Meanwhile, for decades Soviet political economy was receiving an increasingly reduced "share" of statistical information and not altogether reliable data on the history of the national economy. Essentially, political economists were familiar with the status and actual history of the economy only slightly more than the remaining public.

The only remaining way in such circumstances was actually that of theoretical modeling of the socialist economy on the basis of the experience in the creation of the preceding model, i.e., the Marxian system of categories in capitalism. Having developed 30 years previously studies of the universal aspects of this method based on "Das Kapital," socialist political economy was sharpening its methodological weapons for the subsequent theoretical analysis of real problems. However, as it were, the 1970s failed to provide "raw material" for intellectual processing: the rich methodological apparatus turned out to be a machine which was running idle. The standard of scientific thinking, which had been developed in philosophical-economic research and debates in the 1960s, was unable to hinder the popularization of a superficial simplified understanding of Marxism, was based on letters and quotations, to the detriment of a real meaning. Dogmatism—a militant conservatism, "sanctified" by great names—suited the social forces of stagnation.

The two-sided connection between dogmatism and bureaucratism distorts the meaning of party-mindedness in political economy, converting service to the true interests of society into service to short-term circumstances. Such a "use" of political economy had, unfortunately, a very old history and had created a special mechanism for its appearance and preservation.

In our society political economy acts both as a science and as an element of the ruling ideology. This involves a contradiction. As a science, a rather complex one at that, it requires specialized professional knowledge, by no means accessible to everyone. As a structural part of ideology, it is common property and becomes universally widespread. In this case political economy is unable to avoid excessive simplifications and a reduction to

KOMMUNIST

No 1, January 1989

Test of Strength

18020007a Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 3-4

[Text] Armenia was severely wounded.

The pain shook up the entire country.

The greatly suffering Armenian people courageously faced the blow of the elements. Tireless action and fierce struggle for each life extinguishing under the wreckage of buildings were their answer to the tragedy.

Millions of people responded to the great difficulty, as people should: they rushed to help. Rescuers from other republics and even from other countries pulled victims from of the ruins, side-by-side with the Armenians. Physicians from various parts of the countries are taking care of the wounded. Thousands of people donated blood for transfusions and invited in their homes those who had lost their houses, or sent clothing and food, not to mention money.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo Commission activated the powerful mechanisms of the state. In a few hours the army and construction workers, medical, procurement, transportation and communications personnel went to work. The centralized management of resources in this huge country once again proved its great possibilities.

Unlike the situation in the past when, for some reason, it was considered shameful to report that in a socialist country misfortunes can occur, this time all of us immediately found out about the terrible scale of the catastrophe. This helped the entire country not only to express its sadness and sympathy to the fraternal people but also better to understand how much and what type of aid was required.

The blow dealt by the elements tested the strength of people, buildings, public communications and structures. What was able to withstand? What proved vulnerable to this terrible push? The calamity does not allow us to turn our backs to the harsh truth. While healing those whom we were able to save and burying those who cannot be brought back and organizing the rebuilding of the crumbled cities and villages, we must also consider think of everything that was when the bells of Echmiadzin struck. For whom did they toll now?

In the first days of the trouble our awareness could record only individual facts, but even they made us prick our ears. The medical personnel had no shortage of the most valuable item: human blood. Night and day, thousands of volunteers went to the donor centers. However, even the simplest items which should always be plentiful in any polyclinic, such as discardable syringes, were lacking and foreign ones had to be used. Did we have to have an earthquake to bring this to mind? Is this not a shame for our industry, and do we wish to continue to live this way in the future?

The mind is unwilling to tolerate the unfairness of the blind elements and the people angrily asked: What is the worth of science if it cannot predict the minute when everyone should have to leave his home? No, science cannot do this as yet. However, something else is entirely possible: to build in such a way that houses will not crumble as a result of earthquakes. It is true that in these areas underground upheavals of this power had not been noted in recorded history. No one anticipated a 10-point earthquake, but an 8-point one is also quite substantial. Did we think that it would occur? Why is it that in Leninakan all the most recently built houses crumbled, whereas older ones withstood? Above all, where, in what part of the country will the next blow of the elements bury people under the wreckage of buildings and installations which are being erected today? Do we wish to continue to live this way in the future?

The economic managers and planning authorities know perfectly well that everything becomes clear in times of difficulty: in a number of rayons, in general, the infrastructure was weak. Transportation, communications, power, and the procurement system cannot withstand any overloads. We were reminded of this recently, and not only by the trouble in Armenia. Several days earlier cyclones had hit Sakhalin, plunging the city in darkness. It is said that these were cyclones of rare strength. Perhaps, that may be so. However, it would hardly be such as never to have happened in the entire history of such observations. There are typhoons there every summer and snowstorms virtually every winter. How long will the power industry and communications rely on the above-ground connections and equipment used in areas with a more tranquil climate? Similar questions may be asked in any part of the country.

Now as to the most worrisome thing. Even prior to the 7 December tragedy, for several months Armenia and its neighbor Azerbaijan had been shaken up by upheavals of a different sort. An outbreak of unparalleled hysteria had made tens of thousands of people move elsewhere, depriving of a roof even those whose homes had remained standing. This difficulty indicated that in the house of cards built of a frenzied and thoughtless tribal hostility and false myths of national exclusivity, no one can live in a state of happiness and security any more than in homes built of poor concrete on the basis of totally worthless projects. Could we allow ourselves to continue to live this way?

The earthquake tested the firmness of both houses and people. The spirit of the people, their courage, responsiveness and unity in the common trouble withstood the trial, as has always been the case in the past in hours of tragic events. Now what we need is for reason, common

cumbersome organization of large-scale production and the importance of stability and of the guaranteed nature of conditions governing its activities exclude the possibility of engaging in flexible maneuvering and extensive experimentation, for on each separate occasion we must surmount the inertia of rigid interrelationships. The consequence of this is that large-scale production particularly needs a research-testing mechanism, the function of which should be performed by the small enterprises thanks to their large number, relative ease in reorganizing production facilities, efficiency and flexibility of relations.

In other words, large-scale production is the "skeleton" of any contemporary production system. However, it cannot exist without "soft and flexible fabrics," the functions of which are performed by small and medium-sized enterprises. The experience in the functional interaction between large-scale and petty production facilities was gained in relations between monopolies and "small business" in capitalist countries, and the underdeveloped nature of such functional relations in socialist production is, clearly, one of the reasons for our technical falling behind.

The realization of the limits of production socialization does not affect concentration alone but production centralization as well. From the abstract viewpoint, in the course of centralization, its effect should increase, reaching its peak under the conditions of centralization on the scale of the entire society. Actually, it did yield results: it helped to carry out huge structural reorganizations of the economy and facilitated the concentration of forces and assets in the decisive areas. However, in a number of cases the effectiveness of centralism turned out to be lower than anticipated; furthermore, in recent decades we also found that it had an obstructing influence on economic development.

Under certain circumstances, centralization assumes the socioeconomic form of a monopoly of economic processes. The paralyzing, the deadening influence of monopoly, which restricts the additional possibilities for growth, could be expressed both through stagnation as well as various types of major and minor "hitches" resulting from it.

The problem of monopoly as it applies to the socialist economy is not simple. Monopoly is not reduced merely to organizational-administrative factors, although it is closely related to them. However, a source for the establishment of monopoly includes essentially positive processes of socialization, production concentration above all. The elimination of "administrative" monopoly exercised by the central authorities could turn into an "economic" monopoly exercised by several centers engaged in large-scale or highly specialized output.

However, it is not mandatory to relate the neutralizing of monopoly exclusively to the introduction of competitive principles, splintering socialized production and promoting its despecialization. It could be achieved also through the development and unification of forces which counteract monopoly. For example, the experience of a number of developed countries indicates the expediency of creating mass associations of end users, who would have sufficient rights and their own technical machinery to control the consumer quality of output, "counteradvertising," participation in standardization talks, and so on.

The existence of a "counterstructure" within the single economic organization, and the related "competition among planning ideas" is one of the foundations of true centralism. The other one is the reproduction of the autonomy of production units.

Long years of debates on the subject of the correlation between centralism and autonomy failed to clarify the basic question of their material substantiation. The progress of socialization, as it strengthens the interdependence of enterprises, should have undermined all foundations for production autonomy, leaving only a single opportunity: the display of autonomous initiative "through the center."

It seems to us that the dynamics of socialization do not follow a straight line. They express the cyclical fluctuations of scientific and technical development. Correspondingly, there may be phases during which the need for a broad multiple-channel and initiative-minded experimentation with new technical solutions would presume decentralization in production management; on the other hand, the application of new technological principles, which destroy the entire previous economic structure, could trigger the type of phases of economic development in which centralization offers major advantages.

The dialectics of the processes of centralization and decentralization do not essentially contradict basic trend of socialization: the various phases of development presume merely a different combination of the "higher" (national economic) and "lower" (enterprise) levels of socialization and the broadening of autonomy means not only production decentralization but also its centralization on the enterprise level. Therefore, the basic problem in the development of autonomy in following the track of socialization is related to the nature, forms and objectives of activities of production associations.

We hold the view that in the course of the development of the associations the principle of voluntary economic associations among enterprises will be gradually strengthened. The association of enterprises in various areas is consistent with their interests if it is not fettered by departmental fiscal-administrative restrictions, and the possibility of leaving the association creates the necessary economic dependence of the managerial apparatus of associations on the enterprises within it. On the other hand, the flexibility of forms and framework of associations would enable us to make consistent with the organizational structure of the economy the actual needs

the course of the contemporary discussions the general idea concerning the renovation of socialism develops, such as concepts of its development leading toward a variety of forms, the development of which will ensure the flexibility of the economic system and open opportunities for human activeness and economic initiative. However, this idea could easily be turned into an apology of the suitably forgotten old "mixed" or multiple-system economy as the objective of socialist development. The problem is that the old concepts of the development of socialism toward uniformity (the merger of the various forms of ownership within a single one, elimination of social disparities, surmounting the autonomy of enterprises within the unified system of centralized management) led, in the final account, to the classical definition of production socialization, as a merger of disparate production processes within a single public production process.

Naturally, socialization cannot be reduced exclusively to "merger." Concentration always presumes specialization. The existence of different levels of socialization and economic centralization is acknowledged. They can be combined with each other in a variety of ways.

Nonetheless, within the process of socialization itself, apparently we find more profound and essential differences which explain the variety of economic forms. In our view, inherent in socialist socialization—regardless of the level of its development—are internal boundaries which, if exceeded, would make it not only lose its economic efficiency but also turn it into a source of distortion of socialism. In itself, the drop in efficiency could lead to the devaluation of the social advantages created by the preceding development of socialization; an even more dangerous phenomenon is the conversion into a target of socialization of the subject of activities themselves (standardization of the "private factor" in production, a suppressing set of regulations, and so on) which, in turn, results in a drop in efficiency, stagnation and inertia.

Hardly anyone would object to such an understanding of the limits of socialization; the difficulty, however, is that sensing this concealed boundary is by no means simple under the circumstances governed by real economic processes. This requires a more specific study of the basic features of socialization (machine technology as a base of production socialization, role of large-scale output, the nature of the uniform organization of the economy, etc.).

There has been an obvious change in the understanding of the role of the machine base. The classical views on this matter appeared during the period of the blossoming of factory industry and, naturally, made use of the realities of that time to express ideas which were more general in terms of their significance. Subsequently, the interpretation of these concepts was linked to figurative expressions to the detriment of their real meaning. Such a dogmatic use of the image of the "single factory" turned this thesis into a source of technocratic understanding not only as being the technical base of socialism but also the "uniform" organization of management with the help of a huge hierarchical system.

Experience revealed not only the ecological but also the specific economic boundaries of technical progress under socialism. For example, they are related to involving in the production process underproductive as well as expensive equipment which, naturally, led to low capital returns.

The variety of means of stimulating technical progress should not only coexist with the advantages of socialism but also be based on their intensification. Capitalism has greater possibilities in promoting technical development through cash incentives, for it uses an essentially broader range of means of incentive, ranging from the full and total loss of income to huge wealth. As far as the development of the creative functions of labor and the corresponding means of "stimulating labor through labor" are concerned, socialism is potentially stronger and must convert this potential into reality.

In the past this was achieved through quite contradictory means. Socialism ensured not only universal population literacy but also a powerful attraction by the human masses for higher education and creative labor which, however, met a limited need of the economy for specialists with higher education, a decline in the social prestige and in the material sufficiency of individuals engaged in mental labor and the administrative ruling of such individuals.

Another question concerning a different traditional feature of socialization—large scale production—also requires reinterpretation; its development boundaries were seriously disturbed by the course charted toward "superconcentration," and the gigantomania of previous decades. The result of this was not in the least the destruction of small and medium-sized enterprises, but their obvious technical and economic backwardness.

Large-scale production is indeed an important foundation for socialism: it molds the collectivism of the working class and the ability to develop large-scale forms of organization wherever necessary and expedient and contributes to lowering the cost of mass consumption products, thus ensuring equality and universal accessibility in meeting the most vital needs of the people. Nonetheless, in the course of time the needs of developing socialism exceed the limits of these simplest possible tasks, presuming the creative nature of collectivistic relations and the satisfaction of differentiated and nonstandardized consumer requirements.

The coupling of "large-scale" blocks within a single production system inevitably creates "niches" which must be filled by enterprises of different sizes. Their role is not reduced to ensuring a greater variety of goods and services or broadening their range. The point is that the

general concepts and familiar quotations. On the other hand, professional monopoly in the interpretation of the meaning of social ideology also creates prerequisites for the dogmatism of the "priests" of political economy.

What worsened the situation further was that general problems of socioeconomic development have been frequently solved in the course of our history by private bureaucratic means. In that sense bureaucratism is the direct culprit for the development of a "ballast" of dogmatic knowledge among the masses, a ballast for which there was no use.

Dogmatism in science itself appeared in defense of the various forms of the economic system. The function of political economy was limited to the simple one-dimensional task of seeing to it that Marxist concepts strictly substantiated the accuracy of the pursued policy. Under those circumstances, debates among political economists quickly lost their scientific nature, turning into a struggle for the right to represent the "only true line."

The solution of this problem presumes the practical participation of political economists in "navigation" work, in laying a course and analyzing options for future development. At this point the coexistence of different views on the single ground of Marxism-Leninism becomes legitimate and the criteria on the basis of which they are compared assume a more substantiated practical nature.

However, this is hindered by elements of monopoly and departmentalism, which are inherent in political economy no less than in the system of economic management it "services." Internal and interscientific barriers not only deprive economic theory of its necessary outlook but also create breeches which allow entire blocks of questions to "sneak through," and illusions of isolated shortcomings rather than the existence of general problems appear.

Now, under the conditions of perestroyka, many objective roots of the painful condition of economic theory are being gradually eliminated. This raises even more pressingly the radical moral question of the willingness and readiness of the political economists themselves to assume responsibility for the further destiny of their science and to welcome beneficial social changes not with slogans but with hard work in revising their own views, comparing them against reality and historical experience and formulating answers to the questions which society presents to political economy. These questions are not simple. Today we must reinterpret the economic foundations of socialism, for without this we cannot understand who and what we are, where we are and where are we going.

For a long time "orthodox" political economy nurtured its concepts on the socialist economy with the help of contrasts: if a given situation prevailed under capitalism, the opposite had to prevail under socialism. This approach arose from the fact itself of the revolutionary change and intensified the parallel development of utopias in the mass awareness. However, the true correlation between capitalism and socialism is not reduced merely to this negation. A commonality in the development of production forces in the two coexisting systems also creates a similarity in the elements of production relations. Therefore, the approach to socialism as some kind of "anticapitalism" leads, as a result, to absurd conclusions which depict not real socialism but some kind of nonexistent society, the mirror reflection of the opposite "shade" of capitalism. In order to straighten out the problem, we must consider thoroughly and in a new fashion the question of the objective criteria of socialism and its historical determination. In the present debates we find a predominantly simplified understanding of this criterion: the better it is for the individual, the more socialism there is. Such a formulation cannot fail to create problems, for the picture of social interests today is quite conflicting. Equally conflicting is the correlation among the different needs of individuals.

In other words, we should look for a more profound base for the way the objective trend of the production process, aimed at the good of man, can be achieved through all those differences. We would not go far with a simple concept of the "natural" or "obvious" tasks and needs of social development.

We should not allow the dismantling of dogmatic political economy to wreck the scientifically attained **objectiveness** of the socialist economic system. Here the starting point is provided by the greatest discovery in the field of political economy: the scientific foresight of the new economic system, based on the implementation of the objective laws of economic development and, above all, the process of production socialization.

II

The advantages of socialism, determined by surmounting the limitations which were insurmountable by the preceding production method, are justifiably related to socialization and its consequences. However, this also establishes new boundaries, the awareness of which is as important in understanding the historical specifics of socialism as the knowledge of its advantages. Awareness of our own limitations is a sign of maturity in the theoretical understanding of society. An effort to see an interconnection of advantages and boundaries of development resulting from the socialization of production under socialist conditions is the task facing our further research. Without its implementation we could not understand the structure of socialist ownership, the specific nature of interests and the correlation between commodity and planning principles.

The search for new approaches in political economy presumed a comparison between new ideas and the classical understanding of production socialization as the material foundations for socialism. In our view, in

of socialized relations. The associations become the most important tool in coordinating economic activities, and the role of the center is increasingly concentrated on strategic assignments.

However, the correlation between centralism and autonomy conceals the much more difficult question of long-term economic interests and the objectives which will guide the center, the associations and the enterprises in their activities. Under the conditions of capitalism, private ownership makes it necessary for the enterprise to think of the very long-range consequences of its activities and to be concerned with the production process in the distant future. Public ownership is as yet to find its own means of solving such problems.

III

Marx wrote about the political economy of his day that the moment it is a question of ownership, the viewpoint of a children's alphabet book become mandatorily accepted by all age groups. This accusation is applicable to our own views of ownership: it is on their basis that we find the absolute postulates of the 1930s, which played such an essential role in the development of dogmatism.

The traditional system cannot be denied its logic, which is primitive but didactically clear. Since the material prerequisite for socialist ownership is the broad socialization of output, the form of ownership which attains the highest possible centralization—state ownership—turns out to be the most progressive. The other possible forms of ownership are arranged according to their specific degree of centralization. Correspondingly, progress is determined by the degree to which the variety of forms of ownership are reduced.

The significance of state ownership in ensuring the unified organization of the socialist economy is entirely real. However, the development of socialism depends to an equal extent on the individual economic initiative of the workers. It is no secret that for a long time socialism "limped" on one foot. The stagnation, as consequence of the lack of initiative and mass inertia, clearly proved the practical importance of combining both principles.

However, achieving such combination is not all that simple. State ownership both expands the economic-organizational possibilities of the society and hinders the implementation of these possibilities by distancing them from the individual and putting them in the realm of "high politics." The formation of bureaucratic accretions separating the people from the economic center proved the fact that state and nationwide ownership were not one and the same. Today we can clearly see the need for finding the type of variants of national economic socialization which would not void the significance of the individual.

While acknowledging the objective nature of production socialization, we must also acknowledge that its results are not always consistent with our wishes and ideals: in particular, socialization indeed carries within itself the threat of depersonalization, of lowering the role of the "unit." Therefore, a socialized economy faces a particular problem, that of protecting the "social defense" mechanism from the negative consequences of socialization and asserting the individual and his influence on the public economy. Objectively this is based on the process of "socialization" of the individual, inseparably related to socialization in the sense of the free association among individuals in pursuit of their own interests.

Individual freedom is manifested in the free mobility of the population on the different "levels" of the economic system (professional, territorial, etc.). This leads to the appearance of extensive independent contacts among working people which, in particular, are the foundations of the existence of mass social associations. Personal freedom and socialization on which it is based should, in our view, be legitimately considered as particular socio-organizational prerequisites for socialism.

Their importance is confirmed by our historical experience. Thus, for a number of decades population mobility was restrained through legal barriers and considered not a manifestation of personal freedom and activeness but an annoying obstacle to the normal supply of manpower to enterprises and sectors. The result of this was the spreading of parochial and professional corporate feelings. On the other hand, the experience in democratization immediately revealed the prime significance of the establishment and enhancement of the activities of various types of social associations. In our view, this is entirely legitimate: in the socialized economy the individual is constantly dealing with powerful organizations and complex hierarchical structures, for which reason pursuit of individual interests requires unification within a variety of communities which could enhance individual initiatives to their highest standard. The freedom of association becomes a prerequisite for and means of ensuring individual freedom.

Obviously, the association among working people is a basic fact in the development of a truly nationwide ownership, in which the democratic use of state organizations is based not on a given political course but on the structure of the socialization process itself.

The obvious multiplicity of forms of ownership, which develops in the course of economic practices, is another dogma-defeating aspect. Cooperative ownership is clearly experiencing a renaissance. Ownership by social organizations is quite conflicting with the traditional system. We must reinterpret the concept of ownership based on individual labor. We must better clarify the nature of ownership in enterprises involving the participation of capitalist companies. Nor can economic theory ignore relations based on leasing and the creation of stock issuing companies.

It would be erroneous, however, to describe all forms of economic practices as "theoretical indulgences." The increased variety of forms could be the result not only of basic circumstances but also of the need to take urgent steps to surmount the legacy of stagnation and close the breeches opened in the state economy.

The really contradictory nature in the development of the country gives grounds for adopting two opposite approaches in assessing the historical role of perestroyka based on the socialization criterion: as a return to the structure of the transitional economy (hence the popularity of the analogy of perestroyka and the NEP) or as a renewal of socialism. Replacing the socialist ideal with that of a transitional economy contains the threat of finding ourselves in a historical impasse. On the other hand, the task of the renovation of socialism must not be reduced merely to the freedom of development of various forms and the natural progress toward variety does not eliminate the problems of coupling various elements within a single system on the basis of ownership by the whole people.

The reinterpretation of approaches to the socialization of ownership raises yet another difficult problem, that of the economic foundations of socioclass differences in socialist society. The traditional system was based on two forms of ownership, which were in the process of merging. Hence the conclusion of the gradual elimination of differences between the two basic classes and the preservation of residual differences only in terms of the nature of the work (mental-physical, industrial-agrarian). These differences remain essential to this day but are clearly insufficient to explain the contemporary social situation. The enhancement of the social forces under the conditions of perestroyka also revealed lines of contradictions which do not coincide in the least with the traditional social gradations.

The interpretation of the economic foundations of the social struggle is an equally important aspect of the practical functions of political economy, such as issuing recommendations on the organization of the national economy. This task affects the ideological role of political economy: public opinion must realize the need of the struggle for economic reform.

In Lenin's view, political economy must ensure a "sober **consideration of interests.**" The very formulation of the question of economic reforms presumes a political economic analysis of the attitude toward reform taken by different classes and social groups and the theoretical assessment of its significance in the overall development of the economy (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 2, pp 254-255). These concepts by no means pertain to the status of the class struggle alone: Lenin deemed inevitable the preservation under socialism of a **nonclass** "economic struggle" against bureaucratic distortions of the Soviet apparatus and in defense of the interests of the masses (see op. cit., vol 42, p 297).

The differences among social forces and the struggle among them in promoting economic change are more clearly realized now in economic theory. Understanding the social situation in the economic reform requires the study of economic power as a more specific manifestation of ownership. It is precisely the nature of economic power that, in our view, is a subject of the nonclass economic struggle which developed in the course of perestroyka on matters of self-government, autonomy, etc.

In the individual farm the owner was clear. However, the development of the process of socialization makes the picture exceptionally complex. In the course of this process the owner not only separated himself from the working people but was also partially replaced by a manager. Socialism did not simplify the situation by eliminating the antagonism in ownership relations but preserved the comprehensive nature of related functional interconnections.

The economic mechanism which prevailed for many decades ascribed to such ownership relations a contradictory and even a conflicting form. As the owners of the public property, the working people did not have proprietary or "entrepreneurial" functions. These functions were concentrated mainly on the higher and middle echelons of management, in the hands of a professional managerial apparatus. Within the enterprises and associations the functions of production organization were also separated from the immediate producers. The economic aspirations of the working people and of enterprise managers, failing to find proper channels for implementation within the official system, frequently deviated into auxiliary areas and were manifested in a distorted fashion in the "shady economy."

The alienation of the owners-working people from their economic functions triggered a feeling of dependency, passiveness and the mentality of coupon clippers. Separated from ownership and labor, i.e., of material and social responsibility, the monopoly apparatus developed a strong bureaucratic influence on specific managerial strata. A technocratic attitude strengthened in enterprise managements separated from the social problems of economic strategy. Finally, in the area of the "shady economy," the separation of economic functions from labor contribution led to the development of speculative-parasitical phenomena.

The steps taken in the course of perestroyka to develop self-government by the working people and broaden the autonomy of enterprises and to legalize and control individual labor activeness should gradually uproot the economic foundations for adverse social trends. However, because of a significant social inertia, to this day they continue to exert their influence, determining the features of the economic ideology displayed by different groups and a distorted vision of the nature of economic changes. A certain portion of the departmental apparatus

division of goods have another aspect as well, the one which makes us look askance at anyone who earns through his labor more than his lazy neighbor. Of late a number of examples in this respect have appeared.

There already have been press reports on the loss of equipment and output by members of cooperatives and lessees. What are the reasons for this? Why is the mass awareness still dominated not by the constructive but by the "distribution" model of the socialist system and why is the principle "from each according to his capabilities and to each according to his labor" not go beyond a statement? N.G. Chernyshevskiy himself thought of this paradox. "In order to sympathize with socialism one must be prepared for a rather complex combination of ideas; in order to sympathize with communism it would suffice to feel the burdensomeness of existing economic relations....," he wrote.

This statement is quite relevant to the present situation in the social consciousness, for the sympathy of many people gravitates precisely toward the utopia of equalization, which frequently triggers hatred and the aspiration to annoy one's neighbor more.

Of late we have had frequent opportunities to realize that the prestige of the fighter for perestroyka is sometimes easier to acquire with the help of equalization slogans and the proclamation of justice as being a redistribution rather than multiplication of public wealth. However, distribution utopias with equalizing features are an unsuitable prescription for the solution of our problems. In this case, it is particularly necessary not to yield to emotions but to understand the situation calmly and openly, and firmly to oppose demagogic chimeras and petit bourgeois-equalizing moods. Lenin said that "...To must not think that fair distribution alone is necessary; we must think that such distribution is a method, a weapon, a means of increasing output" (op. cit., vol 43, p 359). Justice is always specific. The socialist principle of distribution according to labor is what socialism can give the person today, based on economic possibilities created through common labor in which each social group, collective and individual has a share and makes a contribution.

Perestroyka is being criticized. This should not be considered unusual, for today there is no area in our country closed to criticism. We have acquired a great deal of both positive and negative experience. There are a great many things about which, until very recently, we had very different ideas; there were decisions which had not been thought out completely and efforts at waging an administrative struggle against complex social phenomena, such as the hasty offensive mounted against "unearned income." A great deal had to be corrected on the march and a great deal will have to be redone.

However, perestroyka must also be protected and preserved from any accretions or random factors and, above all, from efforts to ascribe to it the sins of the past and to ignore the main features in the stream of secondary problems. It must be protected from those who are trying to exploit the natural feelings of the people and manipulate them. The prime task today is to understand and defend the priority nature of perestroyka and the need for persistently and through practical action to promote this process of renovation of socialism, which is vitally important to the people and to society.

I believe that no one would oppose the idea of everything becoming "good" immediately. The purpose of perestroyka is precisely to assert that the present has priority over the future. However, let us recall once again N.G. Chernyshevskiy: the task of the revolutionary who cares for his people is to take as much as possible from the future and put it into the present, to bring this future closer through his own efforts. The fate of renovation depends above all on that which has already been accomplished and is being accomplished by millions of people, through the daily toil of the people which, precisely, will guarantee the irreversibility of perestroyka.

It would be erroneous and even dangerous to belittle the difficulties of renovation and it is precisely the party which can see, more clearly than anyone else, the depth and gravity of many of the problems facing the country. However, clearly inappropriate would be moods which promote panic or an unbridled imagination. We have enough entirely tangible current problems. Let us apply maximal efforts to deal above all with such real and essential concerns....

The lesson of democracy could be considered one of the most important ones among those learned last year. The discussions before, during and after the party conference and the tempestuous debates on constitutional draft bills not simply revealed the "touchy spots" of popular opinion but also seemed to have determined the "median" level of mass political standards and indicated not only the basic aspiration of the people to exercise their constitutional rights but also the popularity of some social illusions and utopian concepts. Also included here were intolerance of other people's views, frequently justified attachments to pluralism and extremism which, as reality proves, is most dangerous in approaching a sensitive area such as relations among ethnic groups.

It is no accident that today society pays such serious attention to the conditions for securing a reliable democratic order, clear to all, be it in terms of the functioning of the representative agencies of the Soviet system or the activities of the people's deputies, or else the establishment of political institutions. It has already become universally acknowledged that elections should be supported by a streamlined system of democratic procedures, which would make it possible to elect to one position or another the most suitable person and to exclude elements of chance. Here as well one could hardly rely on the idea that the level of democracy and the level of the mandate of trust can be determined by the practice or absence of direct balloting, by that which

Soviet millionaires" or in some "foreign" influences damaging the people's morality and, all of them put together, contributing to the disappearance of sugar and soap from store shelves. Well, the aspiration to find the "enemy," whatever his garb, is a repetition of the lessons already learned by society.

Clearly, we must not ignore bureaucratic obstructions or the activities of corrupt clans and groups. Naturally, all of this exists in the great variety of today's reality. We must not ignore such phenomena. However, nor should we limit ourselves to them. The main reasons for the fact that inertia was not surmounted are, nonetheless, much deeper.

For the sake of fairness we must also mention the following complex topic: the obvious psychological lack of preparedness of a great many people for change and their unwillingness and inability to work efficiently and independently, and the existence of the sociopsychological complex of faith in the "good king" who is a hero whom one can simply follow without straining one's intelligence or displaying initiative, the person who will come, judge and with an act of willpower restructure life. This phenomenon is explainable. By virtue of the features of our historical way it was precisely socialism that had to do a considerable amount of the type of "civilizing" work which capitalism had done in the majority of other countries. And in order to achieve the type of labor productivity and high conscious discipline needed by the new system and apply contemporary production methods and the latest technology, we had to teach others and learn ourselves how to work knowledgeably and interestedly, on the basis of the expedient combination of material and moral incentives and the free manifestation and consideration of actual interests.

It was precisely this circumstance that Lenin pointed out during the very first post-October months. "To learn how to work is the task which the Soviet system must set to the people, in its entire magnitude" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 189). In this connection, Vladimir Ilich emphasized the length of this process. Naturally, a great deal has changed since then but, to this day, the question remains on the agenda. That is why it is so urgent and relevant today to create conditions for asserting conscious discipline and establishing accurate and honest payments for one's labor. It is a question also of developing a readiness for change and the ability to think and act differently, not on the level of statements and slogans which may sound good at a meeting, but on a personal basis, for oneself.

The press recently published data of studies conducted by sociologists from the USSR Academy of Sciences at 120 industrial enterprises. The following figure is striking: 52.6 percent, or more than one-half of the 11,000 people who were surveyed, considered that the main reserve for accelerating socioeconomic development was not increasing the interest or changing the economic mechanism but taking administrative steps. One year ago the supporters of this "administrative reserve" were nearly two-thirds fewer. Hiding behind this figure and the impatient expectation of the "miraculous rescue" (naturally, the best one would be in one fell swoop) from the annoying economic difficulties, was the habit of observing the "disciplinary" style in economic life. In this connection we understand the frequent calls for "bashing," and taking decisive administrative measures. Not far from this is the familiar portrait behind glass as a symbol of protest (in most cases subconscious) against the meaninglessness and instability of daily life with its constant concerns about the future, waiting lines and shortages. These precisely are the roots of the durability of the myth-panacea of the need for equalizing justice, which seems to explain it all.

In a socialist society there should not be, above all, a shortage of justice. Even the great philosopher Kant accurately noted that "nothing makes us more indignant than unfairness; all other types of evil which we must suffer are nothing compared to it." Indeed, the dream of justice, leading to the "golden age" of universal equality and well-being has led for centuries the people in the struggle for a better future. Were not the ideas of justice the ones which illumined the October days of 1917 and the first laws passed by the Soviet system? Was it not the immediate triumph of this ideal that was sought, taking a shortcut, by the promoters of "war communism," headed by the "Sturm und Drang" thrust? Justice assumed a variety of aspects which, most frequently, were terrifying, harsh and inflexible. Its humanistic nature yielded to the fierce necessity to share the crumbs of bread among millions of sufferers. As we can see after decades, it was this concept of the immediate and urgent justice that was one of the psychological factors which led to and explained a number of crucial events in the history of building socialism.

It would be naive to deny that to this day such moods of equalization have been preserved and are even frequently manifested with noticeable aggressiveness. The basis for such manifestations is understandable both from the political and human viewpoints: the accumulated fatigue caused by constant shortages, irritation with waiting lines and red tape, the challenging behavior of some big and small "chiefs" with access to scarce goods, and the impudence of trade mafiosi. Hence appeals for providing anyone who expects improvements in his living conditions perhaps a minimum of the desired material and spiritual goods. Are such demands just? Yes, they are. It would be inhuman to deny the people the right to wish improvements in the quality of their lives. Neither appeals for voluntary asceticism nor the consolation that there will be prosperity in the future would help in this case. We must proceed from the unquestionable legitimacy of the aspiration to live better in greater abundance and, once and for all, more beautifully! Above all, we must do everything necessary to this effect, directing the economy toward facing the needs and requirements of the people. However, the mentality of waiting in line and the ideal of the equal

which is, essentially, opposed to change, cannot sabotage such change openly. It tries to "edit" the reform and to channel it into the customary bed of "further improvements."

The mood of dependency displayed by some worker circles, who are trying to replace social justice with equalization but, at the same time, demand a firm adoption of administrative measures, is a major danger. Under the guise of the struggle waged by "producers" against "apparatchiks," actually the technocratic elements are promoting the redivision of economic power within the apparatus in favor of its lower levels. Finally, the speculative-parasitical groups, which developed within the "shady economy," are trying to interpret the broadening of the variety of forms of economic activities as freedom for private economic practices and as a legal sanctioning of unearned income and social inequality.

One way or another, all of these trends in economic ideology may be found in the pages of mass publications and economic periodicals. Glasnost is merely bringing to light the existence of substantial differences based on contradictions within the social situation. However, it is also helping to realize the nature of the true economic interests of the people, the identification of which would be impossible without intensive work in political economy.

Political economy cannot fail to realize its willing or unwilling participation in this ideological struggle. To break through the web of individual and group interests and to bring to light the profound but nonetheless really existing national interests and consistently to express the conditions and steps for the development of the economic power of the self-governing people is, in our profound conviction, the task of socialist political economy in perestroyka. Its party-oriented nature is manifested today precisely in this area.

Continuing Lessons

18020007c Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 15-20

[Article by S. Kolesnikov]

[Text] Perestroyka is growing up. Each passing day adds to our experience and teaches us sciences which we did not "take" either in the classrooms or the VUZ, or else in the course of political practices of past decades. We are learning democracy. We are mastering the skills of thinking and acting in accordance with the impulses of freedom and inner convictions, rather than administrative diktat. We are learning tolerance and rejection of all forms of extremism. We are mastering the art of political compromise and moral uncompromising attitude. We feel in a new way the weight of arguments in favor of our socialist choice and socialist values, and once again are mastering the high value of humanism.

In all of these respects, last year was a turning point. Suffice it to recall its most noticeable political landmarks: the formulation of the "ideological components" of the concept of perestroyka—the ideology of renovation, adopted at the February Central Committee Plenum; the instructive lessons related to clarifying that which constitutes the principles of socialism; the daily increasing experience in engaging in a nationwide debate in the course of the preparations for, holding and undertaking the implementation of the resolutions of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference and the discussion of constitutional draft bills. Finally, there was the main political event of the year, the party conference, four summer days, which packed so much meaning and not simply reflected a mosaic of views and positions, which coexisted and interacted within the social consciousness energized by glasnost, but clearly represented a model of the democratic future of our socialism, in which the priority of man as a full and sovereign personality becomes inviolable.

Last year also brought to light the profound difficulties of converting from the theoretical and conceptual interpretation of the vital problems of renovation to their practical implementation. We undertook to unravel the past and, extracted from the depth of history, the roots of many of our problems became entirely clear. The time has now come to sow on this cleared field, so that tomorrow the people could gather the harvest. Although we have still not become, we are becoming wiser. We realized that a malicious and incautious word could wound not only figuratively but, put on the service of militant intolerance, could kill what is human in man, fanning passions and even provoking bloodshed. We also became better aware of the real price of simple things—compassion, charity, comradeship and mutual aid and the dignity of the individual, which do not depend on national affiliation or ideological prejudices.

A great deal was compressed in the year 1988, making us understand our own responsibility for the destinies of the country and the individual in the country and among other people; it was a year which posed many problems and taught us a great deal.

Why is it that despite a passionate desire for immediate change we have to wait such a long time for the results of perestroyka which we could feel and taste, so to say? Such were the questions which everyone of us asked himself, and everyone, in all likelihood, found his answer.

Naturally, the simplest thing would be to ascribe everything to the resistance of the "enemies of perestroyka," who are hindering everything that is new and progressive. Frequent attempts were made to find the enemy among managers, in "headquarters" in the "100,000

L. Onushko, chairman of the board of the Kontinent Interregional Cooperative Bank:

I am convinced that as long as the cooperative sector has not become organizationally defined, the "children's diseases" of growth will make themselves be felt and should be considered calmly, however dramatic they may seem. The main thing is for the organizational process to be developed from the bottom up. A maximum amount of democracy is needed. The Leninist principle of "do not dare to command!" must be systematically implemented. It is on the same principles that we must formulate the structure of the cooperative sector which is now actively seeking new forms of association. In our view, the main link here could be the urban or oblast structure of associations or unions of cooperatives.

Such units have already been created in many cities. In the small republics, such as those in the Baltic area, clearly the basic unit will be the republic association of cooperative members. On the all-Union level, the process of organization may take the path of development of several interregional centers. The urban or oblast associations within it should retain their full autonomy in solving their internal problems.

Organizational structures which enable us to represent the interests of cooperative farmers on the governmental level are vitally necessary. If we are able to include in our interregional federation 10 or 20,000 cooperatives by uniting urban and oblast groups, this would provide us with grounds for formulating and solving serious problems in the development of the movement. Since the members of cooperatives sensibly fear that the creation of centralized management systems on a national scale would restore the command-bureaucratic management methods, their unification on the all-Union level should, in our view, take the form of a federation of interregional centers which would retain their autonomy.

O. Morozov, head of the propaganda and agitation department, Tatar CPSU Obkom:

Nonetheless, would such an organizational boom not lead to the appearance of new—cooperative—bureaucrats?

L. Onushko. The members of the cooperatives watch over every kopek and will not undertake to finance the creation of management structures which, from their viewpoint, are unnecessary. As a rule, we have no full-time personnel on the urban level. Everything is being done essentially on a voluntary basis. Today the full-time managerial apparatus of our interregional federation consists of two people, one of whom is the president.

S. Yershov, deputy chief engineer, Automated Machining Facility, KamAZ, MKF commercial director:

The tasks of the Interregional Federation of Cooperatives cannot be reduced exclusively to the implementation of sociopolitical functions. In order to avoid the danger that the federation would turn into a debate club and replace practical work with holding meetings, we need an economic or commercial program of our own. The federation has drafted and is implementing such a program. In order to ensure the material and technical supplies to the cooperatives and their associations, we are establishing our own trade center. We have set-up our own cooperative bank. We are planning the organization of an information center. The development of the activities of the federation in that direction would enable it, in my view, to implement its sociopolitical functions more efficiently.

V. Pestov, chairman of the Inzhener Cooperative, Kazan:

Naturally, to a great extent the development of the cooperative movement depends on the solution of organizational problems. Nonetheless, the main role in defining its viability and long-term future is played by the currently occurring changes in the motivations for labor activities. The member of the cooperative does not have to develop within himself the feeling of proprietorship. This feeling appears for the simple reason that he is a member of a cooperative. He is involved with everything and has been given the opportunity to prove himself, to engage in work which is sensible and useful to society, investing in it his own heart and bearing full responsibility for the results of his labor.

That is why now increasingly stronger workers and specialists with innovative feelings are switching from state enterprises to cooperatives. They have become fed up with equalization in which the income of a shock production worker is barely different from the wages of loafers and drunks who are paid a salary, in frequent cases, merely for showing up at work. They have become tired of irresponsibility and the need to wage a real battle for the application of any new development, be it a rationalization suggestion or improvements in work amenities. The people want to work at full capacity and earn truly according to their labor. They find in the cooperative the possibility of engaging in such types of labor.

Today the cooperative is starting virtually from scratch. We had no production base, financial resources or industrial and commercial infrastructures. All of this had to be created anew. Our cooperative is still a youngster (which, actually, does not prevent economic departments methodically to impose upon it "adult" loads). However, even at this stage in its development, it is proving its high efficiency. Let us take as an example cooperatives working in industry or construction. They are producing goods and providing services essentially at governmental prices and rates. As a rule, they are being set-up on the basis of the facilities of losing enterprises and literally in a few months become highly profitable.

citizens are becoming its conscious participants. However, to accomplish this one must learn from one's own experience and one's errors and victories over the past alienation from politics. The lessons will be difficult and lengthy. However, there is no other way leading to democratic, humane and free socialism.

Time of Initiative-Minded People

18020007d Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 21-35

[Roundtable materials prepared by journal associates N. Golovnin, M. Krans and V. Nekhotin]

[Text] **Today both the hopes and concerns of our society are related to the cooperatives. Hope, because the people see in the cooperatives a force which will help to surmount the lag in the social area, which concerns them, along with the profound disproportions in the economy, the low quality of services, the scarcity of most important goods and services, and the waiting lines. The concerns are due to the fact that not everything in the development of this movement is taking place is it should.**

Those were precisely the hopes and concerns discussed at the roundtable sponsored by the editors of KOMMUNIST jointly with the Tatar CPSU Obkom, the executive committee of the soviet of people's deputies of Naberezhnyye Chelny, the management of the KamAZ and the Interregional Federation of Cooperatives. It was no accident that this meeting was held in Naberezhnyye Chelny. It was here that, earlier than elsewhere, energetic and initiative-minded members of cooperatives appeared and seriously undertook to join efforts on the scale of several regions. Finally, it was precisely in this city that the local party and soviet authorities are displaying, as is generally recognized, lively interest in the development of this movement, believing that it would help them to solve many pressing socioeconomic problems.

The First Step Has Been Taken. What Next?

V. Pisigin, president of the Interregional Federation of Cooperatives (MKF), Naberezhnyye Chelny:

Ever since the USSR Law On the Cooperative was enacted, two trends have become increasingly clear in the development of the cooperatives.

The first is represented by those who use the law and the difficult economic situation in the country exclusively for purposes of their personal or group enrichment. Their task is extremely clear: to harvest a maximal "crop" within the shortest possible time (such people do not believe in the stability of the course pursued by the party). The credo of these people is to "pick the plums and scatter." The population labels them as "the shish-kabob people" or the grubbers, without giving much thought to the profound reasons for such grubbing.

The other trend is represented by those who consider the cooperative as a way of life, as an excellent opportunity for applying their capabilities and earning according to their labor. Together with Lenin we described such members of cooperatives as civilized. Naturally, supporters of both trends may coexist within a single cooperative and, frequently, both trends may coexist within a single person. However, of late there has been a very intensive and basic separation between the two. We clearly realize that the aspiration of some members of cooperatives to become rich quickly, by all possible means, frequently illegal, creates favorable conditions for discrediting the entire movement.

However, we also realize that the insufficient political, legal and social protection of the cooperative members objectively contributes to the spreading among us of the mentality of daily workers. To a large extent it is precisely the need to counter such moods that explains the current typical trend among members of cooperatives toward setting up their own organizational structures. A variety of cooperative associations and unions are appearing throughout the country. The creation of the Interregional Federation of Cooperatives, which represents cooperatives and their associations from Siberia, Central Asia, the Far East, Belorussia, the Volga area, and Murmansk, Perm and other oblasts in the RSFSR is such a phenomenon. It was started on the initiative of the cooperative members themselves and proves the profound democratic processes which are occurring today in society. From the very moment of its appearance, our federation developed less as a commercial than a sociopolitical structure. This is a reflection of the way the members of the cooperatives understand the importance of their social function and the role which they play in perestroyka.

Facts Without Comment

The Interregional Federation of Cooperatives was organized in August 1988. Members of cooperatives from 29 cities throughout the country, including several large urban and oblast associations, participated in the constituent conference held in Naberezhnyye Chelny. Presently the MKF includes some 6,000 cooperatives from 35 cities.

The social mentality of the member of a cooperative and the lessee changes to the extent to which does his status in society: from a hired worker or employee he becomes a collective owner, the real proprietor of the means of production and the labor product. Such a person is profoundly interested in making the renovation process which has been initiated in the country irreversible. He himself is the product of perestroyka, for which reason, and not only "objectively," he is its active promoter.

one of the founders of Western sociology, M. Weber, described as "democracy by plebiscite." Nonetheless, the use of more "refined" instruments for the democratic manifestation of the will of the masses also demands a more developed standard of democracy, the skill to use the self-management structure and, actually, the existence of such structures. We are as yet to create and strengthen such a widespread system of democratic institutions and see to it that the daily participation in the administration of public affairs on all of its levels become part, as Lenin said, "of our culture, way of life and habits" (op. cit., vol 45, p 390). As long as such a "cultural stratum" of democratic habits has not been developed and the practice of a thoughtful, calm and, literally **thoughtful** clarification of the accuracy of a given view and comparisons, rather than clashes among viewpoints, has not been established, the higher temperature of emotions would be inevitable and so would the persistent and relatively independent survival of some utopian mythologies.

Let us take as an example that which we could describe as the absolutizing of choice, when any official structure and institution is depicted as some kind of bureaucratic devil for the simple reason that it exists. Such "reflection" of unsanctioned awareness, such negativism and desire mandatorily to invent anything whatsoever that is "against" but in no case anything that is "for" is also quite explainable psychologically, for an imposed uniformity of views and opinions on any matter had dominated far too long. However, has the time not come to begin to come out of the shock triggered by the lack of habit to think freely and to begin to think truly freely, including getting rid of the stereotypes which took shape during the time of stagnation and which are today considered anachronistic? At that point we shall not be imagining the ghost of centralization wherever it is a question of expanding local rights; we shall not think of separatism where in fact a process of strengthening the self-awareness of the people is taking place....

A great share of responsibility is assumed also by those who should have anticipated such a turn of events and prevented it. This was mentioned by Central Committee members and by deputies attending the extraordinary session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. "...A great deal of that which is perceived today as acceptable and even necessary for promoting the process of democratization in the country raised questions at the first stage," M.S. Gorbachev noted. "Why? Because we did not take the time to explain this properly. Therefore, the old habit prevailed in the center: never mind, this too will pass. Therefore, I repeat: all of us are now attending a great school and all of us must graduate from it successfully."

The end of last year was noted also by the appearance of a new concept in the political vocabulary, a concept which could clearly not make its appearance in the past. It could not for the reason alone that the feedback mechanism linking political institutions with the "civil society" was very weak. Correspondingly, a procedure for being in touch with alternate views had not been developed. We did not have the skills to practice that which, strictly speaking, is the essence of political leadership, of political methods of work. For that reason the spontaneous outbreaks of social movements caught many people unawares and led to confusion and even contributed to the shaping of something which was aptly described as a "populist ideology." Obviously, we must gain a specific understanding, in each specific case, of what it is that it contains more: an absence of the basic positions or inability to support them or, perhaps, also a disappointment in something which, only yesterday, was accepted as a principle. The solution to this problem is found precisely in the area of political standards and in gaining experience in working with people and developing the skills of real political work. This will come with time.

What is more dangerous, in my view, is something else: the aspiration to please, to swim with the current, essentially to act on the basis of the principle of "anything you want," sensing the "hot spots" of an awakened social awareness and heating up passions precisely in those areas in the hope that something will come out of it.... For example, fear has been expressed on the subject of the weakening of discipline and there is a prepared "personal opinion:" are we not acting too hastily by converting some processes to a democratic track which has as yet not been laid.... If it is a question of criticizing, in the course of a debate, erroneous views or actions, the statement follows according to which we have still not grown up to the level of true democracy and, in general, that the concept of perestroyka allowed a tactical error.... One could listen to such statements and ask oneself: Could it be that personal ambitions could so greatly supersede the interests of the cause that, in this case, all means to an end are good?

This demagogic fear would remain purely demagogic had there not been an essentially new situation, a situation which is developing today. Ahead of us are elections which, this time, will be unlike any previous elections. As was said at the November Central Committee Plenum, a true competitiveness among candidates is taking place in the country's political life. The electoral campaign as well should take place within the framework of socialist morality, based on the principles of respect for the honor and dignity not only of each candidate for deputy but of the entire electorate. It must become a real school in mastering the standards of democracy. The party organizations will have to abandon the hope of using the "allocations" mechanism and will have to master to their fullest extent the methods of electoral struggle and the art of persuasion. They will have clearly and efficiently to express their principle-minded position without yielding to the inertia of the confrontational approach but be concerned above all with consolidating the forces of perestroyka.

Today millions of people are becoming extensively involved in the active political process. The country's

Inzhener, which is our all-round cooperative, is engaged in construction, the production of construction materials, and commercial-purchasing and procurement activities. It also provides engineering services. In 6 months' worth of work we produced commodities and provided services worth 5 million rubles. Our collective includes three brick manufacturing plants. One of them alone used to suffer annual loses of 75,000 rubles and owed 120,000. In a few months of work on a cooperative basis, this enterprise stopped working at a loss and was able to repay almost all its debts. Wages, furthermore, have increased by 50 percent and the cooperative acquired the possibility of financing the building of homes for the workers. All of our plants are fulfilling state orders and the cooperative is left to handle only its above-plan output.

The commercial center of the MKF was already mentioned here. Such a subunit has been established within our cooperative. We are initiating wholesale trade and creating, to this effect, our own network of suppliers. It would be difficult to overestimate the aid and support which are being given to us in this project by the republic's Council of Ministers. Credit is tight but we were loaned 600,000 rubles based on the promising nature of our ideas.

The very first step indicated that we would be unable to ensure efficient material and technical procurements without urban associations of cooperative members. We find it difficult to organize supplies to individual small cooperatives whose needs for materials are far lesser than the required transportation volume. An urban association, which would formulate such requests, could take such transportation standards into consideration.

B. Kurtsev, chairman of the Granat Cooperative, Kazan:

We have set up an engineering-technical cooperative. Its main task is to assist in the accelerated practical utilization of available scientific and technical developments and promote the development of new scientific ideas and their practical utilization in the national economy. We identify promising developments, establish contacts with their authors and find customers interested in such novelties.

With such an organization of the work the customer can obtain results several hundred percent faster and pay for that service far less than if he were to deal with a scientific research institute or a VUZ. Such a cost reduction for scientific and technical output is due to the fact that we drastically reduce the working time and thus lower wage costs, while substantially increasing the wages of the performers. Furthermore, unlike state organizations, we do not waste money on maintaining inflated administrative staffs.

Many examples of the efficient work of application cooperatives could be cited. Let me mention one: In 1988, in accordance with existing rates, 700,000 rubles were allocated for the drafting of technical documentation and reconstruction of treatment systems at the Kazan Petroleum Base. Having developed a new and more efficient treatment technology, we took on the entire project, including the manufacturing, installation and tuning of the equipment at a cost of 60,000 rubles. Our cooperative was created at the start of 1988. However, we already have several extensive projects in different stages of implementation in organizing the production of the latest medical equipment and efficient construction materials.

In the very first months we realized that we had no legal standards which would regulate many aspects of the activities of the cooperatives and their relations with the state and with different departments, enterprises and organizations. Today the need to improve legislation is obvious and, as we know, this is being done.

However, there is no glasnost in this area and we are short of democracy. As a result, we have to be satisfied merely with rumors and with fragmentary and frequently inaccurate information. We seriously fear that the documents which are being drafted will include resolutions consistent with the short-term interests of central economic departments rather than long-term tasks related to the development of the cooperative sector as an intrinsic part of the socialist economy.

Many legal documents issued of late by ministries and departments confirm this fact. For example, on the one hand, the letter of the USSR State Committee for Prices, dated 31 August 1988, contains a number of stipulations which are officially aimed at restricting price increases for goods produced by the cooperatives; on the other, it introduces coefficients which substantially increase the prices of material and technical resources which we purchase from the state. Naturally, this is one way of increasing budget revenues. But could it be that our price-setting workers do not realize that this would significantly increase the production costs of the cooperative and, therefore, would raise the prices of their commodities and services. The next step to be taken by this department would be easy to predict: in answer to the indignation shown by the population at increased costs, some "ceilings" will be set. The result of such steps would be the economic strangling of the members of cooperatives.

G. Bashtanyuk, chairman of the Tatar Oblast Trade Union Council:

I believe that the cooperative movement has a great future providing, naturally, that it is not suppressed as of now. In visiting labor collectives, I frequently come across a negative attitude toward cooperative members. The people are indignant at high production costs although they also frequently say that "better this than nothing at all."

A. Kalachev, head of the scientific problems laboratory of the Political Club imeni N.I. Bukharin, Naberezhnyye Chelny:

It is indeed true that the passions raging around the prices of goods produced by the cooperatives and the income of their members have reached a boiling point. Let us try to analyze the present situation calmly and objectively. We are indignant at the prices and, in the view of many people, such prices are excessively high. However, the price has been set objectively. Under conditions governed by commodity-monetary relations, to a great extent prices are based on the correlation between supply and demand and the entire economy of the cooperative sector is precisely structured in accordance with the laws of commodity output. We have become so accustomed to bureaucratic price-setting that the moment the market shows reflects the objective price of a commodity shouts are instantly heard: "Help! The cooperative members are robbing us!" However, the members of the cooperatives cannot be responsible for the fact that the amount of money in circulation has increased at a much higher rate than the production of consumer goods and services. It is not their fault that today the balancing price, which coordinates supply with demand, is much higher than state prices.

In order for the situation on the marketplace to change, the production of consumer goods, including in the cooperative sector, must be sharply increased. In order to achieve this, normal economic conditions for the development of the cooperative must be created. It is only with an abundance of commodities in the marketplace that a competition will appear among producers, in which the main weapon will be a price reduction.

B. Kurtsev. The civilized member of a cooperative must consider not only its current benefit but also the future. Unless we coordinate the economic interests of the cooperative sector with those of the state enterprises and society at large, the development of the cooperatives will be painful and sluggish. For example, no healthy economic relations among scientific and technical cooperatives and VUZs and scientific research institutes are possible without compensating for their outlays for the development of a scientific potential which the cooperative members use in their work. We are among the first to begin to pay institutes for the use not only of equipment but also of previously developed scientific and technical goods. This provides the VUZs with an additional opportunity for strengthening their material and technical base and increases their interest in cooperating with us.

As a whole, however, the organization of business relations between cooperatives and economic departments and agencies and state enterprises is taking place, for the time being, sluggishly and with contradictions.

Members of Cooperatives and Departments

I. Yanovskiy, chairman, Krasnodar Intercooperative Center:

The simple peasant realizes that a horse must be tamed before riding it. The study of the laws promulgated after the adoption of the Law On the Cooperative, makes it clear that the departments have paralyzed virtually everything. As a result, the law cannot work most efficiently, suppressed as it is by legal regulations.

L. Onushko. The moment the cooperative gathers speed it develops the need for a wholesale market, resources and financing. Our ill-wishers may think that we have huge funds. Nonetheless, we do already have some money. Initial accumulations are developing. We have currently created an interregional bank. Within 6 months we could open our branches in 15 to 20 cities throughout the country. Unfortunately, however, the Ministry of Finance and the Gosbank immediately try to bring the cooperative bank down on their knees. From the very first day a rate of 35 percent tax on profits was set for us. In almost 150 years of activities, the Gosbank has had the time to equip itself with everything it needs, including, currently, computers; we are forced to establish business relations with it on an equal basis, without having a single ruble, for this money must as yet be earned.

O. Morozov. Was this figure chosen arbitrarily?

L. Onushko. No, it was borrowed from international practices. The Bank of England pays that same percentage to the treasury. However, that bank has been in operation for several centuries! We requested that we be given perhaps 5 to 8 years of easy terms in order to be able to stand on our two feet. No, we were told: It is 35 percent or we shall not register you. We were forced to yield.

Should we issue stock? Absolutely not, for in that case tomorrow we shall be asked to set up a stock exchange! However, that same financier who fears these words has never owned a single share. Nonetheless, he is confident that nothing good could be expected of such stock.

I. Yanovskiy. If we continue to fear the transfusion of monetary resources, all that would be left as members of the cooperative would be the "shishkabob men" and nothing serious would be achieved.

R. Davletshin, deputy chairman, Avtozavodskiy Rayon Executive Committee, Naberezhnyye Chelny:

The 31 August USSR State Committee for Prices letter was already mentioned here. It allows the marketing of output on the basis of prices based on the cost of raw materials and a mark-up stipulated for state public

catering enterprises. According to that letter, as of tomorrow we should start closing down cooperatives engaged in trade, purchasing and public catering.

V. Pestov. Among others, our cooperative is engaged in trade and purchasing activities. We buy vegetables and fruits in the south and in exchange, we supply construction materials. For example, we ship from Tashkent grapes which we sell at 2.5 rubles. Grapes of somewhat worse quality sell on the market at 4-5 rubles and in the state trade system, 1.7 rubles, but already old and without giving the customer any choice. People waited in line to buy our grapes and everyone was pleased. Such is my argument in favor of the cooperative and such is the truth as I see it. Now, after the letter of the State Committee for Prices, all I am able to do is no more than add a miserable mark-up on the purchase price.

It is thus that once again efforts are being made to lead us into the outlay system. Instead of saving we would have to misrepresent our cost, which is what state enterprises do.

R. Davletshin. And that is occurring despite our scarcity of vegetables and fruits! At the time that the members of cooperatives were selling them in Naberezhnyye Chelny, the people endlessly telephoned the Executive Committee to express their gratitude although, strictly speaking, we did not deserve such credit. Now the State Committee for Prices has blocked this necessary project.

V. Pestov. Last summer, the Stavropol area lacked washing detergent. We found the possibility of supplying this item to the kray and in exchange we were offered meat at 1 ruble per kilogram. However, we have no right to sell the detergent with a mark-up, for the state price is marked on the packages. We could not even compensate for transportation costs. And it also appeared that the meat we had acquired we had no right to sell even at 2 rubles.

L. Onushko. Unless we succeed in having the letter of the State Committee for Prices invalidated through legal mechanisms, it is clear that there will be no cooperative public catering. The majority of our coffee shops are in no better conditions. Therefore, their price mark-up will be low and there will be no particular profit. However, a state coffee shop buys meat at 2 rubles whereas on the marketplace I have to pay 5. In order to stand on our two feet, we must save more and more. Yet because of the ceiling set by the State Committee for Prices, we shall have just enough money to pay the wages of the cooperative members.

Yu. Morozov, member of the Montazhnik Cooperative, Naberezhnyye Chelny:

All of this seems to be done in the interest of the consumer who, it is alleged, is robbed by the cooperatives. But let us consider our own cooperative. We work on the basis of state prices. For some reason, however, by order of the USSR State Committee for Prices, when we buy something from the KamAZ, we are asked to pay more than 50,000 rubles and not 14,000 as would pay a state enterprise. The same situation prevails in terms of spare parts and diesel fuel, although we are doing the same type of work and are setting no contractual prices whatsoever. Is there any economic expediency in this? Furthermore, are such decisions legal?

V. Pestov. Obviously, we cannot afford to pay such prices. We developed the idea of leasing 10 motor vehicles from the KamAZ Association and, in exchange, supplying its workers with inexpensive vegetables and fruits. Although this was mutually profitable, we were told that we cannot! Why not? I do not understand. Through our own efforts we have begun to lower market prices. This is an important function of the cooperative. Yet obstructions are being put in our way.

V. Gorbanovskiy, chairman, Kamazovets Cooperative Association, Naberezhnyye Chelny:

KamAZ could demand 200,000 rubles and perhaps someone would buy. However, at that point tomatoes will sell not at 20 kopeks but at 1 ruble or higher. Probably the prices which are being set for means of production may be advantageous to the budget but they are procured at the expense of the customer. In his eyes, however, the fault for such a speculative system organized by the State Committee for Prices is entirely that of the members of cooperatives.

L. Onushko. The fate of our fixed capital is a subject of great concern. Any efficient economic system stimulates the productive utilization of capital assets and provides benefits from investments in such assets. Some hotheads have asked, if a cooperative is closed down, to levy as a tax on business and sales 55 percent of the value of such assets. But let us consider what this would bring about. Currently we are deliberately limiting our earnings in order to accumulate funds with which to increase our output. However, we are urged to pay out as wages as much as possible. This is the simplest option which the Ministry of Finance could make, but is fatal in terms of the development of our economic sector.

I. Yanovskiy. If such taxes are being levied in the marketing of means of production I will never invest my money in production development! No single civilized member of a cooperative familiar with simple arithmetic would do that.

S. Yershov. So far, we have discussed the sabotage on the part of departments. However, we should also discuss relations with industrial enterprises. We have all the necessary opportunities and the desire to participate in major programs and to accept some state orders for light industry goods, consumer goods and foodstuffs. The creation of venture (risk) enterprises and big companies which would undertake the practical application of new developments is a separate topic. Such a flexible link and

testing ground between science and large industrial production facilities exists throughout the world. Such activities are financed by special innovation banks. I do not know what the reaction of the Gosbank would be to this idea, but we are ready to undertake venture production.

If we acknowledge the fact that the cooperative is part of the national economy, it should participate in the distribution of a certain share of resources and raw materials. On the other hand, the state enterprises are increasingly gravitating toward different forms of cost accounting activities, including the establishment of cooperative structures based on leasing. This can be seen in the example of the KamAZ. In its present aspect, cost accounting is tying both the hands and the feet of the enterprise. A search for other forms is under way. Members of cooperatives are assuming the production of many types of consumer goods. Preparations are being made to transfer some basic production units to cooperatives. This applies, for instance, to the shop for hydraulic boosters of the Automated-Machining Production Facility. However, a number of problems exist in this area. Therefore, it is hardly possible to ensure the normal activities of an isolated leased island within a state enterprise. Simply neither management nor our neighbors, I am afraid, would avoid the temptation of solving their own problems at its expense. Therefore, for the time being, it is too soon to speak of converting the entire KamAZ to a leasing system.

V. Gorbanovskiy. Why is it that not all of the cooperatives set up within the KamAZ are working? Let me cite the following example: every day the enterprise discards 15 to 20 tons of motor oil. One of our cooperatives developed a technology for its recycling. However, KamAZ rejected its suggestion. Could it be that even under the conditions of cost accounting there are reasons which would justify deliveries of large quantities of funded raw materials and maintain a cumbersome staff of procurement workers?

This, however, is an isolated example. As a whole, relations with the enterprise's management are developing well. For 3 years KamAZ was unable to install a line for regenerated enameled motor vehicle paint made of by-products. The members of the cooperative were able to complete it in 3 months. The paint is now being produced and, as we know, it is a very scarce item. We are now engaged in recycling materials not only from local but also from other motor vehicle plants. We are planning in the future to become shareholders in a joint enterprise and collect used enamel from all of Europe. People are even ready to pay us for taking it away for, as a rule, they burn it, which is triggering the objections of ecologists.

We are also using the waste of materials used in upholstering and insulating the KamAZ cabins. We use such materials to make insoles, slippers, and so on. Naturally, these are not the most important types of consumer goods but, compared to the past, they are being manufactured out of nothing....

Facts Without Comment

On 1 December 1988 there were 73 cooperatives registered at the KamAZ. Many of them are already included in the implementation of the association's production program and two shops have entirely converted to cooperatives. It is believed at the enterprise that in the immediate future the number of plant cooperatives may double and the number of members of such cooperatives may reach 10,000 people. For purposes of comparison, let us say that the association in Naberezhnyye Chelny has 135,500 workers and employees.

V. Latynin, chairman, Progress Consolidated Cooperative, Perm:

Such a symbiosis of cooperatives with state enterprises shows a great deal of promise. But here is what concerns us: some enterprise managers fear that their cadres would be drawn away. Well, in a sense, this is understandable. But then when they hinder our initiatives for "ideological" reasons, referring to "enrichment," and "stratification into poor and rich," how can we convince them otherwise? As a result, after long debates, such managers would agree to let us work in their enterprise but would suggest the following: take, for experimental purposes, a small section and try it out. We already work for ourselves under similar primitive conditions and yet we would like to organize a modern large-scale production facility. Unless we seriously combine efforts, the cooperative would remain on the level of an average workshop without a future.

M. Sirazin, chief of the experimental SPMK, Vysokogorskiy Rayon, Tatar ASSR:

Whatever we may say, the prospect for cooperation between the state and the cooperative sectors are tempting. The activities of our SPMK, operating on a cost accounting basis, confirms this fact: we have sponsored two cooperatives: the Kurkachi Inn and the Kazanka Trade and Purchasing Cooperative. However, there comes a point at which the present limitations of the state enterprise are beginning to fetter us. I am asked the following: Why are you not in a hurry to convert totally on a cooperative basis? The reason is that today our SPMK is under the jurisdiction of the RSFSR Agroprom, the Tatar Agroprom, its Tatagropromstroy Association, the Tatagrostroyindustriya Association, and so on, going downwards. I am subordinate to all of them. Naturally, they are unwilling to give up their managerial functions. A long time ago the view was expressed that the Gosagroprom is unnecessary, for the only thing this system is doing is creating maximal difficulties which must then be "successfully surmounted."

Our SPMK is engaged in the production of a variety of dyes, foam rubber and polymer materials, and finishing and thermal insulation work at rural projects in the republic. We have concluded direct contracts with suppliers. Therefore, we do not have to turn either to

Moscow or Kazan for material and technical supplies. However, the Gosagroprom is handling production and transportation funds. If the departments were to surrender these functions as well we would not need them at all.

In 1 year our collective showed a profit of some 800,000 rubles. Wholesale trade in chemical raw materials already exists although, it is true, at crazy prices. By turning the SPMK into a cooperative company higher coefficients will be immediately issued to us. Therefore, in order not to lose our profits we would have to increase our prices. Yet our goods are being purchased by virtually all Tatar kolkhozes. If construction and installation work becomes more extensive for such kolkhozes, the cost of meat will increase. Who needs all this?

If only all such coefficients for raw materials purchased by cooperatives were to be lifted.... in two or three years cooperatives with high labor productivity would stand on their own two feet and would show good profits even at state prices. Generally speaking, we should see to it that cooperative principles are applied also in the work of giants, such as the KamAZ, as well as to our small enterprise. That is why our entire SPMK is converting to a leasing contracting system, which it considers an intermediary stage leading to a cooperative system.

Help Instead of Dictate

Yu. Petrushin, chairman, executive committee, Naberezhnyye Chelny City Soviet of People's Deputies:

In our city relations between the soviet authorities and the members of cooperatives are as warm as possible. Without this, in all likelihood there would be neither a federation nor interregional conferences or a cooperative fair in Naberezhnyye Chelny. Why do we support the cooperatives? This is based on a vital need. In our city the situation with food and consumer goods and, in general, with social problems is very difficult. It was in looking for a solution that we turned to the cooperative.

In several months' time we realized that this was not such a simple matter as it seemed to some initially: all that was necessary was to register a cooperative and the next day returns would be tangible. We now know that a cooperative must be nursed and helped before it can stand on its own two feet for about a year, a year-and-a-half. A number of unsolved problems remain. Let us consider, for example, the cadre problem. We have initiative-minded people but they have a great deal to learn. We are short of economists, and what can we do without them? The legal service is poorly developed yet this greatly determines our future progress. We deem it our obligation to help them in this matter, the more so since we see in the cooperative a good training facility for future economic managers.

Currently we are giving serious thought to ways of reforming the entire economic service of the soviets. In our ispolkom we have already combined within a single administration the planning, financial and other economic departments. According to our plan, this service should operate in close touch with the cooperative members, particularly in sectors whose structure truly prevents them from doing high quality work, such as in public catering or services.

V. Bazhutin, chairman of the Perm Council of the Association of Cooperatives:

In Perm we were actively supported by the gorispolkom yet we do not always succeed in organizing such cooperation with the rayon executive committees. They know how to conduct a proper session, to make decisions and pass resolutions. As a whole, however, they lack an overall grasp of the problem: they can look at individual cooperatives rather than the dynamics which also determine the course of perestroyka. To many ispolkom officials the cooperative is no more than an appendix to the economy, not a mandatory one at that, which could be closed down as quickly as it could be established.

I. Yanovskiy. In our Krasnodar Kray there are more than 4,000 cooperatives. Their relations with the local authorities develop in different ways. For example, efforts are being made to instruct commercial-purchasing cooperatives in some rayons what to procure and what to ship, the variety of goods and the proportions of such items. We tell them that the law forbids any interference in the economic activities of the cooperative. Their answer is that they must feed the rayon. Begging your pardon, one should not think of one's interests alone but consider the interests of the country as a whole. The result is that in the Kuban fruits and vegetables will rot and will be sold at discount prices while Tatariya would be fed hungry rations. What if here, in Naberezhnyye Chelny, someone would say that the KamAZ will supply no one and Izhevsk will not ship its motorcycles to anyone?

When shall we get rid of such parochialism? Nothing would come out of it if everyone would remain locked within his own rayon. What if the Kuban, the Ukraine or Moldavia would not ship out their surplus agricultural commodities, where would the rest of the country find such products?

A. Sarvartdinov, chief of the planning and economic administration, Naberezhnyye Chelny City Executive Committee:

The situation is such that some cities produce essentially means of production while others are engaged in the manufacturing of consumer goods. Our city belongs to the former. For that reason, from the very start we decided that we shall extensively help the members of cooperatives. Thus, we intend to build a big market for them, which will include a hotel and workshops. This will be leased to our city association and to other cooperatives which we would like to come to us. We have decided to give the cooperatives an entire street in the

old city. It will include essentially enterprises engaged in public catering and a cultural center. We are investing in this project some 200,000 rubles.

In 1987 the cooperatives in the city produced goods in excess of 600,000 rubles; in the first 9 months of 1988 alone, this output was ten times higher. We hope that in the immediate future they will account for 5 percent of trade in Naberezhnyye Chelny.

In the past the gorispolkom had set up a bureau in charge of cooperative affairs. Currently the functions of this authority are performed by the urban association. Clearly, we must maintain permanent business relations, but what form should they take? Unquestionably, the authorities should not exert pressure on the cooperatives. Nonetheless, they must channel their activities in the necessary direction. For example, one of the main tasks of the soviet is to clothe and feed the population and to establish a normal sociopsychological climate in the city. In formulating plans, we know for approximately 1 year in advance the type of commodities we shall be short of. It would be useful to provide the cooperative farmers with such information. We would not impose but precisely suggest things to them. For example, we would say that the city will be needing short-sleeve shirts....

V. Pestov. By not imposing demands you would have a lower percentage of taxes on the income of a cooperative producing such shirts. This could be not 3 percent, let us say, but 2.8. This would yield the necessary results.

S. Yershov. We must strive to achieve a situation in which the entire policy of the local authorities would be exercised through economic instruments which would assist the development of this movement in the interest of the local population. Efforts to set up various coordination councils under the executive committees which would manage, yes, manage, the cooperatives, would not contribute to the project.

L. Onushko. So-called self-supporting departments are being set up now in dozens of cities. As they register the cooperatives, the executive committees stipulate that the cooperatives should set aside 1 percent of their income and use this money to create departments which would be suppressing those same cooperatives. A complaint to the prosecutor would mandate him to annul such a decision. But who is willing to quarrel with his rayon executive committee?

I. Yanovskiy. Something worse is being done as well: special cooperatives are being set up under the executive committees in charge of developing bylaws and drafting registration documents. What happens then? On the eve the ispolkom official would draft such papers and the following day the documents would be ratified by the rayon executive committee commission. This is nothing but legitimized bribery.

S. Yershov. If someone were to tell a cooperative farmer, withhold for me 200 rubles and I will protect you, this would be known as a racket. In this case, we are dealing with a bureaucratic racket.

I. Yanovskiy. One of the tasks of the cooperative associations is to draft documents and provide legal assistance. Yet people would sign a contract with us and pay their money, after which they are being told by the executive committee that they will not be approved unless they deal with the cooperative which has been set up by the executive committee....

R. Davletshin. As deputy chairman of the rayon executive committee, I was assigned to deal with the cooperatives. I have one full-time economist. Let the cooperative members confirm that we have assumed a loyal position toward them and helped them as best we could. However, the volume of work is tremendous and just the two of us cannot cope with it. We have repeatedly appealed to the Tatar Council of Ministers but we were not allowed to open additional positions. Therefore, we were forced to organize a self-supporting department in charge of cooperative affairs. For the time being no one has suggested to us another solution.

V. Latynin. In the past we signed a contract with the rayon executive committee and agreed on all points. The cooperative members are willing to pay for the work of the instructor who, initially, could put them in touch with enterprises, aware of the needs and possibilities of the rayon.

A. Kolchin, chairman, Zelenodolsk Council of Cooperatives:

You and I may be talking about the bureaucratic racket but we must not forget that there also are relations to be maintained with the superior organizations and enterprises, for the cooperative, as a rule, is under someone's jurisdiction. So, a cooperative member would come to me and complain that one of the managers of that enterprise is asking of him to contribute 5 percent of his profits. Why? It turns out that in order to start working with the bank the permission of the superior is needed, which would stipulate that "I, thus and such, certify to the signature of the chairman of the cooperative." The answer of the superior is the following: pay this percentage and I shall sign.

V. Latynin. Let me cite the following example: the members of a cooperative begin to make decorative tiles using by-products of a plant in Perm. The people worked, studied the market and mastered the technology. However, the plant management took a look, realized the obvious profit from such a project and told them: we do not need your services, we shall be producing the tiles ourselves.

V. Umnov, chairman of the Sintez Cooperative, Naberezhnyye Chelny:

Frequently departmental interests are concealed behind the authority of the local powers. Until July our cooperative, which specializes in photographic services, worked successfully. There were plenty of orders. But then, by rule passed by the city executive committee, we were prohibited from dealing with children's preschool institutions, schools, ZAGS departments, recreation centers, etc. The state photographic factory assigned its own photographers to them. Now, for example, in kindergartens, where we earned a good reputation, they show us that paper and say: "Naturally, we respect you but..."

The result is that in the third quarter of the year our volume of work has declined by two-thirds. Yet, the purpose of setting up cooperatives was to enhance the quality of services. Who needs this kind of monopoly? Let the one who works better, faster and less expensively win. Incidentally, unlike the photographic factory, we do not have premises or centralized material supplies. I spent the entire summer traveling around different cities and purchased retail everything we needed. Now, we have no use for such photographic materials.

T. Abdullin, deputy chairman of the Naberezhnyye Chelny City Soviet Executive Committee:

In determining the nature of the activities of a cooperative on the territory under our jurisdiction, we must take into consideration the interests of the population as well. The photographic factory meets the orders of the population, at least we have not received any complaints. Above all, the factory is contributing a substantial amount of income to the local budget, for the real costs of the photographic department are much lower than the rates charged by the factory. This is one type of activity which makes it possible to compensate for the work of losing enterprises. We buy the meat at lower prices but at the expense of what? In the final account, it is at the expense of such enterprises.

In any case, the cost of the photographic services provided by the cooperatives is not higher. The moment they start dealing with such activities while the state sector has not the right to apply flexible prices, it is the local budget that suffers; this means that we are short of funds for social programs, public education and health care. On the basis of such considerations, the ispolkom had the right to impose said restrictions.

I. Yanovskiy. However, your resolutions must be consistent with the laws! Before the Law on the Cooperative was enacted, executive committees had the right to solve problems related to the expediency of setting up one type of cooperative or another. Now you no longer have this right, for the law clearly stipulates that the state agencies have no right to interfere in the economic activities of cooperatives.

T. Abdullin. Indeed, perhaps on the basis of this law the actions of the ispolkom may seem illegal. But let me say polemically that if we were now to sell a Zhiguli car at a price much higher than its production cost and the difference would be used to meet the general needs of the state, including defense, why not look from the same viewpoint at the work of the photographic factory? From the viewpoint of the 100 percent observance of the law a cooperative has the right to work in this area. From the viewpoint of my assessment of the equity of this right, as stipulated by the law, I personally would vote against such a cooperative.

Grubber Or Civilized Member of a Cooperative?

L. Onushko. I have a question for the representative of the city authority. Recently the stores of the consumer cooperative were forbidden to sell meat to our cooperative members. In your view, what is the meaning of this ban?

T. Abdullin. There is a standard for releasing meat to a single person. Meat is sold to all within the limits of the established rate.

L. Onushko. Does this mean that a cooperative, which feeds 300 people daily, should be given only one-half kilogram of meat? This is no longer state trade, for we are purchasing at cooperative prices. Why is it that a cooperative subdivision cannot purchase the produce of another one of its subdivisions?

T. Abdullin. The purpose of the prohibition is that currently there is not enough meat for sales to the population. The stores of the consumer union market not only the meat they have purchased but also meat coming from state stocks. Naturally, they have a mark-up, for this is a consumer cooperative. I agree that this is a faulty practice: the state cans the meat which is then sold to the consumer cooperatives with a mark-up, although the price marked on the can is the state price.... This does happen. But let us ask the people: Is it necessary for the members of cooperatives to purchase today meat and raw materials and make out of them products if virtually all housewives cook the same products at home?

S. Morgacheva, senior engineer, Kamgesenergostroy, Naberezhnyye Chelny:

As a mother and housewife I cannot afford to eat at the cooperative coffee shop for 3-3.5 rubles. For the same money I could cook at home both more and tastier meals. If the sale of meat would be free on the market, as is the case in the big cities, I could purchase it even at 5 rubles. No such thing exists in our city. I am afraid that now the entire meat will fall into the hands of the members of the cooperatives. Yet I do not wish to use their services.

L. Onushko. This is a clear distortion of the situation! Our urban cooperatives use 8 tons of meat monthly. On a per capita basis this means 16 grams, i.e., two pelmeni. Furthermore, how can we ignore the thousands of citizens who currently eat in the cooperative coffee shops!

S. Morgacheva. Go among the working people and listen to what they are saying about you. I am expressing the opinion of the working people. Are the cooperative photographers who were discussed here investing as much work as, shall we say, assembly workers? Yet they earn much more!

V. Umnov. I understand what you are saying about the meat. In this case you are defending your interests. It is true that one could keep arguing and proving that there also are other population strata such as, for example, unmarried people who do not cook at home and would like to eat well in the cooperative coffee shop. The situation with photography is the opposite: the cooperative works both less expensively and better.

S. Morgacheva. However, the photographers are indeed earning superprofits. Labor outlays in photography are much lower than the prices charged.

I. Yanovskiy. Therefore, the members of the cooperative are lowering the prices. It is the photographic factory that is charging superprofits while the "bad cooperative members" make use of it and sell their goods for less. Can you explain your views in greater detail?

S. Morgacheva. The members of the cooperative dealing with photography and sound recording show a good profit without investing any particular amount of work. Yes, their prices are low and naturally, as a customer, I agree with this. It is good to pay less for photography. However, their profits are for their own benefit, specifically for their own benefit. Who, for example, would organize a cooperative for the manufacturing of bricks? This would require more labor and it would be much more difficult to earn the money.

S. Yershov. Have you taken into consideration labor outlays? Naturally, it is insulting to work the entire day by a machine tool and earn 120 rubles monthly, while a member of a cooperative can earn 250-300 or even 500-800 rubles per month. However, we should be concerned not with the pocket of the cooperative member but with what your enterprise should do so that the worker could earn just as much. Earnings at the brick plants of the Inzhener Cooperative have increased although their output is sold at state prices. It is only as a result of highly efficient work that losing enterprises could become profitable. Thus, clearly, they not simply put their profits in their pocket, as you say, but earned it.

At the KamAZ Hostel I talked with the women. They crowded me: the cooperative is robbing us, they said. I took my time and asked each one of them separately what they had bought from the cooperative members? It turned out, nothing. But if someone has not purchased anything from the cooperative how could the cooperative hurt them?

S. Morgacheva. I too purchase nothing from cooperatives!

I. Yanovskiy. The people are saying that the members of cooperatives are earning bucketfuls of money. But when one would answer, take a shovel and stand in line and shovel the money, they stop. Kuban is a very rich area and the average earnings of a member of a cooperative here is 250 rubles. But even that is not the problem. If you think that the cooperative photographers are earning a great deal you do not have to use their services. Follow your own convictions and pay the photographic factory more and get a worse photograph. Simple enough!

L. Onushko. There is a factor such as consumer preference. Why would we buy carrots from one specific old woman and not from another? If the member of a cooperative is doing better work the people will go to him. So the photographic factory has felt insecure. It employs professionals who lost in their competition with independent photographers!

L. Landa, engineer, KamAZ Foreign Trade Company:

What kind of preference could there be a question of if the cooperatives have monopolized photography and sound recording! In our homes tape recorders are idling: there are no cassettes. There is no photographic paper or film. For that reason such cooperatives could be restrained, perhaps.

S. Yershov. Would you call, just as confidently, for closing down, shall we say, a shoe factory in Kazan, which has monopolized trade and is not manufacturing good shoes?

L. Landa. Yes, I would for, using that same type of raw material, the Baltic area cooperatives, for example, are making better shoes. I would not hesitate to pay more for them.

I. Yanovskiy. You see, you agree with this. Someone else would be willing to pay the cooperative for quality and for a good selection of recordings or else for a tasty meal.

O. Morozov. When we discussed the photographic factory, and state monopoly in this matter, you were against. As far as the monopoly of the cooperative was concerned, you were immediately in favor. Now, however, the customer is precisely opposed to monopoly and in favor of free choice.

I. Yanovskiy. I favor the right of the customer to choose.

L. Landa. In the case of sound recordings, there are no cassettes in the state stores and, therefore, there is no selection.

R. Davletshin. Actually, the cooperatives are stripping store shelves bare. Yes, this is not forbidden by law but the stores should serve first not the cooperatives but the population.

M. Sirazin. One does not conflict with the other. Why is it that the labor collective council of our SPMK decided to sponsor the Kurkachi Cooperative Inn? Because it proceeded from the realities of our daily life. In the past as well the settlement had a public catering center but neither the quality of the meals nor the standard of services to the workers were satisfactory. Now, after we built an inn, the cafeteria has to compete with us. So far we are ahead in this competition, although our prices are higher than those of state restaurants.

Facts Without Comment

Kurkachi Inn menu:

Russian Salad—14 kopeks

Fresh Vegetable Salad—12 kopeks

Home-Made Pelmeni With Meat Base—82 kopeks

Borshch With Meat—37 kopeks

Tatar-Style Meat With French Fries—1.30 rubles

Grilled Meat With Buckwheat Porridge—1.35 rubles

Pigeon With Trimmings—1.10 rubles

Tea—6 kopeks

Coffee—32 kopeks

Napoleon Pastry—38 kopeks

An average lunch at the inn costs 2.5 rubles. However, because of enterprise subsidies, the SPMK personnel pay no more than slightly over 1 ruble.

A. Logutov, first secretary Naberezhnyye Chelny City CPSU Committee:

Unfortunately, public catering here is in such a state that in this area the cooperatives enjoy a clear advantage. Most frequently there is no competition.

L. Onushko. You could solve this problem by opening, next to the "shishkabober" your own facility where you could sell for less. No articles would have to be written on the topic. Yet the state-owned public catering enterprises do not do this.

A. Logutov. The wholesale market is bare. What kind of competition could there be a question of if even public catering enterprises are issued goods from general stocks?

Yu. Petrushin. My main headache is where to find and bring to the city baked goods and sweets. And on top of that I have to compete with the "shishkabobers!"

V. Pisigin. Recently we met with a big delegation of Italian members of cooperatives. A number of interesting questions were asked on both sides. For example, we asked the Italians what is their situation with supplies. They asked a number of questions of the interpreter and then waived their arms. There were problems with marketing but as far as supplies were concerned... to us, however, this is one of the most pressing problems.

L. Onushko. The situation with supplies is indeed difficult even in Naberezhnyye Chelny, where the authorities willingly help us. But then who, nonetheless, forbids the sales of meat to cooperative members? We were unable to find out. I understand the considerations which motivated this decision. However, a certain option should have been considered for supplying the cooperative coffee shops rather than making them stop their work with a single stroke of the pen.

We have already started to look for other ways. We asked the Tatarstan Kolkhoz to sell us meat from its above-plan output. It costs them 6 rubles to produce and they sell it for 8. We cannot work with such prices. We then turned to the rural population and were threatened by the militia. We were told that this area is for the consumer cooperative, buy from it in the city. This closed the circle.

A. Logutov. Did you try to produce it yourself? There are citizens who go to the countryside and sign contracts with the farm, and take calves or hogs for fattening and obtain excellent weight increases, much higher than the indicators of kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

K. Galimov, party committee secretary, Kamgesenergostroy:

Here is a specific example. It took us 6 months of effort before our cooperative members were allowed to use an abandoned shed. We finally succeeded and now 5 people have already raised 500 hogs; they will have 1,000 in 1 year. In our auxiliary farm, however, which employs 120 people, the annual output is 5,000. However, the cooperative members cannot find channels through which to sell their meat, for the public catering enterprise is offering to pay the state price and the cooperative trade enterprise refused.

L. Onushko. So let them come to us. We shall build them a store in the center of the city.

A. Logutov. You see, it is possible for the cooperatives not to strip the shelves bare!

L. Onushko. There is a concept such as division of labor. We need sugar but we shall not, for this purpose, undertake to grow sugar beets. We need flour but we shall not undertake to sow wheat. We bake and feed and that is precisely our job. We are willing to pay more for raw materials.

V. Pestov. Generally speaking, the result is that one should grow the flax, weave it into a fabric, sew and sell the clothing and, when the clothing becomes old, take it back and market it. I, however, am an engineer and my task is to develop new technology or equipment. I would like to specialize precisely in such activities. Why should I be asked to install equipment, run it and, on top of everything else, later dump it?

L. Onushko. In other words, you are asking for a normal division of labor and you are not allowed to do so. "And so, you went to a state store to purchase fabric and make yourself a jacket? Grow your own flax and then sew!" For some reason, the natural division of labor between state and cooperative sectors in our country is not encouraged.

V. Gorbanovskiy. We are forced to deal with something which we do not wish. For example, cooperative members are not issued sugar and so we are planning to take over a sugar refinery in Moldavia, for this is their second season that they are unable to make it work. Therefore, we hope, there will no longer be breakdowns with sugar supplies.

A. Logutov. The situation with sugar was difficult in the state trade sector as well. But in areas where shortages are chronic, there are even bigger problems. Should we be amazed by the fact that the cooperative trade stores are selling beef at 3.5 rubles and pork at 2.5 rubles, while the members of the cooperative use this meat to make shishkabob and sell this at 25 rubles per kilogram and that the people are irritated by it. They say as follows: the members of cooperatives are simply robbing us. But if the cooperative members were to produce their meat themselves, the attitude toward them would be different. Under the conditions of scarcity we expect of the cooperative an addition to our food stocks. Possibilities to this effect exist.

L. Onushko. We frequently hear such views. As a rule, the attitude toward the cooperatives in the public awareness is negative. Neither statistics nor data on where we purchase materials and at what price are taken into consideration. I would like to ask you the following:

Imagine a cooperative consisting of three people. Let us assume that a kilogram of beef costs 5 rubles on the market. After removing the bones the filet part would cost 7 rubles. In order to have 100 grams of shishkabob we need 150 grams of meat plus marinade, tomato paste, bread, a plate, etc. (another 15 kopeks). The total cost per portion is 1.2 rubles. It is sold for 1.8 rubles.

It may seem that 60 kopeks of income is a great deal. But let us look further. The cooperative members prepare the shishkabobs in advance and, while it is still dark, travel 100 kilometers to the city. In 14 hours of work they would be able to sell 300 portions (45 kilograms of meat). This means that the daily income would be 180 rubles. Of this 60 go to wages for the three. Transportation-procurement costs are 20 rubles; the tax is 10 rubles; 6 rubles are deposited for social security and other withholdings. The net profit is 84 rubles which could be used for accumulations. The annual profit over 250 days of work is 21,000 rubles.

Some 300,000 rubles are needed to build a cooperative restaurant. With this kind of income, it would take a minimum of 15 years for the cooperative members to open such a restaurant. Yet, if tomorrow the State Committee for Prices would once again undertake to reduce the prices charged by the cooperatives, no one would assume such a burden. It is only the grubbers who would join the cooperatives.

I. Yanovskiy. Yes, the grubbers are our trouble. And although the word "shishkabober" is now a pejorative, this is not the problem, for shishkabobs are also needed! It is precisely a question of the grubbers, of those who have joined cooperatives to stuff their pockets. It is because of such people that such a public opinion is shaped. We can feed tens of thousands of people and they will be pleased. In the press, however, the reader will pay attention rather to an angry letter by one or two malcontents rather than to a serious economic analysis of the problems of cooperatives.

L. Onushko. Naturally, there also are among cooperative members people who violate the law. For example, there are those who purchase meat on the sly from the meat combine or the state store. Such people should be caught and punished in accordance with the law. We would be the first to say thank you for this. More than anyone else, the members of cooperatives are interested in having no people who violate the "rules of the game." The negative image of the cooperative member in the mass consciousness is developed on the basis of deviations from the norm. However, the norm must be made clear and explained.

G. Bashtanyuk. Many of our people still love to peek into other people's pockets. However, when one begins to find out where such "promoters of social equality" work and what they do, one can see that even as state employees, they would like to earn salaries without working, and loaf, cracking sunflower seeds. Today they are shouting that we are raising bourgeois! Most frequently, however, these are people who themselves make no serious labor contribution to our economy.

I. Yanovskiy. And who do not wish for others to make a contribution.

O. Morozov. We have realized that difficulties exist in the development of the cooperative movement, which are no less serious than even the economic difficulties we mentioned. They are found in the mass consciousness, in ordinary public opinion, which may be somewhat substantiated but also which confuses real facts with prejudices. This includes the widespread element of social jealousy: someone is earning money while I am not. The fact that the member of the cooperative works hard is not taken into consideration by anyone. Nonetheless, everyone watches how much the member earns and the belief is that he earns more than he actually does.

The negative attitude shown by many economic and soviet officials is not always backed by bureaucratic and departmental interests. Most frequently it is backed by prejudice. This is a real and very tangible fact. Clearly, the party ideologues on all levels should consider this problem.

N. Galiulin, KamAZ party committee secretary (presently chief of one of the association's administrations):

To one extent or another, everyone of us has been surrounded by myths. It is only people who can think for themselves who can get rid of them. However, we were not taught how to do this. Then, after we had our hands and feet tied, we were freed and told: start running! But how can we run when our feet have become swollen?! We must learn basic control over our own muscles in order to restore our motor activeness.

Some time has to pass after a political decision has been made until it becomes daily reality. Yet there were many who believed that the moment the organization of cooperatives was allowed that they would immediately stand on their own two feet. A political decision is not the end of the work but merely its beginning. Can we blame the people for a passive attitude? In the past, after each plenum, if we were to trust the press, immediately everything "changed for the better."

A. Logutov. Unfortunately, we frequently take what we have said for what we have actually accomplished. The cooperatives as, incidentally, the lessees, do not have open opponents. However, public opinion is being shaped in such a way that the cooperative movement appears to the people as consisting of thieves-shishkabobers. The view has developed that the cooperative means enrichment, abuses and deviations from socialism.

We must remove this kind of blinkers. The party and soviet authorities must support initiative-minded people, who must be given the opportunity to work. They must pay attention to the cooperative cadres and encourage their aspiration for unification.

Social Dimensions of the Cooperative

V. Pisigin. Whereas only a few years ago we were complaining of a passive attitude and social infantilism, the situation today is changing: an increasing number of people are becoming involved in political processes, the young in particular. All sorts of groups, associations and fronts are being set up and programs and bylaws are being drafted. The main struggle, however, takes place not at meetings and demonstrations and not by submitting petitions for or against one decision or another, but in another area which may be less noticeable and, on the surface, prosaic. I am referring to the economy. It seems to me that the combination of social with economic activities in, shall we say, our political club imeni Bukharin and a federation of cooperatives is the natural way of development of the movement as a whole. It is thus that the developing base is seeking its superstructure. Is this a new political structure or a new party? It is not. We see no reasons whatsoever to go beyond the course charted by the CPSU. It is a question of establishing a closer link between politics and economics. The work of our political club has indicated that it is precisely this type of approach that comes close to the civilized member of cooperatives. For that reason, it was not a merchant who was elected by majority vote to preside over the federation.

V. Bazhutin. A person who has been given means of production, autonomy and responsibility becomes a different person. He is concerned not only with personal problems or problems of the collective in which he works and creates but with society at large. Naturally, the need appears to discuss such problems on a serious, on a professional level. That is why we need the press not only for purposes of publicity. We need to have our own newspaper in order to be able jointly to formulate the trends of development of our movement.

A. Kalachev. The publication of a newspaper cannot be a subject of activities of a cooperative. However, social organizations have this right. For that reason the federation is fully entitled to start a newspaper. Work is currently under way to organize a Foundation imeni Bukharin, which would enable us to spend donations by cooperatives, public organizations and private citizens on socially significant initiatives and scholarships, which will enable a scientist to engage in work on topics of interest to us, and offer prizes for best works in the social sciences.

V. Pestov. Naturally, a newspaper could do a great deal in molding public opinion concerning the cooperatives. Equally significant, however, are social initiatives, so that the people can see a specific benefit. Our cooperative withholds 1 percent of its income for existing social funds. If we earn 120,000 rubles monthly, this means 1,200 rubles, which is quite a substantial amount for buying toys and clothing for the children's home. This, if you wish, is an indicator of our consciousness. We are providing money for objectives which are close to our

hearts. I am speaking exclusively about our own cooperative but within the framework of the federation such philanthropic activities would become more effective.

V. Gorbanovskiy. When we withhold assets for various funds, we do not always know where specifically they will end. Kompleks, which is one of the KamAZ cooperatives, set aside 2,000 rubles for aid to the retired in our rayon and for gifts to war veterans. The other plant cooperative also decided to do the same thing. You can imagine if, the way we are planning it, that soon the KamAZ will have 200 cooperatives and that each one would contribute 5,000 rubles we would have a million rubles to be used for specific social programs.

V. Pestov. The raykom asked us to repair the homes of party veterans. They allocated a certain amount of money but estimates indicated that triple that amount was needed. I gathered together my construction workers and said: this is not a profitable job but a necessary one. They agreed to do it without further discussion.

Or here is another example. Some Kazan youth groups have become notorious far beyond the limits of our city. What are the reasons for all this? One of them is that they have nothing to do, they have no place where to apply their energy and so they keep roaming down alleys and yards. We suggested that we set up through our own forces sports facilities which would be installed in the yard by the boys themselves and, subsequently, would be entirely run by them. It is thus that we shall involve them in a real project and help to improve the rayon. It is one thing for such complexes to be given as a gift by the state and another when they do everything themselves. The idea also exists of building an entire youth city, where young people could engage in sports, listen to rock groups or simply strum their guitars.

V. Gorbanovskiy. Recently the Tatar Komsomol Obkom sponsored a meeting with cooperative members within the framework of the republic rally of internationalist soldiers. Initially the boys welcomed us with a certain coolness. Who were these members of cooperatives, what was their work, what were they doing, no one was familiar with them. We had a long discussion. It turned out that among them as well there were members of cooperatives with quite interesting programs. They work with secondary school students and head technical circles.

This is a socially active force which must be able to prove itself in action. When we described to them what we were doing and gave them specific advise on how to begin so that they could start earning money for their own objectives, and after they had understood, they started asking many interested questions.

D. Shayakhmetov, first secretary of the Tatar Komsomol Obkom:

Today we can no longer develop in young people the aspiration to do the work only through slogans, appeals and references to examples taken from books. We have repeatedly met with members of cooperatives. We have tried to combine our own departmental, so to say, interests of the labor upbringing of young people with the developing movement. Within the cooperative a person grows much faster than when we try to teach him to work away from real life.

Furthermore, the Komsomol personnel themselves have undertaken the creation of their own cooperatives oriented toward youth needs. One such cooperative, for example, is working here, in Naberezhnyye Chelny. The youngsters organize the recreation of adolescents. They sponsor circles for the study of foreign languages and a video theater. I believe that such cooperatives would have a good future.

B. Kurtsev. The cooperatives must participate in the implementation of comprehensive regional and, possibly, also all-Union programs. The ispolkoms could use the funds they receive from them for broadening the area of social services. Scientific and technical cooperatives, which already have interesting plans, could also help in solving ecological problems.

Clearly, it is time to think also about cooperatives nominating candidates for soviet deputies on all levels. They would submit their programs for the participation of cooperatives in solving problems related to construction, ecology and scientific and technical progress.

A. Sarvartdinov. Naturally, the associations of cooperatives should nominate their deputies and, through them, participate in the entire social life of the city. We should not stop only at business or commercial relations between the soviets and the cooperatives. If the members of cooperatives have their legal representatives and coordinating authorities, the local authorities will find it easier to establish a common language with them.

L. Onushko. Deputies representing the cooperatives, one would think, should finally draw the attention of the law enforcement authorities to the problem of racketeering, which concern all of us. Everyone clearly realizes that this is a variety of plunder and extortion, and that no new articles should be added to the Criminal Code in order seriously to start fighting them. Cooperative ownership is as much an intrinsic part of socialist ownership as is that of the state. This must be mentioned once again, for in some areas our colleagues come across the strangely passive attitude displayed by MVD authorities, prosecutors and courts when it comes to such racketeering.

B. Kurtsev. Naturally, such deputies should be concerned with the social and legal protection of the members of cooperatives themselves and defend their interests. For

example, so far we have no mechanism for putting social security funds to use. Yet the cooperatives properly withhold the stipulated share of their profits for the social security fund.

L. Onushko. In accordance with the Law on the Cooperative we have the right to create our own trade unions and insurance institutions. However, no one makes use of this opportunity. Obviously, a significant percentage of the thus withheld funds should be spent locally for building housing, cooperative kindergartens, preventive medical establishments, recreation centers, and so on. We have nothing of that and our withholdings actually vanish in the "black holes" and are even not taken into consideration in the computation of retirement pensions.

A. Logutov. In concluding our meeting, let me say a few words about the role of the party members in the developing movement. There are those who are amazed: How is it that, all of a sudden, party members join cooperatives? It is sometimes believed that this is almost a major infraction. They forget the fact that the cooperative stimulates the development of new production relations, which is what the party calls for.

The very form of the cooperative reformulates the question of the role of the party members in the collective. Priority is given not to production discipline but to problems of ideological and moral nature and to the need to develop an atmosphere of reciprocal understanding and creativity. It is precisely this that the party members must deal with.

O. Morozov. Today one of the most important tasks of the party authorities is, in my view, to offer the members of cooperatives a wide range of opportunities for the application of their forces and actively to contribute to the creation of a social climate which would favor the development of the movement and firmly eliminate bureaucratic barriers on its way.

The power of influence of the communists becomes the greater the sooner they are able to support it with legal and economic instruments and abandon bureaucratic administration, which cannot be used as a regulator of relations between the cooperative and the state. The clarity of positions adopted by the party committees, which are called upon to provide political guarantees to the cooperative movement, will largely determine the success of this project.

Facts Without Comment

According to the USSR State Statistical Committee, on 1 October 1988 there were 86,800 cooperatives registered in the country, 48,500 of which were active. So far this year their volume of output and services have exceeded 2.6 billion rubles, i.e., they account for no more than 1 percent of retail trade.

The initial experience acquired after the enactment of the Law on the Cooperative in the USSR indicated that many obstacles, difficulties and unsolved problems stand in the way of this developing movement. This was confirmed by the roundtable discussion in Naberezhnyye Chelny. The general opinion was that it is precisely now that it is being decided whether or not the cooperative sector would become an equal partner of the state sector, whether it will justify the hopes which society has invested in it and whether it will help to solve the vital socioeconomic problems of the renovation of socialism.

From the viewpoint of the economy, the cooperative is a form of labor organization in which a person works better because he considers himself the immediate owner. He does not obey anyone else's orders but produces a product and decides by himself how to handle his part of the income. Everything depends on him alone, for he is the owner and not a hired worker. This feeling of proprietorship is not only an economic category. It is social and political as well.

During the very first months of the Soviet system, V.I. Lenin gave priority, among the advantages of socialism, to the concept of "working for oneself." It was only later that centralism and planning began to be considered the foundations but not in the least a monopoly feature of socialism. Naturally, in the contemporary complex economy a person does not work for himself the way in which the private peasant did at one point. He works for society and, therefore, for himself. However, since society is a complex organism, the forms through which this labor is realized vary a great deal. The aspiration to prove oneself as an active citizen of our society instead of a person who is being manipulated, one way or the other, is manifested through the cooperative, leasing, or individual labor activity, on the one hand, and political clubs and informal movements, on the other. The aspiration to consider oneself the master in all respects, including politics, economics and the social area, is an intrinsic feature of socialism as a society of democracy and humanism.

The tempestuous growth of cooperatives in the last year does not, however, provide reasons for excessive optimism. According to the specialists, in order for the cooperatives to assume a stable position in the national economy and efficiently to compete with each other and with state enterprises, their share in the overall output of goods and services should reach 10-15 percent. However, recurrences of bureaucratic administration, efforts to solve at the expense of the cooperatives a variety of departmental problems, and the active counteraction of the bureaucratic apparatus on different levels are seriously hindering progress toward this goal.

As long as the number of cooperatives remains small, it would be difficult to expect any noticeable reduction in prices in that sector. Today the consumer market finds itself in a difficult situation: commodity shortages have

worsened, we notice a surreptitious price increase and the disappearance of inexpensive varieties of goods. There are serious reasons to assume that this situation will not be quickly corrected in the new year. Unfortunately, in the mass consciousness such negative processes, related to profound financial disproportions in the national economy, are most frequently identified with the results of the activities of cooperatives. Therefore, the party authorities and their propaganda aktivs face the important and urgent task of ideologically supporting the social and economic development of the cooperative movement.

Another conclusion stemming from the discussion held in Naberezhnyye Chelny is, in our view, quite important: today, when the painful process of establishing economic methods in managing state enterprises is beginning, the cooperative has become the testing ground on which the new economic management principles are being shaped. It is here that the detrimental aspect of bureaucratic controls of the economy over the brittle shoots of autonomy is manifested most quickly and clearly. This makes it necessary seriously to consider the cost which, in the final account, will be paid by society for any hasty administrative decisions, although made with the best possible intentions. The experience in the development of the cooperative in this sense makes it necessary to anticipate difficulties in the conversion of the entire national economy to full cost accounting and, therefore, to avoid the repetition of errors.

Naturally, by no means were all the problems which concern the members of cooperatives touched upon in the course of the discussion. We therefore hope that this discussion will be continued in our journal with the participation of all interested parties.

A Quiet Talk

18020007e Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 36-41

[Article by Valerian Nikolayevich Nakoryakov, member of the USSR Union of Journalists]

[Text] Prior to my trip to Ryazan I reread the materials of the 19th All-Union Party Conference. I felt, literally physically, the entirely special atmosphere which prevailed in it. I do not recall other events which people would be waiting for with such interest, hope and impatience and about which they thought long after the conference. The conference raised highly the level of self-critical evaluation of achievements. It was a binding example of sharp and constructive collective thinking and daring competition among a great variety of opinions. Despite all wishes to this effect, to remain on this level and to tear ourselves from the arms of the past was by no means simple. This is clearly confirmed by the present accountability and election campaign in the party...

Before the start of the 25th Ryazan City Party Conference, its delegates obtained information related to the accountability report which the CPSU gorkom was to submit. Such information, printed on good quality paper, looked quite festive, somehow reminding us of the prospectus of a travel agency. It opened with a sentence full of optimism: "Modern Ryazan is a major industrial and cultural oblast center in the RSFSR." In claiming this, the authors did not sin against the truth. The charts and tables offered to the delegates and the comments proved that in recent years a great deal had been accomplished in the city to enhance public production and ensure the better satisfaction of the needs and requirements of the population and to improve food supplies.

However, those who had compiled this referential information had not thought of providing any whatsoever expanded analysis of the information they were offering or a self-critical evaluation of accomplishments. Yet, some elaborations of the figures they had cited would not have been excessive. For example, the pamphlet stated that the average annual growth rate of labor productivity in the urban industry was 5 percent during the 12th 5-year period as against 3 percent in the 11th. This indicator seems adequate. But, as noted L. Khitrun, first secretary of the Ryazan Party Obkom, barely more than one-third of this increase was the result of the use of scientific and technical achievements and the role of this long-term factor for upgrading public production efficiency had declined compared with the 11th 5-Year Plan. This was not the only fact heard at the conference which allowed us to say that both the materials related to the accountability report and the report itself submitted by the party gorkom, presented by V. Sidorov, its first secretary, were clearly short of a critical evaluation of accomplishments.

It cannot be said that the speaker tried to avoid the sharp angles, but nor did he make any efforts to make them worse than the were. Yet, I believe, that was the only way to encourage the conference delegates to express openly and honestly their views on unresolved problems, and to assess self-critically their work and its style and ways and means. The invitation to engage in such a discussion and evaluation was done quietly.

Nonetheless, the speakers expressed a number of practical ideas and suggestions as to the best way to help the countryside, the participation of industrial enterprises in population consumer services and the urbanization of the city. Physician V. Yeltsov suggested that the gorkom set up a commission in charge of health care which, in his view, was "in a state of crisis." School principal N. Kuchumova tried to debunk the persistent formula that "the school is responsible for everything," which made

teachers responsible for everything, directing public opinion away from the obligations of the family and from those who produce clothing and food for school students.

The speakers carefully avoided depressing self-serving reports, which have been setting our teeth on edge for many years, as well as noisy assurances of future successes. They did not try or, to be entirely accurate, they almost did not try to make use of the rostrum of the conference to solve, with the help of the superior officials sitting in the presidium, current economic problems. When the director of one of the enterprises, discussing developments in the production of consumer goods, asked the gorkom for help in building a new plant, the public in the hall laughed and expressed its opposition by applauding. Another director, who spoke after him, said that the gorkom should not hasten to respond to such appeals, for everyone should meet his own obligations.

Actually, this was the only event in which the delegates displayed an emotion. Neither before nor after it was the disciplined tranquillity in the hall disturbed. There were no debates, critical statements or sharp questions. Yet there were reasons for making demands such as, for example, why was it that so many of the candidates nominated by the commission as members of the new CPSU Gorkom were heads of party obkom departments. However, a question on the subject of the candidacies, which would have been entirely appropriate in this case, was not raised and nor was it followed by suggestions of excluding some or adding other. The vote in favor of the suggested slate was unanimous.

The fact that the conference took place somewhat quietly, smoothly and at a moderate pace does not mean in the least that all the problems which affected the citizens had been solved. A worrisome proof of this was the nonetheless abundant number of complaints flowing from Ryazan to Moscow. Like anywhere else, here there are a number of pressing problems around which opinions clash and passions seethe. Should we be pleased that they were not splashed out from the rostrum of the city party conference? Let us consider, as an example, that same argument on the subject of the Priokskaya floodlands which, thanks to the "Perestroyka Beacon," became known to the entire country.

This argument excited thousands and thousand of people in the city and to ignore it, limiting oneself to an occasional statement to the effect that it was time to put an end to all kinds of rumors, was hardly accurate. How not to agree here with the speakers (and there were many of them!) who spoke of the need decisively to improve the level of information of the population on the activities of party and soviet authorities, in order not to continue to encourage rumors, insults or lack of understanding, and so that total clarity would prevail in everything. In particular, I found noteworthy the suggestion of organizing regular press conferences on urban socioeconomic and ecological problems.

Such conferences will unquestionably help the party gorkom to enliven ideological work the method of which, according to S. Zhuravlev, party committee secretary at the Spetsstroymekhanizatsiya Trust, should be changed by actively including in it the primary party collectives.

Unfortunately, no whatsoever satisfactory development of this important topic was obtained at the conference. In general, we should point out that remarks on specific problems predominated in the speeches of the participants. No one tried to provide an expanded evaluation of the work of the gorkom other than the view that it was "satisfactory." What was the reason for this?

The answer to this question, in my view, could be found in the speech delivered by V. Komogorkin, prorector of the Pedagogical Institute. In his report he said that it was noted that the ideological cadres in the city proved unprepared for engaging in a direct dialogue with the young people. However, the speaker limited himself to that statement. Had we been told of the way in which the gorkom considered the possibility of changing the situation, this could have become a subject of discussion.

It could have, but it did not. For that same reason many other parts of the report did not become topics of interested discussion. The speaker did not refute anything, did not argue with anyone, but simply noted various phenomena in the life of the urban party organization. And since, as a rule, it was a question of facts and well-known and solidly ensconced truths, no one developed any particular wish to join in the discussion. But here is what was noteworthy: unlike the situation in the past, the members of the gorkom are young, energetic and knowledgeable. Discussions with V. Sidorov reveal his lively mind, acute power of observation and the ability to provide a comprehensive and accurate characterization of a person. Why, nonetheless, was the accountability report so poor in all such features? I realize that the report is the collective offspring of the gorkom and not of its secretary alone. Nonetheless could he have included some actual features in it? He could have, but did not. Was he unwilling to do so? Did he prefer, as they say, "not to stand out," but to remain loyal to the long tradition of extremely streamlined evaluations and conclusions?

The speaker touched upon a large number of questions. However, in citing figures and facts, he most frequently did not even try to analyze them, limiting himself mostly to most general descriptions. Thus, in describing the new phenomena which had become apparent in the course of the accountability and election conferences of the primary party collectives, V. Sidorov noted that in seven primary and shop party organizations in the city the work of the elected authorities was considered unsatisfactory. In his opinion, this indicated that "the party members have become more exigent and are approaching the election of their leaders more strictly." However, the totally opposite conclusion could be drawn from this fact as well. Who if not the gorkom would know well that

dozens of collectives engaged in industry, transportation, trade, consumer services and other economic sectors are systematically failing to fulfill their planned assignments, waste resources and produce defective goods, triggering the serious criticism of consumers. Therefore, is it possible for a collective to work poorly while its party nucleus, headed by its leadership, is working well? If such is the case, it would have been possible for no more than seven of the 1,747 shop and primary party organizations operating in the city not to be on the proper level, in which case Ryazan would have been simply head-and-shoulders above any rival in the socialist competition....

In preparing the accountability report, it is more likely that the gorkom personnel tried to abandon the old rules according to which, from the very start, an avalanche of all sorts of indicators would be hurled at the audience. Unlike the past, the accountability report of the Ryazan Party Gorkom opened with a major section dealing with organizational party work. Unfortunately, however, this was the only feature marking a departure from the old systems. How, to what extent did the ways and means of work used by the party influence the solution of various practical problems facing the organizations were questions which remained unanswered. Nor was it possible to determine what kind of people are heading today in Ryazan the most important sectors and work areas, and on whose efforts did the successful development of leading production sectors, science and culture and the extents of satisfying the requirements and needs of the urban population depend. It is true that an effort was made in the report to describe the members of the CPSU Gorkom Buro. Unfortunately, like wishes for the future, critical remarks concerning them were extremely short and insufficiently specific. Thus, the following was said about the second gorkom secretary: "Comrade V.Ye. Izryadnov is a politically trained principle-minded and exigent worker. He is persistent in achieving planned objectives. However, in matters on managing capital construction he must make more extensive use of political methods. He must become more demanding of managers of construction subdivisions, who are party members, particularly in the implementation of the program for the social development of the city." Even less was said about the remaining members of the bureau. The work of four of them "was not entirely consistent with increased requirements," and two others had to "work more energetically in the primary party organizations."...

As to the economic managers, their names were mentioned only in parentheses, in the course of the enumeration of the well or poorly working enterprises they headed. The most expanded assessment was that of the heads of the city communal facilities. As was noted in the report, they had assumed a passive stance in the implementation of their direct obligations. What can one say: this was an extremely polite characterization of the activities of the leadership of communal services, which had triggered such severe criticism!

Generally speaking, the statement by the speaker that "the present membership of leading urban cadres is, as a whole, able to solve the important task of perestroyka," had to be accepted on faith, for proof on this account was lacking. As was pointed out in the report, accountability reports presented by 46 secretaries of party organizations and economic managers had been submitted at plenary meetings and meetings of the gorkom bureau and CPSU raykoms. Of late in a number of party organizations economic managers have submitted repeated reports but the situation, meanwhile, was improving too slowly. The city had acquired a certain experience in filling economic positions democratically: 33 heads of enterprises and organizations, 67 chiefs of shops and departments, 153 foremen and more than 500 brigade leaders had been elected to their positions. Such figures appeared impressive. However, the extent to which the new procedure for filling vacancies had strengthened the corps of economic managers or whether something had changed in their relations with subordinates and with the collectives which had elected them, and whether electiveness undermined the principle of one-man command, the figures which were quoted did not provide answers to these and many other questions. This required a specific study of specific and by no means simple situations which, was precisely what was lacking.

"The intensification of democratization of internal party life and expansion of glasnost," V. Sidorov reported to the conference delegates, were assisted by the new principles governing the election of party committees, bureaus and secretaries.... Almost one out of three party group organizers and party organization secretaries were elected from among two or more applicants." And so? Did this help to any extent to surmount the shortcomings which were pointed out recently in a sociological study made in Ryazan by the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences? Following are some data obtained in the course of this survey: 90 percent of respondents pointed out the lack of a system in working with cadres; 53 percent noted the poor professional and political training of party personnel; and 38 percent expressed the view that systematic efforts were not being made in training a cadre reserve. One-half of the gorkom reserve consists of people in their 50s or older. In general, this is something to consider. The simple observance of the "new electoral principles" is not in itself able to ensure the formulation of a modern cadre policy consistent with the needs of perestroyka.

The party committee secretary of the Ryazselmash Production Association, cited in the party committee secretary report, was one of those elected "among two or more candidacies." The extent to which this choice was apt would become apparent in time. The facts, however, that the work of the new secretary will not be easy was made clear the moment the membership of the newly elected party committee was made public. It included, in addition to the general director, three of his deputies, the director of the plant for agricultural machine building and the leadership of the design-technological bureau of

the association. Given such a membership, it could be more profitable to hold not party committee meetings but planning sessions by the directors.

The inevitable question arises: Why is that among the 42 party committee members in the production association there was only one rank-and-file engineer? I believe that this question becomes even more pertinent considering that such a deployment of forces in the party committees is by no means a strictly local Ryazan phenomenon. It is quite widespread and is being persistently reproduced, clearly dating from the time when the intelligentsia was considered merely as a stratum with no significance of its own.

How many are the rank-and-file specialists among the 85 members of the Ryazan CPSU Gorkom? I have no precise figures. However, the information on its new structure lists two people in the item "engineering and technical personnel." Let me point out that in 1985 it had only one. Therefore, this is a hundred percent increase! Meanwhile, the number of enterprise management representatives, 11 people, remained unchanged. There now are 28 instead of 26 workers and, respectively, 26 and 25 party workers. There had been three workers in the field of science, culture, education and health-care, and now there are six. This is not much if we consider that party work is an area of relations among people and not things.

Let me point out, for the sake of fairness, that unfortunately not only shortcomings in the work of the party gorkom but also examples of the successful solution of problems were soft-peddled at the conference. Successes, however, particularly in the area of the party's leadership of the economy, have unquestionably been achieved. In particular, the gorkom has done a great deal to strengthen ties among the labor collectives in the city and to organize reciprocal assistance among them.

P. Orlov, general director of the Ryazselmash Production Association, told me how grateful the collective he heads was to the city party committee for the help provided in mastering the manufacturing of the new potato harvesting combine. This combine, developed by the association, has doubled the productivity of the older model. Furthermore, it is serviced by one instead of six people. However, in order to start the production of this machine, a number of new dies were needed which the combine builders could not manufacture by themselves. They turned to the Minselkhozmash, which ignored them. At this point the city party organization stepped in to help and was able to involve in the manufacturing of such dies a number of Ryazan enterprises. Naturally, this was accomplished on a cost accounting basis.

As the industrial workers in the city confirmed, these are by no means isolated examples. Their study and proper evaluation will unquestionably help to upgrade the level of party leadership in production and add to it the efficiency which is so greatly lacking to perestroyka today.

The field of activities of the party organization of a big city, not to mention an oblast center, is inordinately vast and the economic, social, ecological and other problems it faces are exceptionally complex and varied. Matters are not simplified but, rather, complicated by the "intermediary" status of the city party committee. From the top it is "dominated" by the obkom and from below it is pressured by the party raykoms. Today the city party committee finds it very difficult to determine its proper place in the common ranks and to shape its distinct personality. Under the conditions of the administrative-command system, which operated for decades, all misunderstandings which appeared among the three units of the party's leadership were resolved simply: the superior unit was always right. Today no one is willing to live according to the rule that "everyone should know his place." Different relations are needed as well as a clear division of activities among party committees and in the methods they use in influencing various aspects of urban life.

The difficulties which arise here are worsened by the fact that perestroyka is taking place simultaneously in all social institutions and structures without exception. Major changes are taking place within the party apparatus itself. The old and the new coexist in its life. "I am being told that I should not become involved in current economic affairs but should master political methods," complained S. Tsygankov, first secretary of Ryazan's Moskovskiy Raykom. "Nonetheless, I must regularly draft something like report notes which would explain why the raykom was unable to ensure the 100 percent implementation of contractual obligations by the rayon's enterprises."...

Party work takes place not in some kind of artificially created ideal environment. Such an environment has never existed nor will it ever. There will be real life with its difficulties and contradictions and most unexpected conflicts. For that reason, on each occasion, the party worker must find new nonstandard decisions which would fully take into consideration the specific situation. This is a very complex and difficult matter and in order to deal with it it is important invariably to be guided by the ever fresh Leninist rule: a specific analysis for a specific situation. It is precisely this that is sometimes in short supply!

Man, Comrade, Popular Leader

18020007f Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 42-48

[Publication prepared by V. Bushuyev]

[Text] **It is an old truth that books, like people, occasionally have a had life. The life of the two books which shall be discussed below was hard.**

Both of them were written, as the saying goes, on the hot traces of events. Both contain extremely valuable information on the extremely saturated events of the days and nights after 21 January 1924, when the heart of Vladimir Ilich Lenin stopped beating, in Gorki. Each one of them lets us study the thoughts and experience the feelings of people we know well or of totally unknown people who were afflicted by the immeasurable sorrow which was shared by the entire country.

These books were among many others which, several months after their publication, found their way in the caches of the special security services. Their guilt was that they mentioned major Soviet political personalities, who were subsequently subject to repressive measures, and contained extensive references to their articles and speeches dedicated to the memory of the great teacher and, to many, a close and old comrade.

Today both books, like many others, are being returned to the open stock of the libraries. Obviously, the day will soon come when they will be reprinted. For the time being, however, we must be satisfied with small things—with excerpts from them.

In the first, the pamphlet by V. Bonch-Bruyevich "Smert i Pokhorony Vladimira Ilicha" [Vladimir Ilich's Death and Burial] (Zhizn i Znaniye Cooperative Publishing House, Moscow, 1925), based on personal recollections, with his typical power of observation, the author has recorded all that he was able to see and hear during those frosty January days. The second—"U Velikoy Mogily" [At the Great Grave] (Krasnaya Zvezda Newspaper Publishing House, 1924) is a thick volume which includes documents, and texts of speeches, articles and reports on meetings and gatherings by working people and newspaper articles dedicated to Lenin's memory.

Some features in these documents and live testimonials may seem naive to the reader today, and not always properly structured. However, that, precisely, is where their value lies: the feelings and thoughts imprinted in their pages sensitively describe the spirit of the time as it was, and not deformed by subsequent distortions.

...It was the night of 21 January 1924. Ilich's comrades-in-arms, shaken up by the event, traveled from Moscow to Gorki. Here is the way **V. Bonch-Bruyevich** describes these hours:

The leaders of the old Bolshevik guard, who had just arrived on motor sleds, slowly mounted up the steps, unhurriedly, as though slowing down their pace....

There was a warm, quiet and silent meeting with Nadezhda Konstantinovna....

And then they entered that magic room, where there were neither tears nor sobs but only an eerie calm....

Stepping ahead of the rest was Stalin. He did not walk like the others. He had a unique style of walking.... His face was pale, harsh, concentrated.... And here was Kamenev, gently quiet, slightly agitated, marching calmly with even steps to where he had to go. However, his anxious poetic faith revealed to everyone how hard, how sad was the time he was having.

And here was Zinovyev, who had spent together with Vladimir Ilich, perhaps more than anyone else, years of sharing life together, who had experienced with him closely and intimately a great deal of many hard times in the years of severe trials of our entire Bolshevik essence.... He was sad, thoughtful and grieving. He was pleasant and gentle in seeing Nadezhda Konstantinovna and somehow intimately close. Simply and warmly he approached the one with whom, for so many long years he had become accustomed to share the bitterness of defeat and the joy and happiness of staggering victories. Kalinin came, and so did all the others. Bukharin almost ran, deeply shaken up, excited, red in the face, unable to control himself, half-sick, with an open shirt, totally forgetting about himself and his own illness.... Everyone was here, around.... They looked in the calm face of the one who had always been precious to them, who had been very close to them, and all of them, as though guided by a single inner voice, bowed their heads.... Everything became quiet. It was quiet here where only so recently life was seething, filled with fire and passion....

For a long, a very long time they stood there, tempered fighters and tried veterans of our great revolution and it was as though here they were forging an oath, an eternal oath of loyalty, of infinite dedication to him, their friend, the fighter, the leader of the peoples of the world, of the proletarian revolution, of all nations.

"Yes, yes, that is it.... that is it....," Stalin said, speaking first.... He walked around Vladimir Ilich in his measured steps..., as though literally not believing that death had done its merciless work and as though wishing to make sure that this fatal work was irreparable, permanent....

The hour was approaching midnight....

It was time to return to Moscow.

Once again everyone advanced toward him.... Once again he was surrounded by a tight circle and there was no strength to leave, to go away....

Suddenly, Stalin approached the head of the bed impetuously, passionately:

"Farewell, farewell Vladimir Ilich.... Farewell!..." He waved a hand and turned away sharply, as though separating the past from the present....

The dead were laid to rest, it was now up to the living....

Kamenev approached, thoughtfully and gently bent over the chest and face of Vladimir Ilich....

Zinovyev touchingly parted with his friend....

"Farewell, Ilich" loudly said Bukharin, and kissed him.

The others came too.... And everyone in his own way, in the throes of emotions, some people shyly and timidly, some thrustingly and passionately, paid their last respects to the one with whom they had spent long years of their lives in friendship, struggle and work....

Some spent the night there.... Most of them took off for the railroad station....

Naturally, each generation has its own interpretation of the testimony of eyewitnesses of previous ages. It is entirely likely that Bonch-Bruyevich invested in his words something different, by noting that Stalin had "literally separated the past from the present." We perceive the meaning of these words entirely differently, based on the experience of the most difficult decades which followed.

Morning came. The sad news of the death of Vladimir Ilich spread around the entire country. Journalistic descriptions of those days, collected in the book "At the Great Grave," describe the atmosphere which prevailed at assemblies and meetings in Moscow and other cities throughout the Union.

Krasnoye Vereteno Factory, Moscow, 22 January:

"Comrades, our Ilich is dead...."

Something stuck in the throat of the speaker. The workers froze. The speaker regained control. He went on:

"Whatever I may tell you, comrades, it would be less than what you could say yourselves about Comrade Lenin. My suggestion to you is, you talk...."

A young communist worker takes the floor:

"We were rightless, illiterate. Yet Comrade Lenin said that we too can run the state. And that other than workers and peasants, no one should dare run it. And so, we did what he said and we shall continue to do this work, to please Ilich...."

Another worker:

"Our lives were so bad 3 years ago that we could not even describe them. We asked for Ilich to come to us. He came and said: 'Well, what shall we do? We have nothing. Be a little bit more patient and believe, and you will eat not only black but also white bread, aplenty.' And it was thus, with these words, that he fed us, and we could relax. And now what has happened, as you can all see, is what Ilich said would happen."

"In our factory," a worker said, "at that time I was not employed here, a worker told Comrade Lenin, 'are we working for a bit of bread while you most likely eat as much as you want?' Comrade Lenin answered: 'Yes, I eat as much as you give me. It is up to you to feed me or not'."

"Comrades," a nonparty worker wearing a Red Army cap said. "Comrade Lenin died but the Communist Party will continue his work. And all of us, the entire working class, will rally around it and will help it to bring Comrade Lenin's cause to its successful end."

The call to tighten up the ranks and to complete what Lenin had begun was the refrain of virtually all speeches and articles of those days. Not to despair, to follow Lenin's path, and to strengthen party unity were feelings which appeared in the hearts of the people.

From a resolution of a worker meeting in the **Sormovskiye Works:**

"...We know that we are sufficiently strong to march forward and fulfill Vladimir Ilich's behests."

The statement by the workers of the **Sokolniki Machine Plant** ended with the following words: "Our sadness is infinite but there is no place for despondency."

"No elegiac burial aphorisms, nothing tearful," was the way the situation in Moscow was described in PRAVDA. "...Despite the suddenness of events there was everywhere a model, a self-generating order.... In this order there was a heightened awareness of discipline which, only 6 years ago, was so rarely encountered in a semi-Asiatic country. This was Leninist training and school."

A characteristic feature which strikes when we read publications of that time is the total absence of something which, very shortly after Vladimir Ilich's death, and for many long years became an invariable attribute of all and any speeches, addresses, articles and notes: at that time there was not even a hint of excessive phraseology relative to the personality of the leader, encouraged from above, any kind of hysterical deification or blind reverence of his person.

Old Bolshevik **M. Lyadov:**

"Somehow the word 'great' does not fit Lenin.... It does not fit particularly in the case of those who personally knew Ilich, who had worked with him. To them Ilich was so simple, so clearly understood, so much loved, above all, in the best meaning of the term. Whoever spoke with Ilich, whether a simple worker, a peasant, an ordinary or a high party worker, he made everyone forget the tremendous difference which existed between him and those simple mortals with whom he talked. Everyone

could speak with him simply, without feeling the pressure of the "great man." He was able to hear out everyone and quite imperceptively make him think the way he wanted him to think."

N. Bukharin:

"It would hardly possible to find in history any leader who would be so beloved by his closest fellow workers. They had some kind of special feeling for Lenin. Specifically, they loved him. They did not simply value his powerful mental machinery and his iron hand. No, he tied people to himself with intimate threads. He was one of us, someone close to us. He was in the full meaning of the term a **comrade,** which is a great word to which the future belongs. There will be a time when relations among people will be of that nature....

"It was this supreme **simplicity** that was Lenin's basic feature in his politics."

Here is another characteristic testimony:

G. Krzhizhanovskiy:

"Never in the history of mankind had an individual been justifiably considered so highly. However, not even for a minute did Vladimir Ilich lose his head from all this power and not even the slightest spot stained him from the exercise of this power."

Lenin and his fellow workers never accepted the theory of scientific socialist as something to be blindly trusted. To the Bolshevik-Leninist socialism was a science. Science demands not veneration, sanctified by some kind of cover of mystery and total ban of any doubt and criticism, but convictions, profound knowledge and constant creativity. Science and convictions cannot be based on lies, distortions or myths. They need precise facts, the entire truth, without the slightest exception, and independent thinking.

In the days of parting with Ilich, 65 years ago, **K. Radek** wrote in the article "Lenin's Life and Work:"

"Everyone was amazed by the unparalleled confidence with which Lenin acted as a politician and as the head of a proletarian party. There were those who ascribed this confidence to his **powerful character,** which made him a natural leader. Others saw the source of Lenin's confidence in his unshakable faith in socialism. However, a powerful will can not only rally the people but also repel them, when the test of history proves that such a will guided itself and others along the wrong way. Lenin's power as a leader was that his party fellow workers always saw that his will was leading them along the true historical path.

"...Socialism is not a religion. Socialism is a science under the conditions of the victory of the proletariat. **Lenin's iron conviction stemmed from the fact that, as one of Marx's students, he had understood his science** of society and that this science had become part of him, that he applied it better than any other student of the father of scientific socialism.... Lenin was a great independent Marxist philosopher. This was a prerequisite which enabled this man, strong as steel, to become the leading politician of the international proletariat."

In those days, similar thoughts were expressed by **K. Tsetkin,** the noted leader of the German labor movement:

"Lenin was the most brilliant student of Marx, by no means in the sense of an idolatrous service to Marxian formulas but in the best meaning of the term: the progressive and creative development of Marxian spirit.

"Lenin was the greatest practical Marxist. Dictated by powerful talent and a profound and thorough study, the idea was implemented in Lenin into will and, controlled by a rapidly oriented common sense, this will led the people, shaped events in specific forms and 'made history.' ...It is thus that he was able to complete the difficult project of defending the Russian state under the fierce pressure of the enemy and taking to the most difficult and casualty-saturated steps in restructuring the economy and society. More than anyone else he felt and understood the monstrous historical tragedy of the Russian proletarian revolution, which was mired in the contradiction between a passionate revolutionary will for communism and the backward nature of objective conditions.... In the cooperatives, the trade unions and the youth and women's organizations and, particularly, in education and upbringing, he felt the breath of the new life and this was warmly and tempestuously affecting the aspiration of millions of people to reach the light through their own efforts!"

Not everyone, even among the closest of Lenin's fellow workers, could assume such a truly creative and innovative work, such an ability for fearless maneuvering and revision, at each historical turn, and in the light of the new realities, a life which only yesterday seemed consisting of inviolable formulas, evaluations and tactical methods, a courageous admission of errors, which made it necessary to restart everything from scratch, again and again. By no means was everyone, both now as today, able, like Lenin, daringly to abandon obsolete methods of activity and mental stereotypes and, frequently, to oppose, sometimes alone, a majority which had still not realized and failed to see the vital need to make pressing changes, and to abandon the old erroneous course.

Academician **S. Oldenburg:**

"He had an amazing sense, an intuition which allowed him frequently to detect that which others had to prove. He had an understanding of the ways to be followed to achieve the stipulated objective. This is a feature inherent only in brilliant people. He also had the feature of

understanding the fact that one must not conceal one's errors and that those who have the courage to realize their errors can truly advance."

A. Lomov, old Bolshevik:

"As early as the spring of 1918, in a discussion with us, at that time 'left-wing' communists, Vladimir Ilich sharply raised the question of the superiority of state capitalism compared to the old capitalist order in Russia and the need to combine one's 'nationalizing ardor' with the possibility of 'redoing' all nationalized enterprises. Even then he pointed out that we had nationalized the big enterprises which was beyond the efforts of our practical management of such enterprises..."

Yu. Larin:

"A person felt that he was growing by being in touch with him, growing precisely for work, which was made inordinately **more complex** by the fact that the dictatorship of the **proletariat** had to take place in a country with a **petit bourgeois** majority of the population, on the basis of its **agreement.** Yet prerevolutionary history had accustomed us to engage primarily in 'direct' and by no means 'maneuvering' actions. Under these circumstances, the task of proper 'state re-education' of the party vanguard was a mandatory prerequisite for the preservation of proletarian dictatorship and for the subsequent implementation of all the tasks related to it."

Unquestionably, the question of the future ways of development of the country and the preservation and multiplication of what had been achieved in 7 years of Soviet system, excited, after Ilich's death, literally one and all. This can easily be seen by many publications of that period.

M. Kalinin:

"Millions of workers and peasants knew that Vladimir Ilich was ill and was not participating in the running of the country. However, everyone felt that he was there and that tomorrow he could once again be among us and that gave us confidence in the future. Everyone thought that the course charted for this boat was the right one, and if there were insignificant deviations, they would be corrected the moment the skipper would regain his health.

"The death of Vladimir Ilich is not a blow occurring somewhere outside oneself. It is not a difficulty resulting from a general misfortune but a pain felt by every individual, as though it was precisely he who had been personally affected by some trouble, as though it was precisely he who had lost his friend and leader without whom he doubted his future successes in practical work. Literally millions of people ask themselves how to cope tomorrow without him."

In addressing the mourning session of the Second Congress of Soviets, in his customary hashed rhythm, J. Stalin strung one after another oaths on obeying Lenin's orders: "Hold high and maintain pure the great title of party member," "protect the unity of our party like the apple of our eye," "strengthen with all our forces the alliance between workers and peasants," and so on and so forth. Many long years of the bitter and tragic experience of millions of people and the Bolshevik-truthful and courageous exposures initiated by the party were needed to truly realize the way these oaths were being implemented and the way many of those thunderous statements and assurance of inflexible loyalty to the Leninist legacy, which misled us for many years, turned into crimes.

Nonetheless, the possibility of avoiding the distortion of socialism and the violations of the Leninist norms of party and state life and in economic and state building, existed. Today we can clearly see that this possibility consisted above all in making use of the collective reasoning of the party. Many of Ilich's supporters, as though sensing their lack of the great personal qualities of this philosopher, politician and strategist and his gift of prediction, expressed the hope that, perhaps, this ability would be manifested in a collective leadership which, alone, under the circumstances which existed in the country after Lenin's death, could cope with the tremendous tasks which faced the party and the Soviet people.

G. Zinovyev:

"Aware of the immeasurable importance of the tasks facing us and which, henceforth, we shall have to solve through our own collective experience, without the brilliant advice of Vladimir Ilich, we must, at all cost, rally as an even closer family. Comrade Lenin's death can only be a signal for the fraternal unification of anyone who is a true Leninist. We shall try to work in such a way that, all of us together, although to a small extent, replace Vladimir Ilich. Let us apply to this great cause which Vladimir Ilich bequeathed us his loyalty, watchfulness, calm, energy, courage, love for the cause and perhaps a little bit of his far-sightedness."

Essentially the same ideas are found in the appeal adopted by the workers at the **Krasnyy Bogatyr** Plant:

"Communist Party! Your collective genius, supported by the entire working class, must now replace Vladimir Ilich's genius."

During those sad January days of 1924, **L. Sosnovskiy,** one of the representatives of the generation of old Bolsheviks, wrote about Lenin the following: "...No one as yet in the history of mankind has been as lucky as he was. To see in his lifetime the growth of his project, and the way his cherished thoughts entered broadly and profoundly the masses of working people; to see the already consolidated victory of the working people on

one-sixth of the globe and the growing uprising in other parts of the world. To see before his end that his cause would not die with him.... and that there were incalculable ranks of fighters for someone's cherished goal, is a happiness which other great people did not experience in their lifetime."

Today, under the conditions of developing perestroyka, we can say, with greater justification than ever before, that Lenin's cause is alive, and that the cleansing and renovation of socialism is regaining to this great cause the sympathy and trust of millions of people on earth. This is the best monument to Ilich—the man, the comrade, the people's leader.

Surmounting the difficulties and privations which had befallen us, and retaining our faith in the final triumph of justice and in surmounting the distortion of socialism, the country's toiling masses remained firm supporters of the ideals of the revolution and Lenin's behests. They did not refuse the party they had created that credit of trust which was given to it in October.

It was precisely the party which found within itself the courage and will to raise the question of a radical renovation of society and the liberation from the existing views on socialism, marked by specific conditions, the period of the cult of personality above all. Perestroyka rose the masses to the struggle for getting rid of anything which distorted our social system and hindered the creative possibilities of the people.

Whatever area we choose—economics, the political system, ideology, culture or national relations—so far everywhere we have encountered heaps of problems inherited from the past. As Leninists, we realize that we must not start slashing, that we must patiently unravel the tangle of accumulated problems. It is only by eliminating the very foundations of the trends of the cult that we could deal, once and for all, with the profound consequences of the national drama which afflicted our people and the revolution. This is a gigantic labor which will require our entire willpower and tremendous spiritual and moral strength.

We are returning to our prime sources, we are returning to Lenin, not to the "glossed picture," but to the living Lenin, by reviving the values of the October Revolution and implementing the great principles of freedom, democracy and glasnost, through a radical economic reform, through profound political changes and new approaches to social policy, and through the moral and spiritual healing of society.

Peoples and the State

18020007g Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 49-59

[Article by Valeriy Aleksandrovich Tishkov, doctor of historical sciences, deputy director, Institute of Ethnography imeni N.N. Miklukho-Maklay, USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text] The current views on the state of national relations in the USSR are heterogeneous and, sometimes, conflicting. This is explained not only by the complexity of the situation. In this case we also find a great deal of theoretical confusion and lack of information and knowledge.

It is important not merely to bring to light the reasons or scale of deformations and problems which have accumulated in the area of relations among nationalities but also the main development trends, which combine the specific experience of Soviet reality as well as certain global patterns inherent in the contemporary world, and general trends operating in the social life of multinational states. We believe that this approach makes possible not only a more accurate formulation of steps which would enable us to repay the "notes due" but also better to understand the long-term objectives of politics, and the way to achieve them and to realize the limits of influences which can be applied in the realm of national relations. The resolutions of the 19th Party Conference and the forthcoming CPSU Central Committee Plenum invite us to engage in such a responsible discussion.

On Definitions and Customary Phrases

Let us begin with certain concepts which, with a strictly scientific approach freed from the weight of dogmatic thinking, proved to be by no means clear or adequately reflecting historical and current realities. The popular statement that "more than 100 national and ethnic groups live in the USSR" includes a postulate, which I consider doubtful, of the classification into types of ethnic communities (peoples) based on the three-term "tribe-nationality-nation" formula. Even in its most acceptable stage (or vertical) variant (tribe-preclass standard of social development, ethnic group—prebourgeois, nation—bourgeois and socialist stages of development), this formula contains a great lack of clarity which requires additional scientific interpretation. This makes it even more difficult to agree with the "horizontal" division of contemporary ethnic groups in our country into nations and nationalities, based on a virtually exclusive criterion of the existence or lack of statehood on the level of a Union or autonomous republic. For even based on numerical strength, not to mention internal structures and socioeconomic and cultural characteristics, the essential boundary separating nations and ethnic groups cannot be drawn today. The neutral and generalized terms "nation" and "nationality" in the USSR which, incidentally, may also be found in our programmatic documents, including the Constitution

and the resolutions of the 19th Party Conference, seem today more pertinent and more accurate. These definitions eliminate unnecessary contradictions and puzzlements on the level of the mass consciousness and social practices, when some full citizens in the country must be classified as members of an ethnic community of a lower category than the majority of the population.

But how to treat such a fundamental term as "nation?" I believe that long discussions concerning its content did not turn out to be of little worth accidentally. Our social scientists are still trying to find a new definition to replace the familiar formulation. It may be that we can come out of this theoretical impasse by rejecting the term "nation" in its ethnic significance and retaining the meaning adopted in global scientific literature and international political practices, i.e., that the nation is the totality of citizens of a single state. The United Nations consists not of "ethnonations" (a term which some specialists are now trying to introduce), but nations-states. This is a standard adopted by the majority of the population on earth.

In that case at least one of the three interchangeably used definitions will disappear from our terminological arsenal: nation and ethnicity, nationality and peoples of the USSR, which are now used. The last two concepts would suffice to reflect the true reality of the USSR as a multinational (of multiple nationality) state, without triggering a theoretical lack of clarity and unnecessary complication of categories in the sociopolitical vocabulary. Naturally, this is a matter of tremendous importance, for it pertains to the very core of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the national question, which now needs a creative renovation.

Incidentally, K. Marx never used the term "nation" when it came to a people without statehood or a member of a multinational state. Most frequently, this referred to the formation of a state. To V.I. Lenin, the concept of "nation," "ethnic group," "nationality" and "people" were, in my view, synonymous and he did not engage in particular theoretical elaborations of these concepts. The most important document—"Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia"—uses only the term "people" and "ethnographic group."

Another conceptual anachronism is the classification of citizens living in a republic into "native nation" and "non-native population." The policy in the area of national relations and even some juridical-legal standards were largely structured on the basis of these concepts during that period in the history of society when the problem of surmounting backwardness and equalizing levels of socioeconomic and cultural development was being solved. Despite the superficial neutrality of such concepts, nonetheless they inevitably included judgmental aspects which characterized differences in development levels. This is the only possible explanation of the reason for which these concepts and certain privileges related to them (such as, for example, in the possibility of acquiring a higher education) were not applied to Russians in the RSFSR or to the native Russian population in Kazakhstan.

The experience of governmental policies in developed foreign countries prove that the term "native" or "aboriginal" population or people, applied to peoples which had once fallen behind in their stage development, and which had preserved their traditional economic-cultural nature (Indians, Eskimos and Aleutians in the United States and Canada, Saamy in Norway, Sweden and Finland, etc.). In social science abroad the concept of "native" or "aboriginal" peoples has been used in the same sense, meaning semi-nomad, isolated or other traditionally preserved cultures of peoples and groups of the native population of Asia, Africa, Australia and Oceania which have been assigned a lower social status.

In the USSR, in recent decades, as a result of the narrowing of the gap separating levels of sociocultural development of the peoples, urbanization, and internationalization of culture and way of life and, at the same time, the growth of national self-awareness of big and small nations, the question of the contemporary meaning ascribed to said categories becomes entirely legitimate.

I am convinced that the tasks of democratization of social life and radical restructuring of the economy formulate a trend not toward the further saturation or the more complex utilization in sociopolitical practice of concepts and terms in relations among nationalities but, conversely, toward their simplification, with an emphasis on general civic, all-Union and general republic aspects. In this connection we find regrettable the hasty rejection by some scientists and publicists of the concept of "the Soviet people as a new historical community of people." Although it was formulated in by no means the most fertile time of theoretical research, in my view, it nonetheless reflects a real phenomenon of the development, on the basis of Union statehood, of identical social and cultural conditions of a kind of "metaethnicity," which is a new standard of awareness of affiliation with a broader sociocultural human community. We are no longer simply fellow citizens and members of different peoples but also possessors of an entire set of common features, including linguistic-cultural characteristics, a feeling of commonality of historical destinies, and certain features of sociopolitical behavior, vital concepts and values. Therefore, we can speak of the existence of two standards of self-awareness in the Soviet people: the possibility to consider oneself both a representative of his own ethnic group and of the broader community—the Soviet people.

The newly arising commonality based on a specific statehood is a phenomenon well-known throughout the world. Under our own eyes a new ethnic self-awareness is shaping in the populations of the newly established African countries based on different tribes; new peoples are taking developing in the young countries of the

Caribbean. These are lengthy processes which will take not simply years or even decades to develop; however, the Soviet state has already existed for more than 70 years.

The 'Ethnic Rebirth' Phenomenon

A truly headlong increase in the national self-awareness has taken place in our country, sometimes interpreted as a "new stage in the spiritual maturity of our multinational society and its mastery of socialism, rather than its error or blunder" (KOMMUNIST No 8, 1988, p 23). However, we must realize that in recent years a variety of countries throughout the world, regardless of their geographic location and nature of social system, have experienced, to different extents, this so-called phenomenon of "ethnic rebirth." In Asian, African and Latin American countries, ethnic contradictions emphasize the most pressing social and political problems. In the developed countries with bourgeois democracies, this process is taking place almost exclusively through peaceful forms of political struggle and social movements. However, even there, in frequent cases, it gives priority to social life in its different aspects: ethnoracial (United States), religious (Great Britain), or linguistic (Canada). A complex situation exists in the area of relations among nationalities also in some socialist countries with a polyethnic population structure.

What are the reasons for the global phenomenon of ethnic rebirth? In several or, perhaps, in the majority of cases it is caused by the aspiration to correct historical and sociopolitical injustices which had developed over the long existence of colonial empires, a neocolonialist policy toward many peoples, and discrimination against immigrants and racial and ethnoreligious population groups in multinational states. Another reason is the reaction of ethnocultural communities to some objective processes related to scientific and technical progress, urbanization, and the spreading of equalizing trends in the areas of mass culture and way of life. Converting from the material (housing, clothing, economic activities) to the spiritual area, ethnic and cultural characteristics increasingly became a kind of protective reaction to the alienating and dehumanizing influence of some aspects of contemporary civilization. Nor should we ignore the increasing tension in the world based on competing activities among human societies in the use of life support resources under the conditions of aggravating ecological problems.

In the study of acute situations in the area of national relations in the USSR, we can find manifestations of virtually all the reasons we named. We also have problems of historical and sociopolitical nature which have accumulated and have followed ethnic lines. There also is a reaction to the destructive influence of technological civilization and the modern way of life, particularly tangible in the areas of cultural tradition, historical memory, and erosion of the cultural variety on the basis of frightening entropy laws. The area of relations among nationalities is adversely affected by the sometimes unconsidered intensive economic development of various areas inhabited by peoples which have retained a traditional economy (hunting, fishing, crafts, etc.), as well as limited natural resources and territories in areas where peoples living in close proximity with each other may be found, as consequences of migrations, under conditions of modest material and cultural resources.

The difficult historical legacy of the tsarist "prison of the peoples" and the deformations of socialism in our country only worsened and further aggravated the phenomenon of "ethnic rebirth" in the USSR and, with it, the long-restrained process of democratization of relations among nationalities and the correction of many cases of historical unfairness. The need for profound reforms and reorganization in this area was one of the most important and urgent matters for the Soviet state and the party in the course of perestroyka. The objective of such reforms was not only a broadening of the rights of Union and autonomous republics but also the creation of as favorable conditions as possible for the manifestation and guaranteeing of the specific interests of Soviet citizens, based on their affiliation with one historical-cultural community or another. We must proceed from the fact that the area of relations among nationalities and its internal dynamics and problems in a multinational state are, as is the case with the economic area and the area of sociopolitical relations, a living and constantly changing reality. The social and cultural communities and the awareness of their originality are not something given from the start but something which appears in the course of historical changes and upheavals. The state and the political forces, allied with science, must engage in a constant analysis of this changing situation, including the identification of the factors which trigger "outbreaks" of ethnicity or, conversely, which "cool off" ethnic feelings. Even phenomena and concepts such as "culture" and "traditions" should be interpreted as living phenomena, which appear and disappear and are structured by the people in the course of the interaction between past experience and present reality.

Hence the second most essential initial postulate: an ethnic situation in the country should be considered a confirmation of changes in processes which, at a given historical time in the world as a whole and, in the USSR, under the conditions of perestroyka even more so, are experiencing a stage of their highest intensiveness and require a flexible and considered approach.

Finally, abandoning a uniform concept and the naive faith that it is possible to formulate a single uniform concept which, adopted by scientific circles, would go through the entire process of political decision-making, is quite important in formulating scientific positions. It would be more accurate to acknowledge the possibility and even the necessity of the existence of different alternate views and choices. It would be desirable to retain, despite the different approaches, the individual

responsibility of scientists rather than irresponsible anonymity in the guise of collective hastily drawn up materials on the request of "superiors," the subsequent fate of which, as a rule, becomes unknown. Scientists must be given the opportunity directly to report and substantiate their positions in the course of discussing problems on the highest levels, including, above all, the level of the superior political and legislative authorities.

On the Rights of Peoples

One of the primary rights of peoples in many international documents is the **right to exist.** At the present time there are no grounds for speaking of any whatsoever deliberate threat to the existence of peoples living in the USSR or of coercive actions toward them on the part of the state or of another population group. Genocide and ethnocide (the systematic destruction of the culture of an entire people), which are still so frequently encountered throughout the world, are alien to the nature of socialism, although we must not forget the deformations experienced by our society and the grave consequences of Stalin's coercive actions.

This right includes the acknowledgment by the state of the very fact of existence of one national community or another, supported by national population censuses, in the course of which the ethnic origin of citizens, based on their self-awareness, is defined. Our practice of official "counter" registration of peoples imposes certain restrictions on the manifestation of their will: some small peoples or ethnic groups, which have preserved their historical-cultural and linguistic originality, have been forced, in a number of recent censuses, to classify themselves either as part of the dominant ethnic surrounding or a certain broader new formation.

In itself, the existence of a scientifically drafted list of ethnic groups is necessary in a census. This helps both the citizens and the census takers to make a better qualified decision which would eliminate certain errors related to local-ethnographic or ethnoreligious differences. At the same time, however, it would be expedient, in the course of the 1989 census, to avoid the unnecessary "rigidity" of the list which, in its time, triggered the aspiration to accelerate the process of integration of small ethnic groups within larger ethnic communities.

Another extensively acknowledged right is **the right to self-identification,** i.e., the right of the citizens themselves to determine their national affiliation. The practice of the USSR in establishing nationality in the internal passport, based on the nationality of one of the parents, imposes certain restrictions in the manifestation of the individual's own ethnic self-awareness, and deprives citizens who have lost their clear ethnic affiliation, or with a complex (double or triple) self-awareness. of the possibility of classifying themselves with the broader category of "Soviet" or to indicate a more complex origin. As a rule, in defining ethnic affiliation (or, more accurately, origin) multinational countries allow a multiple answer or else a self-identification on the level of the national community. A citizen of Yugoslavia could classify himself not only as member of one of the ethnic groups living in that country but simply as "Yugoslav;" in the course of the latest census, this was the affiliation indicated by 1.5 million people. In the United States, according to the 1980 census, 12 million citizens were unable to define their ethnic origin based on their predecessors, and described themselves as "American," while more than 80 million indicated a mixed origin.

In our country as well, if the possibility would be granted in the course of the census, in the list of nationalities, to choose the "Soviet" category, clearly, many citizens would consider themselves such. This would apply mainly to the offspring of mixed marriages, particularly children who grew up in families with complex ethnic background or in a foreign ethnic environment. We are familiar with quite a number of examples in which it is difficult for a person to determine what he is in terms of nationality, as is required by our strict rules of internal passport identification or the instructions of the census takers.

To say the least, if the phenomenon of a double ethnic self-awareness could be considered debatable, as some kind of long-range trend, the fact of a complex ethnic origin and, consequently, self-awareness, cannot be disputed. This means that the official acknowledgment of the right of a person to consider himself as not mandatorily belonging to a single ethnic group must be granted. Why could one not be both a Lithuanian and a Belorussian, if one is equally imbued with the culture and language of a Lithuanian mother and a Belorussian father? And what if the offspring of a Lithuanian-Belorussian family has grown up in the area of the new BAM Construction Project, surrounded by Russians and, after reaching maturity, considers himself Russian? Why is that, according to our rules, in obtaining an internal passport, he must register only as Lithuanian or Belorussian? To put it bluntly, this is a practice of defining nationality on the basis of blood. The fact that national self-awareness is a sociocultural concept with which a person is not born but which he acquires in the course of upbringing and socialization of the individual, is axiomatic in contemporary scientific knowledge. It is time to make some of our legal regulations in the realm of national relations consistent with it.

In my view, a profoundly democratic and long overdue step would be a reform in the internal passport system in the USSR, as a result of which the retained practice of the state's determination of the ethnic origin of the citizens would disappear. As a rule, multinational countries have dispensed with such practices. If the Soviet Constitution guarantees the same rights to citizens, regardless of nationality, why and for the sake of what should a citizen "report" his nationality to an innumerable number of officials, from a director to a librarian?

Conversely, more than enough cases could be cited in which such entries in documents have been a reason for violations of rights of the individual or for obtaining undeserved privileges.

The most important right of the peoples is **the right to sovereignty, to self-determination and self-government.** In this connection, we must not fail to recall that for the first time the right to self-determination on the level of state policy was proclaimed and exercised in the course of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The November 1917 "Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia" is, on this level, a document of universal significance, and the creation of a strong multinational Soviet state is a real gain of socialism. Unfortunately, subsequently both the concept itself as well as the practice of guaranteeing the right to self-determination fell behind changing reality.

In a multinational state, by virtue of demographic, migration and economic-cultural processes, as well as a result of the actions of sociopolitical forces and factors, situations may arise which require certain modifications in the administrative-governmental structure. Such structures, obviously, cannot be created "forever:" Otherwise they would threaten to convert into stagnation factors in social progress.

In this case we must take global experience into consideration. Although the nations have aspired and are aspiring to secure their interests by acquiring one or another form of statehood, the principle of the creation of states "based on nationality" (one nation-one state) has not been implemented in history: the overwhelming majority of mankind lives today in multinational countries. Slightly more than 200 governmental structures encompass 3,000 to 4,000 ethnic groups. This indicates that the concept of sovereignty includes, as a rule, a "divided" sovereignty, and that self-determination and self-government do not mandatorily presume the drawing of state borders along those of ethnic territories which, naturally, does not deny the existence of the latter or, incidentally, the possibility for one territory or another to belong not only to one ethnic group but to two or even several, simultaneously.

As to the **right to preservation of cultural originality,** including in the areas of language and education, cultural legacy and national traditions, it would be simply unfair to deny our tremendous gains which have been extensively acknowledged throughout the world, although a great deal of what exists today does not suit us in this area as well, as confirmed by the tempestuous debates, particularly among the creative intelligentsia. The arising interest in various forms of national-cultural autonomy which, at the initial stage of our revolution seemed insufficient in the implementation of radical social changes, could play a positive role in the new historical circumstances. Prime attention must be paid to the linguistic area of the culture of the peoples, on the subject of which the competent view of scientists has already been voiced (see KOMMUNIST No 15, 1988).

Let us add to this that, in addition to constitutional and sociopolitical guarantees, in a number of cases in the USSR, particularly those affecting the small peoples of the North and several other areas, traditional economic activities are an equally important prerequisite for cultural development. Traditional types of economy are experiencing today throughout the world a crisis under the influence of the processes of industrialization, urbanization, intensive industrial development of new territories and implementation of large-scale economic projects. The Soviet Union is no exception. The question is how harmoniously to combine a natural process of modernizing economic life on a national scale with traditional occupations which have still not exhausted their possibilities and which play an important role not only in the preservation of cultural values but also of the physical health and necessary moral and psychological condition of the members of small ethnic groups. The small cooperatives set up by native populations are a viable form of economic organization which takes into consideration both traditional experience and cultural-value orientations throughout the world. The revival of cooperatives in the Soviet Union offers favorable conditions for the development of such forms.

As a result of the intensive economic development of new territories and the aggravation of ecological problems, the question of the **right of the peoples to control the utilization of natural resources and wealth on the territory they inhabit** assumes increasing significance. In a number of countries throughout the world today this problem is assuming priority in sociopolitical life. Suffice it to name areas such as the Amazon, Alaska and the Canadian North in the American Continent. For example, the aboriginal population of the Canadian North has been able to gain certain rights and to participate in solving problems of the implementation of major petroleum and natural gas or hydraulic power projects. In a number of cases problems were solved through monetary compensations and by setting aside special areas where priority was given in the use of resources to the native populations (the hydraulic power complexes of James Bay).

In the USSR, even despite the fact that the land and means of production are national property and the existence of a nationwide economic organism, this question is being increasingly raised. In order to avoid aggravations of the situation in this area, we must above all engage in a more scrupulous scientific work on economic projects, including the study of public opinion, specific requirements and needs, and make a thorough expert evaluation of the anthropogenic influence on nature. In my view, we should consider not only certain withholdings from profits earned from the resources which have been used to meet the needs of the contemporary development of the local population and its

participation in controlling the economic activities of departments, but also the enactment of strict penalties and compensations if significant harm is caused to the economy and culture of the ethnic groups. In a number of countries extensive national park-reservations are set-up in areas with a brittle ecological balance and extreme natural conditions, where aborigines living on state land are granted the exclusive right to engage in economic activities. In the Northern areas of the USSR the establishment of such reservations would be expedient as well.

Despite the intensive debates, in my view one of the most important aspects in the life of contemporary nations has still not drawn proper attention. It is **the right of nations to access to the achievements of world civilization and their use.**

The idea of maintaining cultural "reservations" and of "happy primitivism" has long become compromised throughout the world, although it still has supporters among scientists, politicians and representatives of business circles. It is above all the people themselves who are trying to organize the system of their life support on the basis of the most efficient forms of production activities, and to achieve the highest possible level of material existence with the help of the latest achievements and benefits of contemporary civilization. The adaptive possibilities of nations, even those which until very recently had reached only the early stages in their historical evolution, are truly amazing. This is confirmed by examples of the quick assimilation with the age of electronics of former Bedouin nomads in the Arab emirates and the use of computer communications by the population of even most remote Eskimo communities of the American North and by many other ethnic groups, in the second half of the 20th century.

One can and must be proud of the deep historical roots of one's nation, despite the fact that when in 1976 the Americans were celebrating the bicentennial of their statehood, the USSR was celebrating the 200th anniversary of the Bolshoy Theater. However, we must also remember that the overwhelming majority of contemporary Americans do not have to live even a single day without sewers and central water supplies, forced to stoke their furnace or draw water from wells as, to this day, the population of Russian villages and in a number of small or even large cities, are forced to do.

In today's world the prestige of a nation and the foundation for a good social pride of its representatives as well as patriotism no longer depend exclusively on size of population or territory or depth of roots. They exist, above all, in contemporary achievements and the ability to ensure a worthy life. The patriotism and clearly manifested self-awareness of the Japanese and their international prestige are based not only on respect for and preservation of traditional culture but also the universal acknowledgment of the tremendous accomplishments of that nation in the areas of technology, business and science.

By rebuilding temples and strengthening national languages without mastering the complexities of the information industry and robot technology, returning to the land but still using the scythe, and having strengthened the family foundations as the economic-production unit without, however, ensuring a thorough ultrasonic medical examination of pregnant women, and without lowering the level of infant mortality and ensuring a comprehensively accessible rich variety of food, could the big and small nations in our country retain the feeling of pride in their culture and feel themselves quite confident within the global community of the people of the 21st century?

Imperatives of a Multinational State

To what extent are the state system of the USSR, legal practices, political concepts and ideological views on problems of statehood consistent with the contemporary realities of the Soviet Federation and the requirements of further progress? Above all, in my view, we are retaining a limited understanding of socialist federalism. It is considered that the "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was established as a result of the free self-determination of nations, on the basis of the principle of socialist federalism, i.e., of national-territorial principles, and the principles of voluntary unification and equality among the subjects of the federation," and the fact that "within the USSR there are no geographic areas or administrative units but national states" is accepted as a socialist principle of the Soviet Federation ("Konstitutsiya SSSR. Politiko-Pravovoy Kommentariy" [Constitution of the USSR. Political-Legal Commentary]. Moscow, 1982, pp 207-208). Correspondingly, the title of that section in the Constitution was changed: the words "state structure" (1968) became "national-state structure," which, strictly speaking, marks the absence in a Union state-federation of administrative divisions (the divisions are in the Union republics which have the corresponding sections in their own Constitution), for subjects of the federation are 15 "national states."

Not to mention the fact that this very concept as applicable to Union republics is inaccurate, for they are multinational in their composition, the principle of socialist federalism is poorly correlated with the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state, with world practices in federalism and our own past experience. In his work "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State," F. Engels emphasized that the state is distinct from the old tribal organization by the "division of subordinate states on the basis of **territory**" (K. Marx and F. Engels, Soch. [Works], vol 21, p 170).

This characterization has been preserved so far by virtually all countries in the world, the large ones in particular, including those based on federation principles. There are no reasons to consider the territorial-geographic division of a federal state a principle applicable only to bourgeois federations, pitting it against national-state division as a principle of socialist federalism.

In the majority of cases, states set up as federations, among the many dozen multinational states existing today, are administrative-territorial units (provinces, states, cantons and others) which, as a rule, take into consideration the national structure of the population. Such is the case with small Switzerland and huge India, whose racial, ethnic and religious structure of the population is no less varied than that of the USSR. Nonetheless, the main factor which influences the administrative-territorial division of a state, is usually that of economic relations. Even the states themselves, in addition to everything else, appear and exist in order to achieve the possibly most successful organization of production activities in this social community, which is the main prerequisite for human material existence. It is no accident that in formulating the purposes for which the USSR was founded, in its "Declaration on the Founding of the USSR" they were defined as "ensuring external safety" (an entirely understandable priority for the first socialist state under the conditions of a hostile encirclement), "internal economic prosperity," "freedom of national development," etc. Nothing was said on this matter in the 1936 USSR Constitution. Article 70 of the 1977 Constitution stipulated, in a very general form, that the USSR "rallies all nations and nationalities with a view to the joint building of communism."

If our objective is to create a society which can ensure the best possible conditions for the social existence of its members on the basis of the most advanced forms of labor and democratic structure, it would be difficult to coordinate this objective with absolutizing the status of some of its constituent ethnic units. To say the least, the contemporary world does not know of a case in which any major multinational state has been able to achieve striking successes in its development based on the fact that its ethnic groups have dispersed their "ethnic apartments." Efficient economic ties and industrial complexes are structured above all in accordance with climate, resources, markets, and socioeconomic factors, rather than a consideration of prestige orientations toward the creation of a "national working class" or a homogeneous social structure of Soviet nations. Such homogeneousness should, in the final account, be attained not by a deliberate establishment of diversified economies within national-state formations (should all republics organize the production of computers!), but the high mobility of members of all nationalities. Without such population mobility and the readiness of any specialist, regardless of ethnic origin, to change his place of residence in the interest of the better application of his professional possibilities, we shall be unable to create a highly efficient economy. It would be even more difficult to combine the organization of a contemporary highly efficient production with the economic autarchy of "national states." It is entirely possible that the latter could pull the economy out of its state of crisis in a number of areas (republics) but also, subsequently, become an obstruction to development.

I consider equally unconvincing the idea that in our country there are territorial communities such as, for example, Gorkiy Oblast, "whose function is the reproduction of man, and republic territories (ethnic territories) the purpose of which, furthermore, is the reproduction of national culture and, therefore, of ethnic groups" (KOMMUNIST No 15, 1988, p 30). Gorkiy Oblast is inhabited not simply by "people" but primarily by a Russian population which also needs to reproduce its own national culture. The choice of "national states" as subjects of a federation narrows, for a variety of reasons, the concept of the sovereignty of the all-Union state. It is difficult to agree that the single word "united," which was added to the text of the 1977 Constitution, in defining our state, (Article 70) is quite adequate in strengthening the Union principles of our state. On the constitutional level all-Union sovereignty is expressed in the USSR less strongly than in many other countries. We have been deprived of a powerful consolidating principle, such as the idea of a single nation, although today it would be difficult to find a state in which it is not considered that "the nation" is the object of sovereignty. We are well familiar, for example, with the fact that in Spain, for example, there are a minimum of four large ethnic groups; there are dozens in India; nonetheless, there also are concepts such as the "Spanish nation" or the "Indian nation," the integral nature of which is manifested by the state. It is accepted to believe that a "Soviet nation" does not exist but that the USSR is a state expressing the sovereignty of the Soviet people. Yet, as we pointed out, not everything is as it should be in terms of understanding the concept of the unity and integrity of the latter in our country.

In the course of its existence, the unity of our Union was founded less on constitutional-legal principles but on different principles which were even paradoxically opposite. On the one hand, it meant the faith of the people in the socialist ideal and the power and monolithic unity of the political system represented, above all, by the ruling party. On the other, it meant limiting democracy and manifestation of will under the conditions of the command-administrative system, which reached totalitarian forms of power. In the process of democratization of social life strengthening the constitutional-legal foundations of all-Union sovereignty becomes an exceptionally topical task.

Therefore, the general line in ensuring the national development of the component association of ethnic communities should be that of ensuring the rights of the nations, on the state level, codified in the Constitution

or, possibly, a new "Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of the USSR." However, securing such rights through the development and strengthening of individual rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens is even more important. It is only through the exercise of such rights that we can create in the country a situation in which every citizen, regardless of ethnic origin, will feel perfectly at home in any corner of the Soviet Union.

A high material living standard and harmonious social developments as well as true democracy are the reliable and long-term foundation for the preservation and development of the cultural variety of the peoples of our country.

Unexpurgated Social Dialectics

18020007h Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 60-71

[Article by Yuriy Ivanovich Sidorenko, candidate of philosophical sciences, docent, Karavayevo Agricultural Institute, Kostroma]

[Text] One of the main tasks of the social sciences, philosophy above all, is the formulation of a new integral theory of development of socialism, which would be consistent with its true nature and would take into consideration the experience gained from both past achievements and errors. An important prerequisite in this case is a return to the social philosophy of real dialectics of social progress, in its entirety and contradictoriness. Marxism interprets social dynamics as a natural historical process. Each one of its stages takes place, in this sense, as an objective, a necessary and self-determining step in the development of mankind. This process, however, considered in its entirety, is significantly more complex than is most frequently depicted.

The idea of existence of objective-historical laws was embodied most adequately in the theory of the determining role of public production. It is precisely its development that ensures the progressive changes in the basic sociohistorical forms of human communities. Thus, for example, thanks to the growth of production forces, despite its entire initial spontaneous nature and lack of planning, historically, capitalist society naturally grew out of feudalism. In accordance with this type of understanding, "latter" capitalism should also become an arena for the establishment of socialism, in the economically most developed countries above all. If these expectations are not met or else are not met under conditions of total consistency with "classical Marxism," the fault is in the simplistic concepts on the course of global social developments, the nature of society and the role played by man in it.

If considered not abstractly and not extremely schematically, sociohistorical development is by no means reduced to purely economic factors. This was frequently pointed out by the Marxist classics (Engels and Lenin in particular). This became even more obvious toward the end of our own century. Indeed, the live historical process is extremely saturated not only with economic but also with political, social, ethnic, religious and other contradictions. Clashes among most varied ideological, philosophical, ethical and other theories and schools take place uninterruptedly. Authoritarian and democratic regimes, left and right-wing trends, parties, social groups and individuals clash and intertwine. The revelations and judgments of contemporary science are becoming increasingly haughty and imperative. Physical or biological fragments of the sciences alone could throw mankind into totally unpredictable spirals of existence and nonexistence. Many traditional contradictions within society are reaching a new level while others are assuming second priority, and others again are being restructured. Global phenomena, such as raw material hunger, economic problems, the "demographic explosion" and others have largely reshaped the nature of man and the future of mankind.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that it is necessary to take these factors as autonomously acting and self-sufficient not only in the study of any given historical period but also in the consideration of all the trends and prospects of mankind as a whole. Despite its entire importance to the life of society, economics does not produce either science or morality, philosophy or art. To a greater or lesser extent all it does is to define the type of such phenomena which have the proper reasons and grounds of existence and their own content and laws.

A social theory becomes truly complete only when it encompasses the reciprocally determined dialectics of all aspects of human life, the value and significance of which substantially change within the universal totality of events. Mechanically dividing the lives of people into social life and social consciousness could turn man into nothing but a sort of sociological center with a huge necessary "material" body and a small inappropriate head.

Let us shift this viewpoint even further: the production process is the most important element in life. However, even in the past, in the course of history, by no means was every person engaged in production. Today a huge number of people do not take direct part at all in the material production process in the strict meaning of the term (educators, physicians, lawyers, men of art and culture, scientists, people employed in the service industry, etc.). The number of people engaged in production in the future will decline even further (which is not only a criterion of increased labor productivity but also of social progress as a whole). Marx accepted the fact that, in principle, man may find himself outside the direct production process. This does not eliminate in the least the significance of the latter in human life but requires

an even deeper philosophical approach to its role and, particularly, to the role of science in the historical self-realizing of man. For man is acting ever more actively and vividly as the main productive force not as a result of the activities of his hands but the efforts of his mind. Suffice it to recall the type of qualitative changes in his entire cognitive work which were put on the agenda by contemporary science. This involves the use of essentially new types of raw materials and energy resources, new information standards for the development of the world and the mass application of control and building functions of electronic systems, the genebiological correction of organisms, and so on, all the way to the tragedy of a nuclear crematorium for all mankind.

These actual or presumed interweavings of previously unknown global factors could, in principle, change the aspect of mankind no less profoundly and extensively than would a social revolution in one country or another or even the conversion of an entire society to a new system. Mankind finds itself in an entirely new chain of cause and effect relations, the interpretation of which requires new starting points and broader foundations. The traditional explanation of all phenomena as the interaction between production forces and production relations turns out to be a rather narrow yardstick and is faulty because of its excessive distance from real events Our science is as yet to determine the historical significance of a number of new social, natural and biological phenomena in the destinies of mankind. It is already clear, however, that in both actual history and in the philosophy of history, in order not to lose the thread of research in the entire foreseeable forward (and backward) biography of mankind, we must single out some related and permanently acting factors in their inherent evolution. Such related and permanent factors in all human history and a key to understanding of its dynamics and trend are found only in **man** himself or, rather, **his needs which determine all types and forms of his relations with the surrounding world and with other people, and the entire integral process of man's self-realization.**

In formulating the basic postulates of the materialist understanding of history, Marxism emphasizes that before engaging in politics, science, art, religion, and so on, the people "must eat, drink, have a shelter and clothing" (K. Marx and F. Engels, Soch. [Works], vol 19, p 350). The consideration of these needs made it possible to identify the role of the production of material goods in the development of man and human society.

However, at the same time, not all needs were properly studied and assessed. Along with basic need for food, drink, and so on, equally necessary are the need for other people (as such), and for establishing a certain organization of social behavior and relations with other individuals. As is now obvious, without contact with others, man either perishes or loses his mind as irreversibly as finding himself in a desert without water. The impossibility of meeting the need for freedom, security, information, recognition, and so on, may affect the individual no less destructively than the lack of clothing or housing. It is no accident that in the struggle for freedom both individuals and nations are willing to make the greatest possible sacrifices. The tie linking one person with another is programmed within his very social nature. This is not a simple contact of reciprocal contemplation but a most important aspect of life, a complex system of actions, the profound inner meaning and laws of which are only now beginning to be actually taken into consideration in contemporary science.

It is precisely man, with his entire attitude toward the world (needs, above all) who is the main and only hero of history. Therefore, the logic of universal history and the meaning and consistency of the condition of society should be sought only in man and in his relations with nature and with other people. It is not an impersonal "nation" that is the creator and bearer of history but **every person separately and all men together.** A truncated, half-way dialectics is more dangerous in this area than any metaphysics.

One of the enduring views in our social philosophy is absolutizing the **interruption,** the gradual nature of the historical process. We keep emphasizing that each subsequent formation comes with an entirely new type of production relations, superstructure, and so on. Such absolutizing reached its peak in assessing the capitalist and socialist production methods. Methodologically, however, this is only one aspect of the historical process.

Another and even more important component of the real dialectics of history is its **unity, continuity and interrupted nature,** which act as a self-revelation of the nature of man in the course of its development. In terms of this continuous social development, which is necessary in order to ensure the true development of history, the significance of all other historical phenomena declines. They are always of a lesser scale. This must not be forgotten, for otherwise, let us say, a change in socioeconomic systems would be presented as some kind of faults in the basic foundations of the existence of mankind, and leaps in human nature reaching almost to the point of appearance of a new breed of people. In fact, however, this is only a new way of life **on the scale of human life,** a new type of organization and satisfaction of those same needs. Preserved in the new formation are production forces, the social structures and relations needed by any civilized society and all anthropological manifestations of man—physiological, psychological and emotional (love, hatred, loyalty, jealousy, envy, and so on), morality, politics, law, the family, forms of art, educational institutions and physical culture: these are all basic universal objectives and values although, naturally, using different starting points, assuming different forms and yielding different results.

The single and truly human history is not simply a chain of systems replacing each other but the history of man himself, his appearance on the historical "stage" of systems. General historical (or, more accurately, universal human) phenomena have always existed and developed. They have always been inherent in man as such, at all stages of his historical self-realization, and acquire a more or less clear manifestation in one system or another. Metaphorically speaking, the growing social organism (the **content** of the historical process) "tries on" various systems (**forms**) and, having "worn one out" replaces it with another. Although growing and changing, the organism nonetheless remains the same.

What is the result of understanding the unity and continuity of human history as a necessary element of existence and progress, and as a natural objective overall manifestation of all aspects of life of human society, against the background of which there is a change in means of production, ownership relations and revolutions (social, scientific, technical, etc.)? Above all, this makes it possible more accurately to explain history itself and the place of different social phenomena in social life, and to answer a number of topical problems of contemporary development. Let us briefly consider this by taking the example of replacing capitalism with socialism.

The historical movement of society toward socialism is not a one-sided and one-dimensional process which depends only on a narrowly understood economic progress. The factors and relations here are much deeper. As Engels noted, "what is inaccurate in a formal-economic context could be accurate in a universal-historical context" (op. cit., vol 21, p 184). It is not only economic upsurge but the development of society as a whole that leads to socialism. According to Marx, in the struggle for its victory "the working class is faced not with the need to attain some sort of ideal but merely to give scope to the elements of the new society which have already been developing within the old bourgeois society, which is self-destroying" (op. cit., vol 17, p 347). As Lenin wrote, under the conditions of capitalism "communism 'stems' decisively from all aspects of social life" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 41, p 86). At a given stage society as a whole is ready to convert to socialism, although the extent of maturity of areas and aspects of the social organism may show substantial differences. The socialist revolutions of the 20th century, which took place in Russia, China and a number of other countries, were based not on highly developed production forces but on the overall readiness for revolution, displayed by such countries. In other words, in accordance with the concepts of the classics of socialism (phenomena inherent in socialism) appear (and exist) already within capitalism. Roughly speaking, one could only cut off the elements of the old bourgeois society and give scope to the elements of the new. This is a very important aspect which is quite frequently ignored.

The idea of socialism itself was discovered by the early utopian socialists at the start of the 16th century, long before the first bourgeois revolutions and the scientific interpretation of socialism provided by Marx and Engels. Individual socialist concepts had been formulated, one way or another, in the course of virtually all broad popular movements of the past and in the conjectures and insights of the progressive philosophers at different times and in different countries. At the turn of the 19th century the utopian socialists, Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen, above all, anticipated the actual basic ideas of socialism concerning the role of economics, forms of ownership and class struggle in history, the elimination of private ownership and the exploitation of man by man, and the need for mandatory productive labor for all members of society and for a planned organization of production. They raised the question of the need for universal peace, the liberation of women, surmounting of the contradictions between town and country and between mental and physical labor, etc.

Obviously, the socialist doctrines are the product not simply of purely pragmatic conclusions based on the specific contradictions within the capitalist system but the result of an overall spiritual maturing of mankind. The political, social and moral quests of society lead to the ideas and practices of socialism as the best, the fairest and the most morally justified system of social relations.

The unity and continuity of the historical process are expressed in both the corresponding historical-chronological sequence of events as well as in a certain meaningful homogeneity of social phenomena. In approaching them from the viewpoint of the real historical scale, we must not forget that capitalism and socialism are not only historically "neighbors" but also reciprocally determine each other, as two aspects of a single contradiction. There was nothing exceptional or "suprahistorical" in the appearance of socialism. It is a society which not simply replaces capitalism but also directly stems from it. This was pointed out by Marx and, particularly, Lenin. For example, in his work "The State and Revolution," Lenin emphasized that under socialist conditions bourgeois law is retained and so is even the "bourgeois state, without the bourgeoisie!" (op. cit., vol 33, p 99).

The coexistence of socialism with capitalism is a legitimate, a historically necessary and inevitable form of maturing of the new on the basis and replacement of and within the old. Strange though it might seem, the idea of peaceful coexistence began to be interpreted simply as a pause in the open class struggle or only as a special form of class confrontation. The mandatory element of cooperation and a certain reciprocal enrichment (scientific, cultural, technological, etc.) as an element of active coexistence simply vanished from our understanding for a long period of time.

We are now approaching the same problem from another side, from the side of the global contradictions of our age and universal human destiny. Even children realize today that in the face of the growing planetary crises

mankind must act jointly, together. Capitalism and socialism are, according to the logic of history, two consecutive steps in the historical ascent. In the specific history of our time, however, they are levels within the same sociohistorical age. Persistently emphasizing only that which divides them and the aspiration to do "the opposite" in everything means forgetting the universal human (main) structural elements of the historical process.

Let us recall the scale on which the Marxist classics approached history. Constantly emphasizing that the proletariat is the main striking force in the revolutionary reorganization of capitalism into socialism, Lenin nonetheless deemed it necessary to point out that "...From the viewpoint of the basic Marxist ideas, the interests of social development are superior to the interests of the proletariat..." (op. cit., vol 4, p 220). "On the basis of its principle," Engels wrote, "communism stands above the hostility between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; it acknowledges only its historical significance to the present but rejects its need for the future; its precise objective is to eliminate this hostility. As long as this hostility exists, communism will consider the hatred of the proletariat directed against its enslavers a necessity, as the most important instrument for the **beginning** labor movement; however, communism goes beyond this hatred, for it is a matter not affecting the workers alone but all mankind" (op. cit., vol 2, p 516).

The method of the "turned around binoculars," used in any assessment made until recently, according to which everything is good under socialism (since it is socialism) while everything is bad under capitalism (since it is capitalism) caused a great deal of harm. It artificially exaggerated the contradictions between socialism and capitalism. It set up a double bookkeeping system in politics, morality and art and in all human relations. It harmed the economic and social development of socialism and the global community.

The thinking on which now international and, naturally, domestic policy is based, stems precisely from the understanding of the commonality of human destinies or, rather, the single fate of mankind. It is a new thinking or, rather, a new level of thinking, leading from the general to the specific and from the global to the national. It is necessarily expanded by an approach from the universal to the class factor and from the general historical to the specific-historical, the formative aspect.

Capitalism is an important stage in the development of human society. It makes possible the tremendous growth of production forces, sets up important political, legal and social institutions and gives a certain scope to various types of social, humanistic and passifistic movements. Compared to feudalism, it marks a tremendous leap in the democratization of society. The place and significance of capitalism or, rather, the cycle of sociohistorical development of mankind within the framework of capitalism, cannot be reduced merely to negative results. This is simply nondialectical. It breaks up the single history of mankind, depriving the peoples of their positive gains at all the stages of social life.

Socialism is more progressive not only because it destroys exploitation, i.e., because it does a negative work (although it is historically necessary) but because it ensures greater opportunities for the consolidation of all positive universal human principles in the life of individuals and society. It is historically necessary because it is more consistent with the needs of developing mankind.

Any truly historical process is a self-organizing, self-tuning, and self-developing social phenomenon generated within itself. Unfortunately, in our philosophical literature virtually no attention has been paid to the processes of social self-organization.

Self-organization is a mandatory feature (a foundation) of any objectively necessary and legitimately arising social system and a natural historical condition of any historically real society. Ideally, a self-organizing system is a system which ensures development (self-realization) through the systematic establishment of basic elements which are internally inherent in said system. Without additional outside influence, the "supporting" fundamental characteristics which form such qualities must be organically manifested. Such a system exists and strengthens on the basis of its internal potential. Its structure and correlation among parts (subsystems) are dynamic but internally balanced. In terms of other similar systems and systems of a more general order, it is an autonomous and stable system.

If we extend these general characteristics of social self-organization to the contemporary stage in the development of socialism in our country, the conclusion must be drawn that the majority of system-forming processes—economic, social, political, etc.—are still far from the stage of self-organization. They do not develop spontaneously "out of themselves;" they do not establish their own shape in the course of their internal self-development. The need for an external influence (unrelated to the very nature of a given process, such as management, control, centralized planning, and so on) is frequently taken as a special advantage of socialism. However, this precisely confirms the social infantilism, the specific "infant disease" in the development of many phenomena. In the final account, it is precisely this that led to the command-administrative management methods whose essence is mistrust of the objectively developing forms of social life.

Naturally, self-organization is by no means a spontaneous, an anarchic process. Also mandatory to it are management, control, plan and organizational structures. The entire matter, however, is that they must proceed from the inner, the "natural" logic of the process itself and not be imposed on it from the outside by any whatsoever bureaucratic mechanism.

The situation of our villages is a typical example of the violation of the principle of self-organization. Long and expensive efforts aimed at increasing agricultural production are still not yielding expected results above all because one of the basic principles of self-organization—control and handling of personal and group labor and ownership which must be achieved by the working people themselves—has been violated and cannot be restored at all through the relationship with the producers and the production cooperative. The state, as an agent, deprived of the right of noneconomic coercion, shapes economic relations with the owners of private and cooperative ownership as an equal. Although it is an element of the economic mechanism of the state, cooperative ownership is not state ownership. Accounts are settled with the state, represented by its various economic and production structures which supply the cooperatives with equipment, fertilizers, specialists, scientific developments, and so on, on the basis of a share participation, with the payment of the proper taxes, and so on.

Actually, this was the principle on which Lenin's idea of the cooperative was founded. However, numerous violations of this principle in the past turned the kolkhozes (not to mention the types of production, marketing and other cooperatives which "hindered" the development of socialism and were closed down) into a simple appendix of the centralized state economic mechanism, thus depriving them of their true essence.

The entire logic of economic relations in the countryside should be structured as a system of real (rather than bureaucratic) dependencies: from production and the producer it must go upward, based on the labor of the workers and not the managing authorities (something which is beginning to be applied in the forms of leasing and contracting). This principle, applied systematically in the entire existing cooperative system, including the present type of kolkhozes, could be used either as a supplement or as a development of the Leninist understanding of the cooperative, which was largely distorted in the 1920s and 1930s and later. This could and should constitute the second stage of a true, efficient, socialist cooperativization of agriculture.

The same is obvious in the case of industry, where ministries provide less help to production than hindrance. Ministries should perform only the functions which are needed by the production process (information, coordination, combination of efforts for one tactical objective or another by individual collectives, scientific research, etc.). In other words, the ministries should be a function of the production process and not vice versa.

The is even more obvious in the case of the soviets, which must become the most outstanding manifestation of people's self-rule and the fullest possible embodiment of the universal idea of socialism. Deprived of real power, they frequently perform purely formal functions. At the present stage, the slogan "more socialism!" means, above all, granting the soviets full social organizing functions.

One of the errors of the past was that the masses alone and only socially vast processes in social relations and in economics were considered subject as well as object of sociopolitical control, rather than the individual, as the true bearer of such relations. Theory virtually ignored the individual. The emphasis on the "people," or "working people" was considered "socialist," while emphasis on personality and individuality was considered almost "capitalist," although even the secondary school course in dialectics stipulated that the general exists only through the individual and the specific. It is precisely man, as he identifies his potential, objective and needs, who shapes the production process, social relations and history, and not vice versa.

The difference here is conceptual: man is considered as either means or target. For example, are we building a happy future only for those who will live in it or do we too have the right to happiness and prosperity? In the final account, the wisdom of a social policy is reduced to the ability to ensure a daily harmony in the age-old problem of man: to live for himself or for society, without sacrificing the lasting values of either. The unwillingness (or inability) properly to achieve this harmony has constantly triggered clashes between "high" policy and the true interests and demands of the people.

History studied essentially popular movements, uprisings and revolutions. All social phenomena, past, present and future were explained exclusively in terms of the class struggle. All social sciences were indiscriminately politicized, including philosophy and political economy. It was thanks to this that the latter, in particular, became so alienated from actual economics that for dozens of years it was totally unable to find a proper place for the manifestation of the law of value under socialism.

The real dialectics of the individual remained practically unstudied by ethicists, sociologists or psychologists. The rich, earthy and conflicting individual abandoned literature and the arts. Familiar exclusively with abstract "training units," pedagogy led to a crisis in education. Youth organizations, including the Komsomol, endlessly concocting some kind of mythological "hero of our days," which could only struggle (regardless of with whom and for what) largely lost the trust of young minds and hearts. All phenomena of the so-called human spirit were virtually ignored. Man became the slave of his material nature (or, which is one and the same, the economic relations within society). One of the variants of vulgar materialism was being promoted under the guise of historical materialism in explaining man.

Lofty and base feelings, passions, and attractions, which could not be explained on the basis of the need to eat and drink and which did not proceed from social origin or

perform a role of production force in man were classified as "ideal," thereby undeserving of attention, although the entire real history of mankind (including our recent history) kept confirming that the thirst for power, ambition, fear and other manifestations of human nature could also determine the fate of an individual and the fate of entire classes and countries. Individual morality—the "secret and source" of real human actions—was not studied, since man was the "sum of all social relations" and nothing else. Ethics itself considered the individual simply as one of the functions of society. That is why, in particular, we are short today of purposeful and noble characters capable of self-denial and moral exploits. We have a significantly larger number of lazy consumers and sterile deniers, bored "lumpen-intellectuals" and time servers. Our social sciences and social philosophy, including those which "stubbornly ignored" the individual, greatly contributed to the present lack of spirituality, esthetic narrow-mindedness and social infantilism of a large number of young people. Drunkenness and drug addition and crime of all kinds (particularly among youth), the break-up of a number of families, neglected children of prosperous parents, and so on, are other side products of raising thoughtless consumers of "panem et circenses." For children are not only our future but, which is much more accurate, our past as well.

The success of perestroyka and the enhancement of socialism on a new level can be achieved only by a live personality, who can do everything, with its real problems and contradictions and real needs and interests. One of these interests is something which was considered for many decades as an almost typically bourgeois phenomenon: the economic interest of the individual. Marx and Engels emphasized that " **'The idea'** invariably disgraced itself the moment it was separated from 'interest'" (op. cit., vol 2, p 89). "No one can do anything without, at the same time, meeting his own needs..." (op. cit., vol 3, p 245). According to Lenin's familiar concept, the new society must be based on "the personal interest, personal involvement and cost accounting" (op. cit., vol 44, p 151). Although it may have seemed that everything is clear in this area, so far it is the socialist nature of individual economic interests that has been considered most questionable in the eyes of a great number of participants in public debates.

Personal interest in the broad meaning of the term is a booster of historical progress. As a form of psychological awareness of its social status, it lies at the base of the class struggle. The masses go to a revolution on the basis of personal interest. They also build communism on the basis of their personal interest (including economic) and not because they acknowledge, on a purely rational basis, the more progressive nature of such a society.

Socialism means not only "from each according to his capabilities" but also, in the specific meaning of the term, "to each according to his capabilities," according to the real contribution which the individual makes, and the interests (needs) which he formulates to society and which he ensures through his efforts, talent and human qualities. If someone wants a great deal he should have the possibility to work a great deal (it would be extremely stupid to prevent a person from working). All society must do is see to it that the satisfaction of legitimate economic interests of the individual to live better would not hinder the same interests in others. Under socialist conditions it is not only the concept that the well-being of society means the well-being of everyone that is true, but the reverse as well: the well-being of the individual is a particle of the well-being of all.

The principle of equal distribution of income, which has been formulated as the main slogan in virtually all popular uprisings in past centuries, does not have a positive socioeconomic meaning. It works as a political slogan only in the initial stages of the movement. "Equalization" has never been a slogan of scientific socialism. The aspiration to make all people the same, which bourgeois ideologues ascribed to socialism, has always been considered by the classics of Marxism as an attack against the very foundations of their outlook (see, for example, Marx's "Critique of the Gotha Program," V.I. Lenin's "The State and Revolution," and other works). The principle of "equally for everyone" is a slogan of petit bourgeois egalitarianism and not of socialism. The socialist principle of equal wages for equal labor is by no means an implication that all people should earn equally. If there are those who can work more or better they should also earn more for their labor.

As historical experience in building socialism in different countries indicates, the principle of equalization of income cannot be used as a long-term foundation for economic policy. The principle of self-organization of social life under socialist conditions presumes the mandatory identification and stimulation of all capabilities in man, including his desire and capability of improving his well-being through various forms of socially useful labor.

Naturally, differentiation in income inevitably triggers social differentiation. In the immediate future there will be a variety of different rates of growth of prosperity among individual population strata. "Differences in wealth," Lenin emphasized, will remain in the first phase of communism (see op. cit., vol 33, p 93). However, this does not conflict with the basic objectives of socialism. To begin with, by ensuring for itself a higher standard of economic well-being as a result of a more efficient (or longer) labor, the most active and efficient segment of the population also makes the most significant contribution to the progress of the entire society. The virtually inevitable distortions under the conditions of a scarcity of goods and services—speculative high prices, falsifying the quality of commodities, etc.—would, in this case, gradually be reduced to naught in the process of a general improvement of the country's financial and economic mechanism. Secondly, differences in the living standard will not be the result of participating

in the "shady" economy or the "gray" market but only the result of differences in individual labor contributions (which is particularly important from the viewpoint of socialist morality). In this sense as well there will be socially approved forms of material incentives for improved, more intensive, better quality work, more needed by society. Third, a certain hierarchy of well-being will constitute a clear incentive for the activities of working people who are still not working well and, consequently, do not have a high income. Fourth, under socialist conditions money cannot become capital and used for exploitative purposes. The currently appearing differentiation in incomes (even by dozens of times) is only a means of acceleration of socioeconomic development and not its objective. From the viewpoint of the basic tasks of socialism, this will be nothing but a specific form of a gradual lifting of all remaining categories of the population to the level of the vanguard group.

The development of democracy—social dialectics in action—is the most important aspect in the self-organization of our society. In the past one of the most obvious prerequisites for stagnation was the various forms of violations and restrictions of democracy. Lenin's fundamental concepts of class and primacy of politics over economics and party-mindedness were interpreted one-sidedly and distortedly. The principle of democratic centralism began to manifest itself as "democracy through the center." Applied to all aspects of life—economics, politics, science, culture, and so on—it could not fail to lead to the distortion of the entire system of social relations and to a profound decline in social initiative, without which any system will dry up at the roots. Society began to be identified with the state, something against which Marx himself constantly cautioned (see, for example, "Critique of the Gotha Program"). It was not only real social processes which developed but so did their huge bureaucratic superstructure.

The principle of self-organization, i.e., that of natural historical development and real social dialectics, presumes the mandatory and total interaction among all the elements of society in their dynamics, conflicts and struggle. In defining some features of dialectics, V.I. Lenin quite accurately named those of which characterize the processes of social self-organization: "...Internal impetus toward development, leading to contradictions and clashes among different forces and trends acting... within a given society; interdependence and closest possible and unbreakable ties among **all** aspects of each phenomenon (history brings to light ever new aspects of it), relations which provide a single and legitimate global process of motion..." (op. cit., vol 26, p 55).

Ever since it appeared, democracy as always been (even when it was violated) a sociopolitical manifestation of the historical content of a given system. If we were to define the potential of our system briefly, we could say that socialism is the fullest possible democracy in everything—economics, politics, social relations, and so on. As we know, socialism without democracy leads to political paralysis, to self-liquidation. The socially significant life of society (as well as the individuals which form it) is possible only in the form of true popular rule—the free socially justified exercise of a sensible and willful activity of the individual. The historical leap which must be made by our country is impossible without an upsurge of social enthusiasm, internal release of the spirit, faith in one's dignity and possibilities, and confidence in the future, i.e., a social atmosphere which can be created only by democracy in its fullest possible manifestation.

The specific manifestations of the further restoration and development of socialist democracy, as confirmed by the live practices of perestroyka, should affect virtually all aspects and levels of our life: political and social structures, economics, activities of the party, the soviets and the public organizations, the practice of molding public opinion and social intercourse, ideology and social psychology, social life and social awareness. In this respect we are at the very beginning of the way.

Therefore, real social dialectics is more complex and more varied than it is most frequently depicted. By simplifying and schematizing historical processes, rejecting their "unnecessary" aspects and adding to them the more "accurate" ones, we deprive ourselves of the possibility of observing the true rather than fictitious logic of history. We should see behind the development of production forces all the objective laws governing the development of man and mankind. Man, in the totality of his interests and needs, is the main motive force and maker of history.

The dialectical approach demands the perception of the historical process not only in terms of the struggle among its components but also in terms of their unity. In general, there is no development without unity. There is no history without social continuity. The natural historical process of the change of systems is a typical example of the interaction between the two sides of the dialectical contradiction, either of which fights the other but, at the same time, presumes it. Their coexistence is no accident but a historical law of both transient and universally meaningful content.

Total dialectics in the development of socialism at the present stage requires the maximal cleansing of social processes from anything that is extraneous, accidental, brought in through the specific features of the victory and development of socialism in a single and, furthermore, economically backward country, under the conditions of a "besieged fortress," when some historical situations or characters were given the opportunity to leave a specific mark on the entire course and outcome of most important social phenomena.

Socialism is called upon fully to restore its historical nature and to recreate the **unity and continuity of objective historical processes,** which define its place and role in the progress of human society. In this case the **degree**

of achieved self-organization could be a criterion of the maturity and advancement of all **social processes. The following stage in the development of socialism is the stage of the self-organizing socialist society.** Possibly, it is precisely this stage that is consistent with the **middle** phase of communism which, one would think, will replace the lower stage of communism or present-day socialism.

Letters to the Editors

18020007i Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 72-81

[Text] **V. Yershov,** second secretary, Vanchskiy Raykom, Tajik Communist Party, Tajik SSR: Soviet System Plus....

In 1920, as people's commissar of railways, Trotsky signed the then familiar order No 1,042: a five-year plan for increasing the fleet of steam-driven locomotives. The plan was being fulfilled quite energetically, sparing no outlays. The objective was quickly achieved and, just as quickly the plan was acknowledged a classical failure. This convincing and terribly instructive example which was cited in KOMMUNIST (No 14, 1988) led me to certain thoughts.

One does not have be the enemy of society, for it suffices for that society to take another path in its development.... I read about the first years of the Soviet system, and I see in front of me our supergiants: the Nurek GES, the "greatest, greatest, greatest" Rogunskaya GES, now under construction and, into the future an entire system with who knows what consequences....

Unquestionably, all of this is bad. Yes, we will complete yet another power industry giant but in our small village of Zaych, which is at some distance from a road or a power line, located in the Yazgulem Sovkhoz, as it were there will be no electricity (there are no funds or the possibility of bringing electricity to six homes). Billions of rubles are found to build such giants but we would be unable, in all likelihood, to find a single million to complete the full electrification of the country, albeit through nontraditional sources of energy.

Ya. Parkhomovskiy, doctor of technical sciences, laureate of the USSR State Prize, Zhukovskiy: The Hypertrophy of Gigantism

We have become so thoroughly accustomed to gigantomania in most various areas of life that we have stopped noticing it. Throughout our country there is an attraction for the "big:" big machines, enterprises and even social groups. Quite frequently this "big" is pitted against "small," generating a scornful attitude toward it.

Take our motor vehicle manufacturing. Judging of its development according to the press, the main thing is the production of ever more powerful engines and ever bigger vehicles. However, excluding the "rush" periods—such as the sowing and harvesting campaigns—it is precisely small motor vehicles that are needed to meet daily needs. Yet they are unavailable. We therefore use heavy-duty motor vehicles which burn a lot of gasoline to transport several barrels of milk or a single quintal of vegetables.

Also by no means always justified is the pursuit after increasing the capacities of APK enterprises (livestock breeding complexes, sugar and canning factories, food and vegetable bases, and so on). For example, reducing production costs per kilogram of sugar at a big plant is more than compensated by the increased outlays for procuring raw materials from distant areas.

The same is noted in the social area as well: huge hospitals, service enterprises and trade centers are being built. Huge bakeries are baking bread which becomes stale by the time it has reached the store and, furthermore, is tasteless compared to the products of a small bakery. An elderly person would be seen dragging out of a huge general store products which are not in short supply such as, for example, bags with potatoes. Why are such products bought in such quantities, which makes carrying them difficult? For the sake of saving oneself a long trip. And what about having a greengrocer's shop in each big apartment house: we can only fantasize about it.... as we can about a dishwasher and many other items of this kind.

The lack of attention paid to "petty matters" (of which, as we know, essentially human life consists) and the exaggerated scale of everything developed at a time when "big" seemed identical to "highly efficient." This is a direct consequence of an outlay-based economy (the greater the amount of invested funds the more important the project appears). Global practices, however, proved a long time ago that the disproportion between "big" and "small" leads to the waste of all types of resources and to major economic and social losses.

To this day prevalent in our country are considerations of prestige and "reportability," and planning "on the basis of the level reached." This is more convenient and easier. The result is that if we have a big machine it means that an even bigger one will eventually be made. The same occurs with enterprises and construction projects. Yet debates on the expediency and economic efficiency of such plans remain extremely rare. We have not started to take seriously in the least into consideration money and resources and amenities for the people. I fear that both the Gosplan and the State Statistical Committee will not be able to tell us the final cost of ignoring "petty matters" and increasing "gigantic" projects.

A. Krumin, agronomist, deputy general director of the Stepnoy Kolos NPO, Odessa: The Nature of the Peasant

Any monopoly, including that of the state, hinders the development of production and leads to increasing the cost and worsening the quality of produced commodities. This is particularly clearly demonstrated by the USSR Gosagroprom, which is promoting its own monopoly over the production and procurement of food raw materials and their processing into comestible goods. The trend toward increasing agricultural productivity remains weak. This is noticeable in stores and markets.

By virtue of the nature of my work I have the opportunity frequently to communicate with agricultural specialists, kolkhoz members and sovkhoz workers. In connection with the "leasing system," I would like to present my views on this process which, to a certain extent, also reflects the views of my colleagues.

Obviously, in our state all forms of agricultural organization should exist on an equal basis, from the state (sovkhoz) to the farmer who has been given a plot for perpetual use and against payment of an annual land tax (kolkhozes, cooperatives, contracting brigades, lessees). The choice should be left to the worker or the collective and be based on material possibilities. A single system cannot be universal and suitable for all soil and weather zones and areas of the country. Ethnographic and cultural-historical traditions as well must be mandatorily taken into consideration. I am profoundly convinced of this, for I have worked in the area of practical agriculture 10 years in Latvia, 15 years in the Kazakh virgin lands and now, for the past 12 years, in the Ukraine.

Enthusiasm for leasing, particularly without a developed legal foundation, and its standardized application, could spoil this system. Examples to this effect already exist. The mass conversion of the peasantry to another, even a progressive, means of production initially, as a rule, leads to a drop in labor productivity.

Study the conversion from landed estates to peasant communal ownership or to the farmstead system, as was the case in Latvia, looking at the land reform, which was started in that country in 1940, and land collectivization. Each time there was a drop in output, followed by an increase, albeit quite slow, in subsequent years.

The true owner of the land has always looked at the lessee as a second-class owner or, rather, he did not consider the lessee the owner of the land. If he had his own land plot, he found it prestigious to lease, if conditions were advantageous, another bit of land in which to invest his capital. As to being a lessee..., in bourgeois Latvia, where sharecropping no longer existed, landowners scornfully referred to lessees as "half-and-half people" (who kept one-half of the grain). Leasing a piece of land for a certain time against a specific payment is a temporary status. Property relations between landowners and lessees are also temporary: the landowner has the right, whenever he signs a new leasing contract, to change the payment conditions. This does not exclude applying pressure on the lessee.

Today it is the kolkhoz or sovkhoz which is the landowner and, itself, is the user of the land. The social atmosphere is changing and so is the property status of the so-called landowner. This means that the leasing conditions could change as well. The lessee is not protected against such changes.

The lessee or a collective of lessees sell their product to the landowner on the basis of contractual, estimated or procurement prices which are not strictly fixed. Essentially, these are not lessees but hired workers who retain as their income the difference between production costs and earnings from the goods they have marketed.

Finally, given the state monopoly of purchase prices and agricultural and industrial commodities, which the lessee needs, the latter is totally dependent on the state or even on an individual official. This involves additional risk to the existence of the lessee, for he cannot know how and to what extent prices could be lowered or raised. Other examples could be cited of unsolved economic and legal problems which make, for the time being, leasing a risky matter.

In my view, anyone who wishes to engage in farm labor should have the right to obtain from the state a piece of land for perpetual use and with the right to inheritance but not sale. If such land is transferred to another user, one could sell only the inventory and property and recover outlays for capital improvements (reclamation, perennial crops, etc.). Lending institutions for the peasants should be established.

A fixed tax in rubles, based on land registration data, taking into consideration the natural fertility of the land and economic factors, such as distance from the market, and so on, should be established for the use of land. The peasant should have the right, guided by the situation, to determine for himself the structure of his crops and, in general, the specialization of his farm and the right, alone or through a cooperative, to market his produce both on the public market as well as on the basis of contacts with procurement, trade and industrial enterprises.

The prices of goods purchased by the peasant (tractors, tools, machines, chemicals, GSM, packaging, various materials, and so on) must not be dependent on monopoly producers. The peasant's outlays for the goods and materials he purchases, per year in rubles, should not exceed a certain share of the annual income under normal farming conditions, for otherwise the peasant would be ruined. Or else, the peasant should have the freedom to choose a supplier among competing companies, including foreign ones.

I shall not discuss many other problems, such as social security for the peasant, or his relations with health-care, education and agricultural authorities and various inspectorates (their name is legion). Unless "kept on a tight leash," they do not leave the peasant alone. Scientists should work on such problems. This is no simple matter yet it is extremely necessary if we are to revive a type of peasant protected from any sort of arbitrary rules.

Unless we take into consideration the main features I have presented in this letter, there will be no peasant bread earner, and whatever name we may give him, he will not become the master of the land.

We need a law on leasing. What we need even more, however, is a law on the peasantry, on the land and, as we used to say, on the legal foundations of agricultural labor in all of its hypostases. It is only then that the slow and difficult process of the revival of the peasantry will begin.

G. Nikonov, candidate of technical sciences, and **O. Poslavskiy,** engineer, Moscow: 'For Technical Reasons'

The elimination of the chronic shortage of spare parts and their procurement not on the basis of the level reached but of real needs could be greatly assisted by organizing a mass, centralized rebuilding of worn out parts. Within the USSR Gosagroprom system alone, "for technical reasons," largely determined by this shortage, every year tens of millions of tractor/days are lost. An effort was made to struggle against the shortage of spare parts by increasing the production of new parts. However, the problem remained unsolved. Furthermore, methods such as rebuilding, powder-lining, increasing the amount of metal, and so on, provide a real opportunity for solving the problem. No one has to be convinced of their efficiency. In terms of quality and service life, rebuilt parts are virtually as good as new and metal outlays are dozens of times lower; electric power and labor are saved as well.

Nonetheless, the rural mechanizers see virtually no practical return from the use of the new methods. The point is that no one knows which of the 200,000 varieties (taking into consideration their application) of spare parts supplied by the USSR Gosagroprom could be rebuilt. The new technology requires standardized methods for taking into consideration the need for spare parts and planning their production and delivery to the consumers. We need a method for determining the corresponding rates. That is where the difficulty lies.

As early as 1979 the USSR Council of Ministers instructed a number of ministries and departments to formulate, and the USSR Gosplan to set, differentiated rates of use of new and rebuilt spare parts for motor vehicles, tractors and agricultural machinery. Based on an order placed by the agricultural department of the USSR Gosplan, several scientific research institutes drafted a method for the formulation of such standards. The method may not be perfect and it would be worth hearing the remarks of the scientific public and plant and ministry specialists and correct it as necessary. Instead of it, however, so far the only method which take into consideration the possibility of rebuilding parts, already coordinated with four out of the five interested ministries and departments and most Gosplan subdepartments, was "frozen."

As in the past, there is no instrument for the formulation of differentiated rates and for issuing assignments for the collection of parts to be rebuilt, determining the volume of output of new spare parts, and planning the location of rebuilding enterprises, precisely for this apparently insignificant "technical reason."

Naturally, the purpose of this letter is, above all, to draw attention to a problem which concerns us and our colleagues. In order to evaluate and complete the old method it would suffice, in our view, to use a task force of competent specialists which should be set up under the USSR GKNT. This could be done efficiently without any postponements and red tape.

Otherwise the consumers of spare parts will continue to subsist on short rations and a substantial part of the machine fleet will continue to idle. Furthermore, worn-out parts, which could be recycled, will at best be treated as scrap metal.

Yu. Tribitsov, candidate of juridical sciences, Kemerovo State University: Training Historians in the VUZ

We say and write a great deal on the revival of a universal interest in history, the importance of history training, and so on. However, we discuss extremely rarely the way we train specialists who must spread the knowledge of history among the masses. This is something worth talking about.

This would apply to the expediency of the traditional composition required as an entrance examination for enrollment in history departments of universities and pedagogical institutes, for the language and literature teacher, who assesses the composition, neither can nor should be required to take into consideration the ability of the secondary school graduate to have a creative understanding precisely of history. Would it not be preferable to have a written rather than oral test in USSR history? This would make it possible, among others, to determine both literacy and the ability to present one's thoughts on paper. A test in the social sciences which, one would think, would synthesize knowledge of the foundations of philosophy, political economy and scientific communism, actually becomes a test of the ability to memorize a number of formulations and definitions which, in frequent cases, are not profoundly mastered by the graduate. It would be more sensible, in my view, to have an entrance examination in general history on the

level of the secondary school curriculum. The examination would offer an excellent opportunity to display the range of thoughts and speech standards, the ability to use a history map, and so on. We need a set of tests for the **right to become a historian,** and not simply to become a VUZ student.

In the light of new thinking, another important problem is that of what should the student of history study today, in other words, what subjects and to what extent and in what sequence, and what should be considered necessary. At the risk of triggering the indignation of people who may even consider themselves progressive, I would ask the following: Is it expedient in a history department to teach a course in CPSU history of the type, sequence and forms of control which have been and are applied? Is it possible for the history of the party to be separated even to a minor extent, from the history of our society? Therefore, why not study it in history departments, precisely within the framework of USSR history from the end of the 19th through the 20th centuries, instead of teaching it in two separate almost similar courses which are presented either in a stupid sequence (the Great October Revolution in one and the pre-Peter the Great age, in the other), or else on a parallel basis, with the different departments trying not to annoy the students with repetitions? I can anticipate a legitimate retort: Why not drop entirely the training of students in the "purely party" specifics of the subject? A large number of training hours are spent in specializing in this subject! Yes, the importance of knowledge of historical-party problems is growing. This problem can be solved not by making the history of the CPSU a kind of supersubject (today it is taught in history departments longer than the history of more than one-half of all mankind—the Asian and African countries), and instead seek qualitatively new forms of training. For example, why not, at the last year in the course offered by the history department, not introduce a special course taught by senior party workers in the respective republic, kray or oblast, which would make it possible for the student to gain an idea about the CPSU not only on the basis of theoretical studies alone? I am confident that there will also be many party veterans who could frankly discuss and argue with curious students various historical-party problems within the time set by the curriculum.

The elimination of duplication and reducing the senseless waste of training hours would make it possible for the history departments to teach the student a more thorough history of mankind as a whole. In my view, it is time to surmount the concept that the history of dozens of countries throughout the world could be studied either fragmentarily or not at all. Ask a history department graduate (even on the university level) how much he has learned from the lectures and seminars on the history of science and technology, world culture or, finally, the history of the communist movement? He would rather describe the numerous repetitions of the same formulations and quotations taught at world-outlook courses and courses in history (which, for some reason, are not considered conceptual)....

The elimination of duplications would make it possible to free additional time for the linguistic training of history students, for be it said to our shame, the overwhelming majority of graduates have virtually no knowledge of foreign languages (unlike their foreign colleagues).

Whatever the situation with the curriculum may be, the quality of training of historians in a VUZ depends to a tremendous extent on the good quality and interesting manner in which the subject is presented. Yet a large number of teachers are still "tied" to the pages of their lecture textbooks which were frequently written many years ago! How frequently do we, VUZ historians, think of the way our words, gestures or display of visual aids are transformed in the mind of the student who will then present our ideas in secondary schools, general audiences, museums or, finally, in science? Do we think of the reason for which our graduates, who are sent to teach history in secondary schools, can easily "re-educate" an experienced teacher with his concepts of history from the 1940s to the 1970s, insisting on compressing the lesson to a "sensible minimum and a clear plan?" Or else why is it that the graduation work of a student, albeit innovative, remains unknown and gathers dust on departmental shelves and later, after tearing off the covers, turns into recycled pulp? We believe that we should not consider normal the fact that the quality of a graduation work and its grade have, as a rule, no influence whatsoever on the future of the graduate, since the students are assigned their future jobs in advance.

In the course of the training process we are still not aiming at the notorious "domination of the audience," but try to squeeze as much material as is possible in a 90 minute class, concerned, above all, with evaluations and ratings of "his own" discipline, thinking of department, faculty or VUZ superiors. All of this leads to an averaged approach, haste and formalism even on the part of teachers who like their subject a great deal but are unwittingly developing in the students the same qualities, plus a great dose of disappointment in the delights of history itself in the mind of the future historian. Is it not time decisively to reduce the "field of accountability" covering a number of indicators, which exist only for the sake of possible future investigations?

The concept of "production-living conditions" in a higher educational institution may have a bureaucratic sound. All I can see, however, are neglected and internally and externally dilapidated premises of history departments in the great Leningrad or Tomsk state universities. I could enumerate an entire series of other problems afflicting history department life, from the grave shortage of good textbooks to paradoxes in student practices.... The quality of training of historians on the level and skills which are demanded by our time largely depend on paying proper attention to and promptly solving them.

V. Obukhov, art expert, member of the USSR Painters' Union, Kaluga: How Much Is a Painting Worth?

Today a great deal is being said and written about economics. This is a vital topic which affects all of us. I would like to suggest one more aspect of it: the economics of graphic arts.

Do not think that it is my intention somehow to belittle the social significance of painting or the cultural and educational role of sculpture. It is not. Nonetheless, I would dare remind you that spiritual values also have a consumer value which could and should have a clearly defined monetary equivalent. The customary and partially just views on the "pricelessness" of works of art frequently turn against that same art such as, for example, when they become ordinary acts of vandalism. Architectural monuments are frequently being destroyed also, in addition to everything else, for the reason that they are truly "priceless:" the criminal code demands that the culprit pay only a symbolic fine for their destruction.

It is true that throughout the country hundreds and thousands of artistic councils and purchasing commissions are at work, setting, on a daily basis, the cost of a great number of paintings, icons, sculptures, mosaics, porcelain sets and clay toys. Special brigades of art experts evaluate works of art used by religious associations. Nonetheless, it is only a small percentage of the tremendous number of heterogeneous works of different quality and produced at different times art that can be considered by such "price-setting committees."

Something else is equally important: the evaluation of the work itself has always been and remains, delicately speaking, subjective. Here is an extremely simple example: although a given artistic council could assess a work as being worth 500 rubles (if, for example, it is purchased by a noted establishment or enterprise) or 50 rubles (if it is one of the exhibits at a sale, to be purchased by "private owners"). This does not mean in the least that any given canvas does not have a real consumer value. If that same "50-ruble" work is seen by a foreign businessman, its monetary equivalent could become quite impressive: several hundred or even a thousand marks, yen or dollars.... Generally speaking, our painters and graphic artists do good work and their "output" is entirely competitive.

A strange situation has appeared: here is a commodity in demand but there is no developed system whatsoever for setting its price. The reason is that even the best artistic council can judge only of the artistic value of an object but it is only the market that is the yardstick of its consumer value. Generally speaking, we have no art market in our country: some people buy icons while others collect engravings.... However, these people are frequently considered as "speculators," even if they have not earned a single ruble for such "criminal" activities (although many of them may be real gangsters). For purchases and trade are not controlled by the corresponding authorities and are not subject to proper taxation. Under the conditions of a clandestine business, price setting is not only uncontrolled but also distorted. The "criminalizing" of market relations greatly narrows the range of sellers and purchasers. Understandably, "expertise" in this area is provided by anyone other than an art specialist or a painter.

The absence of a developed art market and of a normal price setting system leads to tremendous losses to the state: "Inexpensive" Russian icons go abroad and there develops a "glut" of modern works, and a large number of paintings and graphic designs pile up in creative workshops and in various "reserves." Naturally, the work of the art councils could be somewhat improved and regular "price catalogues" could be issued. Nonetheless, these would be no more than half-measures. I believe that the time has come to restore and, partially, to legalize the art market. Actually, this is already taking place: auctions are being held and increasingly sales-exhibits are being organized. "Street painters" have appeared in Moscow, Kiev and other cities. However, in order for this market to stop being "semi-clandestine" we must, first of all, eliminate all restrictions and prohibitions and, secondly, give the trade in works of art a stable and nonrestrictive format. For example, we could create a system of auctions which would function in a number of large cities.

If something should be restricted, it should be precisely the activities of the art councils. They should become only advisory and expert bodies and should no longer be "price committees." For otherwise their activities could cause (and occasionally does cause) definite harm to our economy, particularly in cases in which the art council becomes the "broker" in international trade.

It may be worth to grant the local organizations of the Painters' Union the right to establish direct contact with foreign companies engaged in reselling painting and graphic works.

Our fine arts are facing major and noble tasks, cognitive and educational. In any case and under all circumstances the creation of works of art should become well organized and profitable.

Excerpts from Letters

G. Vilner, CPSU member, Temirtau:

Twice a year, 10 days prior to the November and May holidays, the main street of our city is blocked by barriers. Bus stops are moved elsewhere, hundreds of motor vehicles have to follow circuitous ways, and people have to walk the length of several districts. The sole purpose of this is so that from the height of the rostrum one could see the renovated and pristine outline of the streets. Is this a petty matter? It is not, for such barriers not only block the streets but also separate the

city's leadership from the rest of the population. Why should not the members of the gorkom bureau or the city soviet march along with everyone in the holiday columns and not only hear what the people are talking and arguing about but also participate in such discussions? In my view, there is no need for rostrums. V.I. Lenin's monument would suffice.

V. Voronina, Aleksandrovsk, Perm Oblast:

Should mothers of many children not be allowed to retire perhaps 3 years earlier than the present retirement age? I believe that they deserve this. We have been able to find funds to give pensions to those who leave ministries and departments as a result of the reorganization of the apparatus without having reached the legal retirement age.

G. Grishin, Serov, Sverdlovsk Oblast:

We are now talking about many of our difficulties, but for some reason we keep silent about barbarism. We estimate losses caused by natural disasters, fires, theft, negligence, and so on. Tremendous material and not only material losses are caused also by the tendency shown by a significance segment of the population to display a barbaric attitude toward the labor of human hands. Wide-scale destruction is taking place at bus stops and children's playgrounds, telephone booths and benches, and window glass breaking in construction homes and in kiosks. I do not know how to fight against such "artistic works" and why do people like them so much. However, something must be done.

S. Tokhtabiyev, candidate of philosophical sciences, Nalchik:

Currently the job finding and population information bureaus are officially obligated to find a job in his specialty to anyone who needs it. But what could such a state office do if it has no real power and right and if an enterprise would refuse to hire a specific worker who has applied for a job? It is difficult to find jobs for the retired and the disabled who can work a partial work day or work at home, or for people with a prison record. I believe that the solution lies in the creation of cost accounting vocational guidance centers to which enterprises would contribute their share, and which would assume the management of the entire system of cadre training and retraining.

Responses To Our Publications

P. Karp, Leningrad:

KOMMUNIST (No 13 1988) published a talk with A.G. Solovyev on pensions. Naturally, the detailed discussion of the draft new bill will become possible only after its publication. The concept, however, as it is conceived by those who are drafting this document, should be discussed without delay. It is inseparable from a general understanding of relations between the citizen and the state. In the final account, it is precisely the looseness of the legal awareness that led to all the excesses in our social system, which we now would like to and must eliminate.

In discussing the nature of pensions, A.G. Solovyev notes the following: "As we know, they constitute some of the public consumption funds spent to support the disabled. On the basis of this definition, a pension should be paid to anyone who is unable to work and has no other source of existence." But if such is the case, why are pensions awarded after reaching a certain age rather than on the basis of a medical conclusion on disability? The very fact that the current law gives, with full justification, the right to pension on the basis of age exclusively, length of work and earnings, confirms that after having worked for a certain period of time and having paid taxes for that period of time (not to speak of insurance withheld on his account by the enterprise or establishment), the person has earned enough for his old age. In other words, he has entrusted a certain part of his earnings to the state so that the state could pay to him, after reaching the stipulated age, a pension based on the contributions that he has been making toward it all that time.

The social consumption fund is by no means totally impersonal and cannot be redistributed randomly. Every working person has made his individual contribution to this fund which becomes common property only after the individual's death. If the funds, the way I understand it, were not set aside in order to pay a pension to the individual in the future, and the wages would not have been reduced by withholding for social funds but instead the entire amount would be paid to the people and immediately deposited by them in the savings bank with interest, in 25 years for men and 20 years for women (considering that, alas, not everyone lives long enough to receive a pension) it would develop into funds which would make it possible for the old people to receive more than they do today. What is even more important is that the amount of the pension would be a recognition that it is not charity but earned funds, the payment of which was postponed. A pension is not a philanthropic act but the mandatory duty of the state.

The actual viewpoint presented in this case by A.G. Solovyev is based on the fact that the state has no obligation whatsoever to repay the working person the money he has deposited in the state treasury and, by allowing some pensioners to work, it "makes certain sacrifices," for it is paying a pension to able-bodied people. It turns out, therefore, that the State Committee for Labor can classify, even without a medical certificate, the old people into able-bodied and disabled, regardless of the fact that frequently the disabled are obliged, by the force of circumstances, to work more than they should. Most veterans continue to work because their pension is much lower than wages and because they cannot live on

it. Unless the state acknowledges its absolute obligation to repay the old people their earnings, which is a duty in the literal meaning of the term, the new Law on Pensions cannot be fair.

In the past, as we know, the duty was only on the part of the citizen to the state. The state provided benefits, food, drink, clothing, learning, medical treatment, and so on. For all this that the person was given he had to thank the state, as though the funds for all of this did not come from the people themselves or their relatives, but as a result of the miraculous wisdom of the "leader" and his loyal fellow workers. Under Stalin, calculated in present-day terms, old-age pension was 15 rubles and, after bread prices were raised, 21 rubles. The Law on State Pensions, which was adopted after the 20th Congress, despite all of its imperfections, was a major event, for it was an acknowledgment of the fact that the state nonetheless has an obligation to the citizens. Today we openly say that the relations between the state and the citizen could be fruitful only if based on reciprocal obligations, the more so since in our country all citizens are considered as the collective owners of state property. Nonetheless, the obligations of the state continue to be manipulated, allegedly for the sake of state benefits.

A state which wishes to enrich itself at the expense of the impoverishment of its citizens always loses in the final account. Furthermore, this triggers mistrust, a state of permanent expectation of being taken in, or of dirty tricks; the people listen to rumors, frequently the most stupid ones; incentives for creative initiative and conscientious work are eliminated. If the old ideas are applied to the slogans of perestroyka, mistrust will develop toward perestroyka as well, and a feeling of social passiveness will consolidate.

The least I would like to imply, naturally, is that a pension should be treated as a simple supplement to the earnings of all people, a reward for years of service. In my view, its most important social function, conversely, is that it contributes to the timely change of generations of working people, and to a possible earlier taking of jobs by young and active people fully able to replace their seniors. I am even ready to accept that for certain positions an age limit should be set. However, it would be unfair to punish an old person with deprivation of pension for the fact that his work is still needed and that no proper replacement for him can be found.

Apparently, today everyone acknowledges that neither the state nor its wealth should be considered as separate from the citizens, who are thereby assigned a role of performers, who are voiceless, obedient and do not think of their interests, and who should simply be given something for "sustenance". This, precisely, was the foundation of the administrative-command system which we want to abolish. It would be hardly possible to speak of any true perestroyka without restoring the reciprocity of relations between the citizen and the state.

V. Zhdanov, head of the organizational work department, Orenburg Oblast Trade Unions:

A number of press publications, including the article by R. Ryvkina in KOMMUNIST (No 14 1988), and talks with higher school teachers lead to the conclusion that sociology needs a lengthy "latent period" for cadre training, after which it will be able to perform "major projects." But will a lifetime suffice as we wait for the people to graduate from sociology departments or faculties? No, in all likelihood, for we already now must have an idea not only of the "punctures" of the times of stagnation but also the current problems and, possibly, the problems which will be facing us tomorrow.

Even people quite distant from social science problems, are familiar today with sociology and its tasks. The press constantly discusses the need for determining public opinion and taking it into consideration in making practical decisions, and so on. At meetings of labor collectives, at informal gatherings and meetings of pensioners, the people unanimously reach the conclusion that "we need sociology!"

It may seem that everything is developing properly. However, what concerns us is what we see in practice in the efforts to use for such purposes the available cadres of professional sociologists.

The initial impression is that today they are extremely few. Why? Efforts to understand the situation provide essentially three types of answers. The first is the following: sociological research is needed and there is a reliance on the sociologist (or on the possibility of getting one) at an enterprise but there is no available specialist. The second: the collective realizes the need for sociology and party and trade union committees would like to open such a position or request studies by existing sociological subdivisions, but the economic management does not agree to the expenses, referring to the rigid limits of cost accounting, the short practical returns on such studies, as they view them, as so on. The third is the following: individuals who make decisions at a given enterprise do not consider in the least the need for sociology, referring to the stability of current economic results and the normal social microclimate in the collective. It is only the nonfulfillment of the plan or the outbreak of a row that would force them, according to their statements, to spend additional funds on sociological studies.

At one of our mining-concentration combines, the recently elected director (a graduate of the Academy of the National Economy) impressively described the way they were directed during their training toward the maximal utilization of new forms of work with the people; asked by a Polish guest "Is there a sociologist at your enterprise?" he was sincerely astonished: "Why have one? We have a good collective!"

How would a practical worker who needs help find sociologists? Should he wait until the VUZs can "produce" suitable specialists or could something be done as of now?...

It may be worth requesting that sociology vacancies be filled by party, soviet and trade union personnel with an bent for and a certain experience in such work and with solid practical experience. Naturally, they would need specialized instructions and subsequent consultation assistance provided by academic and departmental sociological centers.

Asked who could today become a sociologist and what are the selected criteria for such a choice, I was unanimously answered by specialists as follows: "This is a legitimate question and the idea is rational. However, to us it is a new one and so far no one has asked us to consider it...." This may be a paradox, but what stands behind it is something much bigger than the confirmation of the traditionally bureaucratic postulate which prevailed recently that "without assignment there is no execution."

I am worried by the reduced level of practical activities in developing sociology not simply as a social science but also as part of our social and economic life, as a necessary tool for our understanding of the world and as a guideline in the reality surrounding us. Suffice it to compare the scale of the problems and the clarity of the tasks set to sociology with the one-sidedness, brevity and orientation toward a vague "later," and the total lack of a scientific approach in the documents drafted by the various economic authorities. Probably, we should not let this process continue uncontrolled. We must coordinate the requirements of a rapidly changing practice in economic building and the education of the people with the so far unhurried development of the social sciences.

L. Salnikov, Krasnodar:

I consider timely the suggestion made by N. Moiseyev (No 14 1988) on restoring the consultative scientific council under our country's government. We wasted many years in promoting "unanimous approval," of ideas drafted by ignorant people and inspired by self-seeking advisors and departmental pushers. The people are fed up with mirages and confusion. We need a serious scientific quest for a strategy of social development.

N. Naymark, doctor of chemical sciences, Vladimir:

I agree with many of the points raised in Academician Moiseyev's article. However, I would like to object to one of the questions raised: the role of faith in the individual's world perception. The need for integral scientific concepts entails the need for the element of faith, which "cements" our inevitably fragmentary knowledge of a certain system. However, we must firmly distinguish between faith as the result of extrapolation and the summation of knowledge as a hypothesis, and belief and the mythologizing of the natural scientific and social pictures of reality.

Today many are those who believe that faith could contribute to the preservation and strengthening of the moral aspects of the people. Alas, this does not take place very successfully in traditional religions as well.... Respect for and tolerance of people and their beliefs is clearly needed. The justification and adaptation to contemporary conditions of religious faith as a means of knowledge and vision of the world are, in my view, regressive.

P. Ryabtsev, Moscow:

I read the selection "Working On the Job" (No 12, 1988). The situation with manpower in the countryside is difficult and, in the immediate future, this area cannot do without additional manpower. However, we must also struggle against the dependency moods of "spoiled" farms which, for many long years received major state subsidies (it would be difficult to describe such funds as "loans") without standing on their own two feet. Why not give the empty houses to anyone who would like to help the farms on mutually profitable conditions: long-term repayment at low prices?

Subscribers On the Journal

V. Litvinenko, officer-political worker, Sverdlovsk:

Here is what disturbs me and people I know, who are KOMMUNIST readers: you regularly print material from CPSU Central Committee plenums. What is the purpose? We receive current information on such events through the newspapers, radio and television. We are able to read and consider these materials and start to disseminate them. Then, 2 or 3 weeks later, comes KOMMUNIST carrying the same text, despite the severe shortage of paper in the country! On the September 1988 Plenum, all you provided was an information report. I believe that this is the right way.

P. Pavliy, intern, Tashkent Medical Institute:

In 1987, when "as assigned" I had to subscribe to a political journal, I chose KOMMUNIST. In 1988 mandatory subscription was lifted but by then I personally wanted to extend it.

Some readers have asked that the volume and number of issues of the journal be increased and that its presentation be improved. In my view, however, what matters is not this but the competence, depth and clarity with which problems are discussed. What else would I expect of KOMMUNIST? Not so long ago we saw on television a Council of Ministers meeting chaired by N.I. Ryzhkov. This was the first time that we gained some knowledge

about him as one of the leaders of our state. And when the time comes to vote for a deputy mandate, the people will be voting for him no longer automatically.

It would be a good thing for KOMMUNIST to become a rostrum for the members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretaries, so that, in articles or interviews, they may formulate their views on topical problems of the economic reform, the cooperative movement and the prospects for solving national problems in our country.

O. Brankovskiy, worker at the Gomselmash Production Association, nonparty member, 36 years old:

Increasingly, KOMMUNIST is carrying letters by readers who discuss important and topical problems of our lives. My wishes for the future are that you publish more frequently testimonies of eyewitnesses of past events (such as the letter by Ye. Bender in your issue No 14 for 1988). Articles, books and motion pictures on historical topics are useful but the recollections of the people who have experienced things personally are sometimes more convincing to our generation. Let us, as we analyze various periods in the development of society, not forget the main thing: the moods and living conditions of the people at that time.

Inevitability of the New Methodology; Mathematics and the Methodological Renovation of Science

18020007j Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 82-92

[Article by Aleksandr Andreyevich Samarskiy, academician, department head at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Applied Mathematics imeni M.V. Keldysh]

[Text] Perestroyka demands the search for and application of essentially new approaches to the solution of the problems facing society. The old methods are unsuitable in solving the new problems. This idea has been repeatedly emphasized in programmatic party documents. Unfortunately, the roots are still deep and the positions still strong of the extensive way of thinking and acting, including in the scientific and technical area. Another tradition, consistent with our time, has always prevailed in Russian and Soviet science. For long decades D.I. Mendeleyev's periodical law was a guide in the study of many topical scientific areas. The discoveries made by N.I. Vavilov were the methodological foundation leading to the development of a unique collection of plants, which assembled the tremendous genetic stock acquired by science itself, and is used to this day. Yet our scientists had material and technical possibilities which were substantially more modest compared to those of their foreign colleagues!

The development and strengthening of this tradition appears to be inevitable today. Any major step on the path of progress is linked by a thousand threads to an entire system of superficially unrelated phenomena and events but which activate a variety of processes and mechanisms, including those in the socioeconomic, humanitarian and political areas. The systemic approach and the consideration of universal human values have become a mandatory rule in clarifying the immediate or more distant consequences of decisions made under the conditions of limited resources of all kinds—energy, raw material and manpower. Naturally, the greatest pressure is that of the time factor, for time is elusive and merciless and is a truly nonrecoverable resource.

How to coordinate the complexity of problems with the demand for simple solutions, economy with safety, quality with dynamism, and basic research with practical development? The formulation and implementation of a number of major plans, ecological for instance, clearly proved the limitations of traditional theoretical and experimental methods and approaches. Said objectives can be achieved only by the **radical renovation of the methodological arsenal.** More than ever before, today we need precise knowledge and forecasts, relatively easily and rapidly obtainable, and specific quantitative characteristics and recommendations which lead to the required results. This can be achieved on the basis of comprehensive mathematization of scientific research and experimental design.

Soviet science applies a methodology consistent with contemporary requirements. It is based on the development and extensive use of the methods of mathematical modeling and computer experimentation, and is the closest available strategic reserve for the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. The essence of mathematical modeling and its main advantage are simulating the initial project with a respective mathematical model and its further study (experimentation with it) on computers, with the help of computer-logical algorithms.

Mathematical modeling is a natural development and summation of the methods of scientific research, combined with contemporary information technology. The cycle of the computing experiment of object-model-algorithm-program-computer-target management reflects the basic stages in the process of knowledge and in their present computer embodiment. This is an organic combination of the strong aspects of theoretical methods with major experimentation. Working with a model rather than an actual object becomes an efficient way of obtaining detailed and clear information showing inner connections, qualitative features and quantitative parameters. Material and labor outlays inherent in traditional experimental methods are reduced by several hundred percent. The latter provide, as a rule, only bits of the necessary information. Experimentation with a computer is not limited by any restrictions. A mathematical model can be safely tried in all conceivable and inconceivable conditions.

No contradictions whatsoever exist between traditional methods and the new methodology. Both in terms of the means used and the results achieved, mathematical modeling acts as a unifying and binding factor. The creation of the model-algorithm-program triad, on which it is based, requires subordinating to a single task activities which solve the age-old conflict between theory and experimentation and between basic and applied science. This leads to the coordination of profound knowledge with specific information and makes flexible the line which divides so-called theoretical from applied mathematics, for inevitably here we must apply the entire available mathematical arsenal. Classical methods are given a new dimension and an additional substantiation, while basic research is given a clear direction and applied research a theoretical foundation.

Therefore, mathematical modeling is not a specific technocratic prescription for a narrow range of specialists but a universal methodology, a basic instrument in the mathematization of scientific and technical progress.

The new methodology practiced by Soviet science for nearly 40 years has proved its efficiency in the implementation of a number of major projects, such as those in cosmonautics and the nuclear power industry. Its strong aspects are a well tried concept and high level mathematical physics (such as the science of modeling) and computer mathematics (such as the science as algorithms), as well as the existence of a number of strong collectives of highly skilled scientists. Extensive experience has been acquired in solving complex problems of mechanics, plasma physics, nuclear physics, quantum mechanics, geophysics and astrophysics, and some problems in chemistry, biology and technology.

However, mathematical modeling and computer experimentation in our country instill major concern in terms of the scope of research and its backup and returns. The successful start taken by the new methodology in the 1950s and 1960s was not subsequently supported with target-oriented measures. Stagnation in the development of applied mathematics was manifested in the lack of a single policy and coordination of the work, its low standard in most organizations and the lack of skilled cadres and computer equipment oriented toward the needs of mathematical modeling. The inertia in the educational system has had an impact as well. It has triggered a lack of understanding and underestimating of the role of mathematical modeling (as well as, in general, of mathematical sciences) on the part of many leading scientific and administrative workers and exposed their psychological and professional lack of readiness to master the new methodology.

In our country the new methodology cannot develop on the basis of the old foundation, particularly in the light of the active and strict challenge of the West and Japan in this area. In the developed capitalist countries the advantages of mathematical modeling have been realized by the broad circles of the scientific and technical public. Organizational steps were taken on a national and international scale and there has been a fast conversion from one-of-a-kind areas to mass application, such as in automobile manufacturing.

The way to surmount crisis phenomena in the development of applied mathematics were formulated in the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers 13 November 1986 Decree on Strengthening Scientific Research in the Field of Mathematics. Specifically, this implies the development of a nationwide program for the extensive utilization of the methods of mathematical modeling in various areas of the national economy. Actually, what is contemplated is the creation of a service for mathematical modeling, a kind of mathematical industry which should become as commonplace as the power or transportation industry.

The fast development of this program will largely define the aspect of scientific and technical progress in our country. The inevitability of the new methodology is based on the ubiquitously penetrating feature of the processes of modeling: replacing objects and situations with their models. "...Even the poorest architect is different from the most skillful bee... by the fact that before building a cell from wax he has already built it in his own head" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 23, p 189). "Built in the head," means, in today's parlance, the creation of a model of an existing or a future object. It could express precisely established basic laws (a mathematical model in the strict understanding of the term) or be limited to a description of certain external characteristics of the object (the imitation or simulation model, which is the prototype of a mathematical model), but which nonetheless always exists. In a certain sense, any application of mathematical methods means mathematical modeling. However, it is only one stage of the "model," developed since the times of Newton, that no longer satisfies anyone today. The power of the new methodology is found in the full model-algorithm-program triad, which marks the long and difficult path from the object to the computer. Knowledge, design, structure and many other types of human activities are now already inseparably linked to the modeling triad.

It is precisely on the basis of such positions that we would like to discuss the prospects of mathematical modeling, having singled out among the entire variety of problems those which are now considered the most important in terms of its future destiny: the development and application of computer technology and improving technological processes and the restructuring of education.

'The Intellectual Nucleus' of Computerization

Today the question "why do we need computers?" sounds somewhat naive and implies a mass of answers: creation of information systems and means of communication, automation and management of various types

of human activities, etc. The incredible increase in the complication of social life triggered the manifestation of a computer information technology and changed the meaning of the term "information industry." Obligations consisting of obtaining new information, new knowledge and its use have been added to its traditional functions, which are the storing and processing of prepared information.

The comprehensive dissemination of computers formulates the unprecedented methodological problem of the efficient utilization of computer equipment. Its solution demands prompt large-scale measures.

Nonetheless, a very powerful trend exists toward reducing said problem to its exploitation aspects (organizing computations and formulating tasks and repairs and preventive maintenance of machinery, and providing mathematical support in the strict meaning of the term). Unquestionably, this is a necessary activity which must be developed comprehensively. However, it frequently replaces the main thing: the reason for which and the way computers are used. The objective turns out to be behind the technical means of accomplishing it and the wrapping prevails over the content. The role of the computer as an instrument of knowledge and for penetrating in-depth the studied processes and their management on the basis of obtained knowledge are suppressed and become second-rate.

This trend, which exists both in our country and abroad, although temporary, is quite dangerous. It is related to underestimating the importance of mathematical methods in the process of computerization, excessive reliance on equipment as such, and a kind of computer euphoria. It is particularly dangerous in terms of the development of mathematical modeling and computer experimentation, for availability of technical facilities is only one of the conditions for such experimentation. The result is an unjustified distortion in evaluating the prospects of scientific and technical progress.

The practice of mathematical modeling is the first major and most developed area of application of computers, which enables us to earmark the ways for its balanced development. We must take into consideration the **comprehensive nature of computer equipment above all as an instrument for the discovery of new information.** Computers and their mathematical and software support (including computer algorithms and packets of applied programs) and the systems based on them should include as their inseparable feature a highly developed "intellectual nucleus" for obtaining new knowledge. In its absence computer equipment remains actually incomplete. Any other policy leads to the well-familiar consequences of the inefficient utilization and freezing of invested capital as well as a reduced pace of developments.

From the viewpoint of mathematical modeling, this means simply the almost obvious truth that **all parts of the model-algorithm-program triad must be equally developed and applied on an equally high level.** In particular, the end product of computerization, subject to assessment, should include not only software stocks and libraries but also models and algorithms.

We believe that this approach is applicable in all areas of use of computer equipment. The various areas in its utilization have already now become closely intertwined. Their further synthesis and interpenetration are inevitable. Thus, decision-making relative to designing and management require the profound study of the project (an airplane, let us say) or a process (such as the one taking place in a chemical reactor) using the methods of mathematical modeling. In turn, large-scale computer experimentation is impossible without information backup of control systems, data banks, systems of artificial intelligence, expert systems, etc.

In the majority of present scientific studies and experimental-design developments, the role of mathematical modeling has been concealed, so that so far we are using the simplest and occasionally most primitive models. The first question is that of servicing, of ensuring facilities for computer technology. The main emphasis in the triad falls on the final stage. However, practical experience will mandatorily require a turn toward more complex projects and their management in real time. Consequently, objectively inevitable is a conversion to full mathematical models and the development of more economical and accurate computer algorithms. The share of mathematical modeling and of modeling systems as an intellectual nucleus in the main application of computers will be increasing steadily.

The currently predominant trend in the utilization of computers is partially justified only at the initial stage of computerization. It could provide only a limited and short-term effect. Its extrapolation leads to an irreversible slow-down in the pace of scientific and technical progress. This is confirmed by certain alarming symptoms, duplication in particular, the high cost of development of complex software systems and their low quality and poor adaptive characteristics. Thus, in the opinion of a number of experts, the actual results achieved in the United States in 1982 from the development of the information industry could have been obtained at the cost of $1 billion whereas in fact, $50 billion were spent, although such expenditures were considered justified. The cost of some developed systems for automatic design could be reduced by a factor of 15-20. Another crisis aspect is the catastrophic increase in the scarcity of programmers, the overall assessment for which in the industrially developed countries runs into the millions.

Problems related to the use of computers must be developed and solved at a pace outstripping their creation. The belated reorientation in the development of

computers and their application could cause great damage and loss of time. Covering the distance "from the problem to the computer" requires basic research in the field of the information industry and defining the most promising bridgeheads for computerization and corresponding types of problems. Their profound "spectral analysis," and the thorough processing of the units in the model-algorithm will enable us substantiatedly to convert to the final stage in modeling. This will include defining the problem of programming logic and computer architecture, and linguistic, instrumental and apparatus means and requirements concerning processors, suitable for a given type of problems. It is only thus that we could create economical and highly adaptive information-computer systems which could develop and support the model-algorithm-program triad. In particular, we must not passively wait for new models of computers. The intensification of the efforts for mathematical and, on an even broader plane, information modeling (for information on the object is actually a type of its model) and their increased returns are entirely possible on the basis of the already existing technical foundations.

Yet another important aspect should not be ignored: the methods used in applying computer equipment under our circumstances should not be a literal repetition of the Western models in which, given a relative saturation of the market for computers and their low cost, to a certain extent a method "from hardware to user" is applied. In the years to come it would be difficult to rely on the fact that an entirely favorable situation with computers will develop in our country. This is an additional argument in favor of **our specific way of computerization.** Its purpose is **to compensate for the lag in technical facilities with intellectual reserves.**

This objective (along with increasing the production and improving the quality of computers) could be achieved only through the primarily intensive development of the new methodology and computer sciences and technologies based on it, which can ensure essentially new solutions to key problems.

Perfecting Technological Processes

The technocratic models of the future society were developed in the period of universal belief in our power, when the power of man over the forces of nature appeared unlimited. Currently such models are being abandoned. An understanding is developing that in technology as well essential changes cannot be made through purely technical means. Thus, in machine building, which is the largest sector in the national economy, support of empiricism and the customary methods for updating equipment on the basis of a systematic insignificant improvement in certain designs, leads to the appearance of a large number of models of morally obsolete machines with few distinguishing characteristics. Radical changes must be made in the conditions for the production and use of the equipment and new methods for computing and designing machines and mechanisms must be found.

However, still prevalent is the old way of acting, which has been used for years and has cost billions: let us place facilities in different areas, make tests and take measurements, compare variants, compute parameters of small experimental systems of actual structures, with the assumption that a similarity exists among them (something on which, actually, we should not seriously rely). The reason lies by no means in the lack of or low quality of computers, which is an excuse frequently used for continuing to work as in the past, but the fact that problems of methodology are ignored. The mathematical arsenal of the engineer and the technologist reflects, in the majority of cases, by no means the latest standard. The **traditional way of indirect application of mathematical methods in technology** remains dominant. This means that mathematical results and concepts are used predominantly in the basic sciences (chemistry, physics, biology and mechanics), and are being gradually instilled in the minds of scientists in different fields and becoming accepted by them. It is only later that they are converted and and applied initially in one area of knowledge or another and only afterwards in specific technical projects.

This largely objective yet chaotic and diffusing process has obvious weaknesses: slow pace of application and loss of many important achievements. Furthermore, it frequently turns out that wherever theory is needed it is simply unavailable. We are forced to work without the magic lantern of mathematics. The idea even exists that theoretical mathematics can do whatever it can but when necessary, while applied mathematics does what is necessary as best it can. Such views are based on the specific nature of mathematics, many ideas and methods of which appear as the result of its internal development and peculiar logic of creativity, for which reason they are not directly related to the vital problems. Without belittling in the least the significance of such trends, let us acknowledge that the time has come for the mathematicians to do both what is needed and the way it is needed. We have no longer decades at our disposal to wait for the truth, and to wait for the time when stored results will find a use. Today we must strengthen the trends which can lead to the direct application of mathematical methods, including in solving problems of technology.

Such opportunities are provided by mathematical modeling. Complete models, which adequately describe the process in its entire complexity, and efficient computing algorithms, and problem-oriented packets of applied programs, which encompass available mathematical experience presented in a form accessible to a wide range of users, are the means which enable us truly to update the methodological base of technology.

Naturally, we must aspire not to the partial but the integral systematic renovation based on a widespread range of models and their program implementation.

Thus, flexible automated production facilities include a variety of levels (cutting tool, machine tool, assembly line). The development and use of each one of them and, even more so, their combination within a single entity, call for the implementation of computer experimentation on several levels, constant modeling and forecasting the work of all elements under changing circumstances (in the case of a cutting tool, for example, with a view to obtaining materials with predetermined properties and determining the characteristics of its wear). It is only thus that we can create truly integrated technological SAPR and ASU, which guarantee such greatly desired **unity between a process and its management.**

Does this mean that on each separate occasion we must formulate the model-algorithm-program triad for each technological process or design? Considering the tremendous variety of technologies, this would be a hopeless task. The solution is to consider technological problems as basic problems of scientific and technical progress which is, in fact, what they are. The unity of the mathematical world makes it possible to reduce their variety to a relatively small number of basic problems and (in addition to the other advantages of the computing experiment) make full use of a quality such as universality. We know, for example, the similarity among the processes of heat exchange in the shielding of a spaceship and the cracking reactor, and the similarity of phenomena which trigger vibrations in parts of an airplane and unstable movement of valves under the effect of gas flows. From the viewpoint of mathematical modeling, there is virtually no difference between such problems and the conversion from the one to the other is achieved with a simple adaptation of already developed computer means. In particular, the possibility of specialized computers with ready-made replacement blocks used in modeling typical types of technological problems is entirely realistic.

The use of the advantages of mathematical modeling and of the means of information in technological applications, based on it, requires major intellectual and organizational efforts. The current situation is unsatisfactory. The symptoms of our lagging in this area behind the developed capitalist countries is more alarming than in basic sciences. There has been a shift in the West toward the mass application of mathematical modeling and computer experimentation in technology. The purchasing by automobile-making concerns of supercomputers to compute complete automobile designs, particularly in terms of accident situations, is becoming typical. This proves to be quite profitable, for such "breakdowns" involve mathematical models rather than the use of hundreds of expensive custom-made cars (a limited number of "basic" tests with actual motor vehicles naturally does take place). It is believed that companies which do not have similar computation facilities will become noncompetitive as early as 1990. Replacing some physical tests in aerodynamic tunnels with computer experiments in designing the latest American airbus made it possible to find a model which offered a significantly lower resistance and reduced fuel expenditures by 20 percent (savings from this alone are assessed at $10 billion). A European consortium for "Mathematics in Industry," financed by the EEC has been created with the joint efforts of 11 countries. Its purpose is to ensure the efficient utilization of the methods of mathematical modeling in industry, the formulation of a corresponding catalogue of problems and the training and retraining of specialists in the area of mathematical modeling of technological processes.

Against this background the unique experience acquired by Soviet specialists in mathematical modeling of some technologies in the areas of microelectronics, instrument manufacturing and laser and heat processing of materials remains virtually unused.

For example, important achievements without foreign analogues have been obtained in the method for designing measuring equipment, linked with computers, and computing algorithms of transforming measurement results (so-called measuring-computer complexes). The steadily increasing demands for measuring equipment can no longer be met through purely technological means (such as improving the precision machining of surfaces). Physical limitations, which are basic and essentially inevitable, become operational. For example, thermodynamic fluctuations which trigger inevitable static in electric circuits makes it impossible to measure arbitrary low currents and tensions; diffraction "vetoes" increases in the resolution power of telescopes with fixed dimensions, and so on.

Such obstacles can be "circumvented" by mathematical modeling. Experiments with mathematical models of measurements, accurately describing the interaction between instruments and the means and targets, and transmitting processes occurring in the instruments themselves, are taking place with the help of computers. It turns out that the distortions and the static inherent in real measurements can be compensated by processes which have no analogue in nature. They are "attainable" only through computer experimentation (i.e., technological tricks are essentially unable to correct matters). The thus structured measuring-computer complexes have parameters which far exceed "physical limits."

With this approach, computers are used not only in routine processing of information but for achieving a deep penetration into the essence of the process. The development of such a method requires fundamental mathematical studies of the theory of reduction (transformation) of measurements. As a result, it becomes possible to choose instruments and their work systems in such a way that, combined with computers, they acquire the best possible features which are noticeably superior to the indicators of standard systems of the same value. The extensive use of measuring-computer complexes is an essentially new and, possibly, exclusive means of intensification in machine-tool manufacturing.

Such achievements clearly confirm the unacceptability of purely technical means of improving technologies and the unavoidable use of intellectual reserves. **Conditions for the development of contemporary methodology must be created today.** It cannot operate in its customary role of a residual economic unit. Otherwise the relatively modest initial "credit" which is needed today for the future alliance between mathematics and technology will soon turn out, in accordance with the familiar rule, into the need "to pay double" in terms of material resources and education.

Education As a Training Model of Science

The acceleration concept requires the adoption and application of new concepts in education. The contemplated pace of scientific and technical progress can be attained only by a specialist trained in a new fashion. In this area the human factor is related above all to a drastic improvement in the quality of education and its efficiency. As to the methodological restructuring, in this case the decisive role of education is unquestionable. Man has always been the creator and promoter of new methodology. The problems of our higher education, the reform of which is now extensively being developed, is well-known. They involve the archaic nature of curricula, the predominance of passive forms of training, duplication of targets, overloading students and teachers, and the poor mathematical and technical facilities of VUZs. A wide gap exists between the training and scientific processes, and the role of VUZ research remains insignificant. It accounts for less than 10 percent of scientific outlays in the country, although more than one-half of all specialists with scientific degrees are employed in the higher schools. Additional difficulties are the result of a certain inertia in the educational system (time is needed to complete the reform and for its results to appear). This inertia becomes particularly grave today, under the conditions of the fast obsolescence of knowledge. The contemporary "period of half-life of competence," i.e., the period during which knowledge becomes 50 percent obsolete, is 5 years for engineers and less than 4 years for chemists, medical workers and biologists.

Consequently, we must abandon extensive means and methods of training, and shift priorities. We must review plans and curricula and **convert from hopelessly obsolete "referential" knowledge to "scientific" education, which, in a certain sense, is a model of science and reflects the dynamics of scientific and technical progress.**

The essence of a scientific education is combining the necessary minimum of basic knowledge with the new and intensive technology of research, using general purpose means which do not depend on sectorial specifics. The rapidly aging specific information could be concentrated in regularly updated knowledge and data banks, using the possibilities of the modern information industry. For example, if instead of studying multiple-volume atlases on the strength of materials, based on the simplest mechanical models, the future engineer were to study high-precision and fast methods for computing designs on computers and respective design automation systems, his skills, labor productivity and creative returns would improve drastically.

The solution of this problem is impossible without the creation of a thoroughly planned and well designed system for the training and retraining of a significant number of specialists on different skill levels, and managerial personnel. The basic requirement for specialists is the confident mastery of the model-algorithm-program triad. Their general theoretical baggage includes, in addition to basic information in the chosen area of science, a good knowledge of mathematical models, computation methods and computer possibilities. Naturally, the emphasis in training depends on the functions of the specialist and the specific area of application. In areas (such as mechanics) in which the adequacy of models and the limits of their applicability have been determined on the basis of long experience, the main attention is concentrated on the development of computer algorithms and problem-oriented program packets. It is also possible to develop a gradation in terms of functions (mathematical models, computer algorithms, applied and systems programming), by area (physics, chemistry, biology, etc.) and level ("developers" and "users").

Actually, the ideal specialist in mathematical modeling is a certain (albeit small) collective. The ability to work in a collective cannot be developed in the course of a purely training process (this is one more argument in favor of combining training with scientific-production work).

What could be the contribution of the higher school in training specialists who have mastered the new methodology? Above all, it is necessary to upgrade the general mathematical standards of graduates and their computer literacy.

The computerization of education is, unquestionably, consistent with the needs of our time. However, it must not be reduced merely to the purchasing of computers and teaching programming to students. A mandatory prerequisite here is introducing in programs for natural science and technical subjects the foundations of mathematical physics (such as the science of models) and computer mathematics (such as the science of algorithms), i.e., the balanced consideration of all parts of the model-algorithm-program triad. The worse bottleneck is that of training specialists in computer methods which ensure the covering of the "algorithm" stage, without which the new methodology is inconceivable. Yet, such cadres are simply unavailable in dozens and hundreds of computer and information centers with powerful equipment at their disposal.

For the time being, the computerization of education bears the very familiar features which set our teeth on edge, of a superficial campaign, following the path of least resistance.

We must point out that expressions such as "computer literacy" and "second literacy" by which, as a rule, we imply mastering programming languages, should not mislead us. Ordinary literacy and the mastery of one's native language link each one of us to the cultural, intellectual and moral values, which took thousands of years to develop, and to history and the contemporary world. Naturally, this cannot be said of translating specific assignments to a language understood by the machine. The emphasis on the "program" stage, which is characteristic of the present approach, leads to the appearance of a large group of encoders who are incapable of making full use of the possibilities of computer equipment.

In itself, the computerization of education cannot solve the problem of cadres. Its meaning lies elsewhere: in the creation of an educational background and psychological prerequisites for the adequately extensive training of medium-skilled specialists ("users" of the new methodology). Intensive and concentrated steps must be taken to train highly skilled developers.

One of them is that of creating in the largest VUZs of mathematical modeling centers. This is a very promising step, consistent with the nature of the higher schools. The multiple-purpose nature of mathematical modeling would make it possible to rally the efforts of scientists in different areas, working in the VUZs, and will help to synthesize the scientific with the training process without scattering funds among faculties or departments. The share of research done in VUZs will be increased significantly without the use of major capital investments.

Mathematics departments must make graduate studies possible; they must include laboratories for computer mathematics and mathematical modeling and allow teachers to engage in scientific research in the area of specialization of their VUZ.

It is also necessary to develop a network of departments of mathematical modeling based on the facilities of the leading academic and sectorial institutes in this field. The basic training system, which has proved its usefulness, and which includes active creative work by senior students as part of highly skilled collectives should, in terms of mathematical modeling, be granted the most favorable regime, not only in universities but also in technical VUZs. Hopes that the separately taught elements of the new methodology will, at one point, merge within the mind of the future researcher, becoming a single entity, are illusory. Only a specialist working on the cutting edge of science can develop a training program as a model reflecting (and outfitting) the current level reached in science.

Significant possibilities exist for increasing the number of applied mathematicians with higher skills, outside the higher schools. In particular, strengthening the leading centers of the country in the area of mathematical modeling would automatically ensure, in addition to a standard of work and their scale, the broader training of cadres both for their own needs as well as the needs of other organizations. The collective target practicing by groups of specialists has proved its usefulness. It is desirable because its results are a kind of duplication of target scientific schools operating on a high quality basis.

Solving educational problems will, naturally, require major efforts in the revision of curricula and aids, the elimination of interdepartmental barriers and the lifting of prohibitions and restrictions which were imposed decades ago. However, we cannot hope for any stable acceleration without these and other steps.

It is possible as of now to obtain substantial results on the basis of the new methodology, not only in the scientific and technical but in the socioeconomic and political areas as well. Furthermore, it reaches areas in which, with its help, it becomes possible if not to "compute" the future at least to play out a variety of scenarios of regional and global development. This is exemplified by the projection of the "nuclear winter," which was developed with the help of Soviet specialists, and which totally owes its appearance to mathematical modeling. A program has been drafted for the extensive development and use of methods of mathematical modeling and computer experimentation in solving a huge range of scientific and technical and socioeconomic problems. However, the question of resources and the training of cadres for its implementation remains unsolved. Delays in this area are inadmissible. We must urgently focus our efforts on the development of this priority trend in scientific and technical progress. The results will not be slow in coming.

Cuba: Sources of Change

18020007k Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 93-101

[Article by Pavel Vladimirovich Bogomolov, PRAVDA special correspondent]

[Text] With a happy rumble, the self-propelling diesel railroad car rushed upward, along the blue steel platform hanging over Havana Bay.

"Is this not a more convenient way to 'skip' across several districts of this two-million strong city," said Antonio Piedra, a driver with more than 30 years of practical experience, his eye focused on the instrument panel.

The elevated railroad was built at the turn of the century, when Antonio's grandfather was driving along those same tracks not heavy trains but coaches. They were connected to small locomotive engines any one of which would seem today like a toy. Eighty years ago, however,

considering the modest dimensions of the then locomotive engines, the builders had put both tracks very close to each other. At that time this narrowness did not obstruct anything. Now, however, it is necessary to alternate in launching the trains along the platform.

To increase the handling capacity of the tracks is a key problem for all Cuban transportation workers. Actually, similar problems are being solved today in the country's entire economy, in Cuban society as a whole. The Third Cuban Communist Party Congress, which took place in 1986, exposed the shortcomings in areas in which the "handling capacity" no longer allows further progress.

As was reported in the press, this was not a totally ordinary congress. It was held in two stages, separated by an almost full year of intensive work. It was this, actually, that enabled the party to formulate, by the time of the final December session of its forum, a clear and integral concept of the present stage in the country's development. Officially, it was described as a process of correcting errors and eliminating negative trends. It was an original process which reflected the special conditions prevailing in the first socialist state in the Western Hemisphere.

The originality of Cuba. Most frequently such words remind us of the unique landscape of this island, the ardent tropical nature and temperament of the Cuban. I believe, however, that the features of that country involve a much broader concept.

Unlike the countries in Eastern Europe, at the time of the victory of the revolution Cuba was in a state of neocolonial dependence on the leading countries in the capitalist world. Within an underdeveloped island economy, burdened by feudal vestiges, the necessary material-technical and organizational prerequisites for the future "socialization" of economic life which had formed, let us say, in today's GDR or Czechoslovakia, could not mature. Furthermore, there was a tremendous gap in Cuba between the levels of development of the capital and its periphery.

The main economic task of the republic at the time of socialist change was not to "retune" an almost ready or relatively mature base but to lay its foundations. The country had to be "girded" with power cables, rail and automotive roads, create a comprehensive industrial and social infrastructure and undertake the mass construction of schools and hospitals. To the deep regret of the Cubans themselves, such tasks which demand essentially extensive solutions are still on the agenda. Let us add to this the difficult circumstances of one-quarter of a century of imperialist blockade and the huge distance separating the country from its main partners, friends and allies.

The existing nature of production relations in contemporary Cuba demands a very cautious approach and a balanced and unhasty evaluation. Within the rigid limits imposed by a chronic scarcity of many resources, centralized planning and a largely rationed distribution of material goods, even timid attempts at economic reforms become difficult.

Those who have not followed the dynamics of socialist changes on the Isle of Freedom may think that the Cuban communists are only now undertaking a more profound reassessment of their domestic policies. Actually, the first major correction of the course took place as early as the mid-1970s. In the republic, as noted Raul Valdez Vivo, rector of the Niko Lopez Higher Party School, in an interview granted to the journal REVOLUTION AFRIQUAINE, "major errors were made in the end of the 1960s and in the years which immediately followed. We allowed... a left-wing deviation which was manifested in arbitrariness. In other words, it meant belief that willpower could accomplish everything, regardless of economic laws and the need for economic mechanisms in managing the national economy, ignoring material factors without which neither the economy nor society can develop. This was described by Fidel Castro as a major tactical error."

The First Congress of the Cuban Communist Party, which was held in 1975, firmly put an end to a number of distortions and unfinished projects of the preceding period. After the adoption of the party's programmatic platform, it essentially led the republic along the track of a scientifically based development and a closer consideration of material and moral-political factors.

Soon afterwards, however, another deviation was let to occur, a kind of opposite leftist approach to the country's problems. Numerous party, state and public organization units were affected, as is presently recognized by the Cuban comrades, by an epidemic of formalism and bureaucratization.

I remember that 3 years ago I visited the Eastern part of the republic, the Moa Municipality, where, with Soviet help, one of the biggest ore mining territorial-production complexes in the Western Hemisphere is being created. The working conditions at the complex are quite difficult: a red-colored dust, the inevitable companion of iron-containing compounds on the surface of the ground, permanently hangs over hundreds of hectares. At the construction office of the Ernesto Che Guevara Nickel Plant, we talked to a group of installation workers, and excavator and bulldozer operators. Virtually all of them, in speaking of the increased humidity, heat, distance from cultural centers and other objective difficulties, referred, as compensation, to their huge, almost fantastic earnings: 700 pesos, 800 pesos or 900 pesos monthly (on the official rate of exchange a peso was worth approximately 90 kopeks). Meanwhile, year after year the construction plans remained unfulfilled both by the fault of the Cubans and the Soviet personnel.

As I recorded these data I kept wondering what amount of advance payments, bonuses, overtime, and so on, were included in the overall earnings of my interlocutors! I could find here the use of parts of Soviet, Bulgarian and Czechoslovak experience in material incentive. And all of this was under the existing rationing system for the distribution of basic foodstuffs, according to which a working family of three members needed between 150 to 200 pesos to buy potatoes and some unrationed products. For the time being, apartments, and furniture were still sold on a centralized basis. The legitimate question was the following: In that case were such record payments, which simply could not be converted into goods, performing any kind of incentive role?

A number of such questions could be asked in Cuba, for the administrations of hundreds of enterprises and state farms generously paid for virtually anything done by the workers. Everywhere the personnel was being increased and more money was paid on bonuses, assignments and representation purposes and the number of initiated construction projects was increasing without, however, higher returns on invested funds. The need for a radical revision of such practices was becoming inevitable.

For Themselves and For the People

Today the process of correcting such errors is referred in Cuba on the highest levels as "revolution within the revolution." This is due not only to the new qualitative nature of the changes which are taking place but also to the fact that this process is taking place exclusively on a socialist basis, thus defeating the futile hopes of the enemies of new Cuba that the country will degenerate. The correction of errors has spread to literally all areas of life in the country. A radical revision was made above all of the party's economic policy. The faulty practices of the first half of the 1980s, when efforts were made to accelerate national economic development through an artificial investment in enterprises and entire sectors, ignoring the modest possibilities of the republic and, therefore, were clearly excessive in volume, were condemned.

It is true that under the conditions of a relatively favorable foreign economic situation, for a while extensive economic management methods were still able to provide economic growth. However, the economy was exhausting its reserves. Meanwhile, some planning workers stubbornly continued to rely on the "magic power" of outlays, ignoring very alarming phenomena around them. Today such lack of concern is being stopped; the evaluation of achievements and unused reserves is becoming more considered, thought-out and strict among labor collectives. It is precisely this approach, consistent with the resolutions of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat, that must become comprehensive. However, not everyone is as yet ready to master it in full, for one must fight for anything that is new, unusual and progressive.

For example, here is the nontraditional way in which one of the meetings was held at the Republican Spain Agroindustrial Complex. The meeting began with the customary reading of the agenda which, unexpectedly, assumed a rather tense aspect. And all this was because party member Ezekiel Barrios, head of a brigade of combine operators, suggested another text of the item "On the Socialist Obligations of the Collective."

"They must be dropped altogether," he said confidently, as though this was something which had been decided a long time ago.

The meeting froze. Dozens of people looked at Barrios with amazement. Some muttered something, others disapproved and others indifferently sighed. "Stop kidding, Ezekiel," said someone in an effort to stop him....

However, no one could quarrel with the labor activeness of Barrios. As a frontranking mechanizer, he was quite different from some pseudoworkers who try to get easier jobs and earn more. Conversely, Barrios was respectfully praised as a "multi-millionaire," which is the way those who have mowed hundreds of thousands of quintals of sugar cane are known in Cuba. Suddenly, it was precisely this man who was rejecting a draft resolution which, incidentally, was absolutely identical to the one adopted the previous year.

"Let us ask ourselves," the brigade leader went on to say, "why is it that our obligations look so positive? Because they are properly differentiated from a plan which has been clearly reduced. This, however, is a self-delusion: we are showing pride in something which, it is high time, we should be doing on a daily basis. It would be better for the management to adopt as its plan our own counterplan and higher obligations!"

The rejection by the farmers of stereotyped "copies" of obligations was made public. The decision which was made by Barrios and his comrades we viewed as confirmation of the growing maturity of the Cuban working people and their unwillingness to follow obsolete standards and be paid unearned money. Other demands are replacing the questionable calculations on all sorts of supplements for "overtime" and so on.

The Cuban Communist Party rejected both idealistic ostentation and the narrow-minded approach to the organization of labor and wages. Strict control over the accurate and thrifty use of the budget and investments replaced the "pilfering" of the budget and the wasting of investments.

A careful study of the latest resolutions of the Cuban communists, and the essentially official publications in GRANMA and the party's theoretical journals reveal, above all, the particular urgency of the tasks of optimally combining material with moral incentives and organizational and educational instruments aimed at upgrading labor productivity. This emphasis is legitimate: a mass of

cash appeared, unsecured by commodity stocks, because of errors committed in the preceding period in the republic. The struggle against whitewashing, profiteering, a dishonest attitude toward labor and the aspiration to become rich at any cost was noticeably weakened.

Occasionally it is not so simple to explain to the ordinary working person that his previous earnings were not backed by the quantity and quality of goods produced. There were resentments, arguments and lack of understanding in the workshops. However, thanks to the painstaking ideological and educational work of the party organizations, an increasing number of Cubans are consciously accepting and supporting the source of improving the national economy and freeing it from unproductive expenditures. A quite painful but necessary reevaluation of the old concepts on communal and other services as being either free of charge or very cheap, has been initiated.

Electric power rates and the cost of urban transportation were increased. Certain limitations were introduced in food supplies. Free food in the nonproduction area was either stopped or reduced. Television programs became shorter. Some economic steps affected the network of preschool education and educational institutes. Less fuel is being issued to the state motor vehicle transportation system and expenditures for assignments abroad were lowered. This is not a question of a worsened situation on foreign markets and the aggravated shortage of foreign exchange or else, for example, the consequences of several years of drought. The heart of the matter goes much deeper: the Cuban Communist Party has consciously formulated a new, a self-critical attitude on the part of the people toward their needs and their labor contribution to the country's development. The republic of revolutionaries and internationalists is also becoming a republic of economically knowledgeable people who are taking increasingly into consideration the objective conditions for building socialism.

A curious phenomenon took place: the moment tens of thousands of Cuban workers and employees found themselves in the new circumstances and were deprived of undeserved privileges, they stopped "sticking to death" to their production sectors and office chairs. The surplus manpower, unsupported by real needs, became clearly apparent at enterprises, ministries and departments. The party found proper use for such manpower. On the initiative of many labor collectives, supported by the higher leadership, the once popular but then undeservedly forgotten "microbrigade" movement was revived.

"This means," I was told by Rojelio Lopez, Cuban Communist Party Central Committee member and secretary of the party committee at the Antillana De Acero Metallurgical plant in Havana, "that our collective will assign dozens of working people to participate in housing construction and the building of kindergartens, nurseries, stores and clinics. The plant will continue to pay their wages. As to the comrades remaining in the plant shops, having restructured their labor organization, they are meeting the full production quotas of the personnel who went into construction. In the 1970s it was essentially the members of such "microbrigades" who built their own housing premises or those of their comrades. Currently this work has been expanded. The efforts of the microbrigades are becoming part of the plan for the social development of entire municipalities. As a result, the social area is gradually reaching the level of modern requirements.

The faulty experience in the first half of the 1980s, when the country was literally covered by a kind of "boom" in individual construction, is now described as "ghost town." Theoretically, such construction was handled by the local authorities. In fact, however, it was largely uncontrolled. I remember an area of such disorderly individual building at the edge of Sancti Spiritus. Two-story cottages and garages, private homes, 19th-century style, and little cottages with brick roofs appeared there. However, there were no bridges, water mains, sewer lines, post offices, public laundries, stores or street lights. The country is indeed interested in solving the housing problem but not at the expense of chaotically appearing "Klondikes."

The correction of errors and elimination of negative phenomena in the social area mean, above all, restoring social justice and the major role played by social funds, which are inherent in socialism, and, in the view of the Cuban comrades, a more equitable distribution of material goods, taking carefully into consideration the prime tasks of the country. In Havana alone, within a short time, 50 kindergartens, 14 schools, dozens of polyclinics and 600 medical centers have either been completed or are under construction; in 1987 some 37,000 apartment units were completed and some 45,000 will be completed in 1988. For many long years there has been no such scale or pace of growth in the social area. As a whole in Cuba social consumption funds are increasing at an annual rate of 3.9 percent.

Thanks to the stricter observance of the socialist principle of payment according to labor, according to some estimates, the country's income increased by 158 million pesos. A substantial share of these funds was used to provide better incentive to low-paid categories of working people and to retain the manpower in the countryside. Despite adverse weather conditions, this helped to stabilize the production of meat, milk, coffee, citrus crops, cocoa beans, fruits and corn. However, additional state food subsidies were also required, and for the year they were higher than planned.

The closing down of peasant markets, which previously had handled as much as 30 percent of various food products, triggered quite conflicting reactions, particularly abroad. As some foreign mass information media reported, this step was in contrast with the practices of other socialist countries which are increasing the role of the markets not only as a kind of incentive for individual

labor activity but also as an additional channel for the marketing of kolkhoz and cooperative output. In the opinion of the Cuban comrades, the work of the peasant markets, which is difficult to control, and their specific nature and the possibility of making a quick killing, which was particularly tempting to the farmers and the wholesale brokers buying their output, could conflict with the tasks of the cooperative movement.

Greater Responsibility and Lesser Outlays

The reorientation of economic authorities and the methodological and organizational aid they receive from the party leadership are already yielding substantial results. Thus, with the help of production rationalization and in accordance with party decisions significant reductions in the volumes of Cuban imports have been achieved: in 1987 such imports declined by more than 6 percent compared to 1986. Purchases from capitalist countries were cut by virtually one-half. As to exports, conversely, they increased substantially. Exports of Cuban goods abroad rose by more than 8 percent, including exports to the fraternal countries. The responsibility and practicality of international collectives at projects of Soviet-Cuban cooperation increased.

Efficiency, proper performance and observance of foreign economic priorities, as was noted in the resolutions of the 3rd Congress of the Cuban Communist Party and subsequent Central Committee plenums, are inconceivable without a strict regimen of savings. The number of enterprises in the republic implementing comprehensively substantiated and stressed programs for energy and resource conservation has already reached 961. As a whole, this yielded additional savings totaling 45.6 million pesos. However, if we compare this with the overall production cost of goods, the success will prove to be quite modest: no more than 0.3 centavos per peso of outlays.

This is a modest amount, and the Cuban comrades say this frankly, as they look at the overall economic results achieved in 1987. The drastic worsening of the situation in the world capitalist market, to which Cuba sells some of its output, and the adverse weather conditions led to an overall reduction in the volumes of industrial and agricultural output by 3.2 percent. However, in the opinion of the republic's leading economists, this reduction would have been much worse under the old conditions, when material-technical and financial resources had been literally pilfered by sectorial ministries and the command role of national planning authorities had reached very low standards.

The correction of errors and involving in such work the broad toiling masses made it possible, despite a drop in the gross national product, to achieve substantial breakthroughs in areas such as power industry, petroleum refining, ore mining, metallurgy, machine building, construction of fishing vessels, the chemical and textile industries, and the production of paper and construction materials. Above all, there was no drop in the living standard of the population. The volume of retail trade did not decline and greater attention was paid to public health.

In order to consolidate such positive trends, the Cuban friends believe that they must struggle against waste even more energetically, for it is a question of a developing country with limited resources. This truth was properly realized, for example, by the small Sangili settlement. It is true that the thrift of its population can be traced back to the times when the droughts, which are frequent in the tropics, floods and hurricanes doomed entire provinces to hunger, for no help could be expected from the neocolonialist regime of the dictator Batista. Before the revolution "saving" frequently meant "surviving." There have been radical changes in the Cuban countryside since then but, as in the past, thrift and efficient accounting help the farmers in solving their difficult problems.

"This 5-year plan we organized special control over economic tasks," I was told by Umberto Ramirez, member of the buro of the Cuban Communist Party Municipal Committee, and old resident of the area. "We frequently considered at buro meetings problems of personal responsibility of managers-party members for the economical use of fuels and lubricants, for the petroleum comes from afar, from the Soviet Union. Therefore, do not be surprised if you see along our roads animal-drawn carts. In the past we hauled our vegetable crops by truck or tractor. These are different times. However, there is nothing shameful in such thrift."

There is a somewhat guarded attitude toward the changes occurring in Cuban enterprises and agroindustrial complexes: the rights and prerogatives of middle-level managers have been restricted somewhat. Yet until relatively recently this category of managers appeared quite flexible and independent in decision-making. Indeed, concepts such as "enterprises," "economic autonomy" "free shipping to foreign markets," "enterprise foreign exchange fund," and other features in Cuban reality may be found to a much lesser extent than are practiced by the majority of European socialist countries.

All of this is being frankly discussed in the republic. The point is that a really systematic and scientifically substantiated development of the Cuban economy began only in the mid-1970s. It is true that despite the lack of knowledge and practical experience, most plant directors, shop chiefs and chairmen of peasant cooperatives are distinguished by their high moral and political qualities and loyalty to the cause. However, revolutionary convictions cannot replace proper cost accounting and ability to provide a weighed study of the situation and make knowledgeable decisions. For example, what was the worth of the recent struggle for profitability in Cuban

enterprises, when many directors could not consider any other way of increasing production efficiency other than raising prices of industrial and agricultural commodities.

To Tell the Truth

Along with socioeconomic development, the process of correcting errors affected the spiritual life of society, its standards, and the work of the creative intelligentsia and the Cuban mass information media. It is true that in these areas, in the view of the Cuban leadership, there were fewer shortcomings and failures than in other areas of life.

"Nonetheless, step-by-step we are surmounting the legacy of the preceding period during which successes were excessively praised," said Carlos Aldana, member of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat, at a conference of heads of central organs of the party press in the fraternal socialist countries, which took place in Havana. We are abandoning, in order to serve our interests better, that which Cubans usually describe as 'apologetics' or 'triumphalism.' On the other hand, by acting in precisely this manner, we are blocking more successfully the anti-Cuban propaganda of our experienced ideological opponents, which is being beamed at our territory for more than 100 hours daily. In this sector of the work any delay is the equivalent of a political loss. Furthermore, the Florida microphones are now being handled not by retirees but by relatively young renegades consisting of emigres of the new generation, who are familiar with our problems.

"Under these circumstances," Comrade Aldana went on to say, "we must more daringly rely on the firm foundations of the Cuban Revolution and its increased maturity over the past years. We can and must fearlessly and openly speak of the problems existing in the country, including the inadequate use of the tremendous assistance which is being given Cuba by the other socialist countries. We do not intend to cultivate our previous myths of some kind of particularly secrecy and mysteriousness of Cuban political activities within the country and in the international arena. We must also put an end to underestimating our audience which, under socialism, as become the highest educated in Latin America. Generally speaking, the Cuban ideological front must seriously restructure its work. This does not mean, however, that we shall uncritically accept literally the entire experience of the fraternal countries, for Cuba is in a special, very specific geopolitical situation, and at a very specific level of socioeconomic development."

Here is what I was told by Lisandro Otero, a noted writer, who was only recently head of the Cuban Union of Writers and Men of Culture, on the current changes in the life of the Cuban creative intelligentsia:

The most important thing is to provide an honest and objective evaluation of the path covered by Cuban culture in the 3 decades since our revolution. Indeed, what were we yesterday, what are we today and where shall we find ourselves tomorrow? These are difficult problems and, to many people, even painful ones, and here is why: the 3rd Cuban Communist Party Congress exposed most principle-mindedly the errors and negative trends in our development and indicated ways to correct them. This enhanced the spiritual life of society, making it more active and dynamics. Many Cubans are asking where were the writers, our entire literature, for so many years? Could it be that those experts of the human soul were unable, from the very beginning, to detect the bacilli of bureaucratism, philistinism, grubbiness, egotism, boastfulness and other faults which, alas, under the new conditions as well could spread so extensively?

"Yes, the critical mood and civic concern were all, unfortunately, rarely found in our books," L. Otero went on to say. "But do we have the moral right to punish anyone for this or question his professional standard merely because he failed to expose on time the totality of negative phenomena and did not find the proper approach to them? The point is that we are in the immediate neighborhood of the largest country in the capitalist world, a country which threw at Cuba the full volume of aggressive actions, political provocations and economic blockade. Many among our men of culture spent years under arms. Under these circumstances it is extremely difficult to criticize that which was built and defended at the cost of tremendous losses and sacrifices. That is why our union undertook the search for a new organizational-creative formula, within which the masters of culture could more actively help the party in surmounting the shortcomings existing in the country."

It is believed in Cuba that the expensive correction of previous errors was undertaken, as a whole, on time. Particular efforts are being made now to make party life incomparably more combative and dynamic. In guiding the process of surmounting negative trends, the Cuban Communist Party has also subjected to a critical review and, in some cases, to a radical reassessment the nature, ways and means of its own work. On that level, the half-a-million strong Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the Cuban people is not only a leading force but also the most important target of the changes being carried out in the republic.

What is being changed, above all, is the style of party fora on all levels. Most party organizations have discarded formal predrafted speeches, relying on open and sharp debates. The aspiration to "respond" earlier than others and to report has been replaced by a thoughtful analysis of possibilities and reserves which are only then followed by the adoption of specific resolutions in accordance with contemporary party requirements.

The organizational work of the Cuban communists have changed a great deal. More than anything else it is the nature of the relationship between the primary party units and superior party authorities that has changed. This was helped by the establishment of mobile instructor units under the provincial committees of the Cuban

Communist Party. In Havana, for example, each unit is responsible for the work of an average of 38-40 primary organizations.

Qualitative changes are being made in party cadre work. The previous rather conservative concepts on the contribution of party members to the country have been largely revised. A far greater number of young people, women and members of different ethnic groups are being promoted to leading positions. A process of certification of party members and an exigent investigation of their ability to be worthy of the high title of party member has developed. Although not without conflict situations, work is taking place on the confirmation of party cards.

"In short, a psychological restructuring of party cadres is taking place. The cadres are directed toward achieving end results and converting from the yardstick of outlays to efficiency indicators," I was told in Sancti Spiritus, at the Cuban Communist Party Provincial Committee. "Before the 3rd Congress it was as though we hesitated to criticize mangers on different levels of the economy, culture and education. Today this false embarrassment has been abandoned."

Even a fragmentary and by no means complete description of the changes occurring today in Cuba gives an idea of the difficulty and comprehensive nature of the process of correcting errors. In a number of areas, this process is substantially different from the changes taking place in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

The authors of letters to the editors of Soviet newspapers and journals occasionally ask whether the Cuban friends can be fully guaranteed against making new errors or other shortcomings, perhaps not so dangerous but nonetheless noteworthy? How could there be absolute guarantees in such a major and complex matter as the live creativity of the masses? Time will show. My interlocutors in Cuba willingly admitted this: the insufficient substantiation or poor work done on one aspect or another in the correction of errors, and the need to correct the course in the future.

The Isle of Freedom, noted Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the State Council and the Council of Ministers of the republic, at the 4th Congress of the Union of Writers and Cultural Workers, has a strong party and people whose culture is based on the principles of internationalism and revolutionary awareness. The country can be proud of its youth. All of these are Cuba's priceless treasures. Since the revolution the republic has created tremendous moral values. Despite the negative trends which appeared in recent years and led to the need to initiate a process of correcting errors, inherent in the Cuban people are mass patriotism, internationalism and heroism.

Before the Congress of the Italian Communist Party

18020007l Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 102-112

[Article by Vladimir Kupriyanovich Naumov, doctor of historical sciences, Department of World Politics and International CPSU Activities, CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences]

[Text] The Italian Communist Party, the largest communist party in the nonsocialist part of the world, is preparing for its 18th Congress. The party rallies within its ranks some 1.5 million members, or nearly one-third of all communists in the capitalist countries. Unquestionably, however, its authority and social influence are not based on numbers only. The unflagging attention paid to the ICP and interest in it are determined, above all, by its theoretical and practical activities, political activeness in the national and international arenas, and wealth of intellectual potential and innovation.

The party deserves tremendous credit for the fact that the Italian working people have been able to gain political freedoms (which must be constantly and stubbornly defended). As an impressive opposition force which governmental coalitions must take into consideration, the ICP is active in the parliament and in the regional and local self-governing authorities. Throughout the entire territory, in all cities and communes, it has its sections, federations and committees. The ICP manages (together with the socialists) the General Italian Labor Federation. It is the only communist party in Western Europe which (again with the socialists) heads a large share of the cooperative movement throughout the country.

A characteristic features of the ICP is the priority attention it gives to problems of democracy. It was always operated under the banner of democracy and defense of human rights and freedoms of the individual. The communist party has invariably asserted its conviction that "democracy and socialism are inseparably interrelated and can be strengthened only under the conditions of full respect for the right of each nation to guide its own destinies."

The independent theoretical work done by the ICP in interpreting the new realities of the country and the world has triggered disparate and not always substantiated reactions. It is a fact, however, that it has formulated innovative ideas which have drawn the attention of party members throughout the world and stimulated discussions and the development of theory. In 1956, at its 8th Congress, the ICP formulated the concept of the variety of ways leading to socialism and that of the struggle for socialism under Italian conditions—the "Italian way to socialism." Although initially this

shocked some people, it was by no means different from Lenin's behest to the foreign communists of not duplicating the "Russian example." The ICP tried to provide a more profound interpretation of the contemporary role of the working class in terms of the new realities and problems of shaping the subject of social changes on a broad social base. It drafted its concept of interaction among the European left under the conditions of economic integration and the strengthening of international relations and interdependence.

The Italian Communist Party was the first to appeal to all progressive forces—and not only in its own country—to join efforts to prevent a thermonuclear catastrophe, and laid the beginning of an entirely new process, for the situation was also entirely different from the one in the past. It was not a question in the least of being "for" or "against" the Soviet Union but of supporting actions initiated on various sides to remove a mortal threat. Now, P. Togliatti emphasized, extensive possibilities appear for the unification of "forces which are quite distinct from each other in terms of their nature and social and political features." This unification could turn into an actual movement for safeguarding human civilization and mankind itself. That is why anyone caring for human life faced the task of promoting "the broadest possible coalition of forces for the preservation of our civilization, ascribing to this a decisive significance both in the domestic situation of each country and in the international situation, and turning it into an insurmountable force." By developing this approach, the ICP formulated the concept of a "new internationalism" which, as E. Berlinguer emphasized, was explained in terms of the changes which have taken place in the world arena and the increased threat of nuclear war and which, in turn, required the unification of a wide range of forces which opposed war, regardless of class differences.

The ICP maintains relations with all socialist, revolutionary and progressive movements. "The establishment and broadening of such relations is the major prerequisite for asserting a policy of detente and peaceful coexistence and friendly relations and mutual interest among countries and peoples and, at the same time, assisting and disseminating the ideas of democracy, progress and socialism as the independent choice of each nation."

Unfortunately, many of the ideas and theoretical postulates of the ICP were not accurately assessed in our country in their time. Our historical science and many social scientists and political experts were unable to perceive their relevance and novelty. The years of stagnation did not disappear without a trace in this area as well. No single official document or communique on the results of meetings between CPSU and ICP leaders in Moscow or Rome included any kind of criticism of Italian communists; conversely, the inviolability of the foundations of the principle governing relations among parties—mutual respect, noninterference in internal affairs, autonomy, and so on—were invariably emphasized. However, they lacked even the customary statements on "full coincidence of views" and in a number of signed articles the searching by the ICP was criticized.

Remarks aimed at us triggered particularly noticeable irritation. The ICP expressed the view that the "process of renovation initiated by the 20th CPSU Congress, a process which, from its very beginning, took place under conditions of contradictions and uncertainty and was paralleled by various types of resistance, had been obstructed," explaining this as the shortcoming of the congress itself and the fact that, having concentrated the criticism on the "cult of personality" it has been unable to provide a profound analysis of the organization of the political system in the USSR. It was true, E. Berlinguer emphasized in 1982, that the 20th CPSU Congress had stimulated the development of new processes in the socialist countries. However, this progress had not only failed to become universal but was paralleled, particularly on the ideological and political levels, by directly opposite phenomena of "stagnation and even regression." The ICP expressed its view on the alienation of the working people from participation and adoption of most important decisions, and on cases of violations of the freedom of creativity. The criticism of shortcomings in Soviet reality failed to meet with proper understanding on our part.

Assertions were made in the Soviet press including, unfortunately, in KOMMUNIST, that the leadership of the ICP was joining the "common channel of antisocialist propaganda mounted in the West," that it was promoting the "ideological disarmament" of the working class "in the face of the class enemy," and that the "economic program of the ICP.... does not attack the main positions of the capitalist system," and so on (see KOMMUNIST No 2, 1982, p 102; No 4, pp 84-85).

To this day, referring to such articles to substantiate conclusions on ICP policy, some social scientists make use of their evaluations. Yet, as time proved, a great deal of that which was rejected and condemned out of hand contained a rational kernel and a great deal of valuable features worth considering. Active scientific and theoretical investigations and the generating of ideas, albeit not always impeccable but, unquestionably, contributing to the development of social thinking, are to the credit of the ICP. The fact that negative views and evaluations on this account still prevail is due, in our view, not only to the deep-seated dogmas remaining from the previous decades. The information we had about the ICP was extremely scant and, in some cases, tendentious.

How do the Italian communists live now, on the eve of their next congress? Naturally, this author does not claim to provide a full picture of processes and debates taking place within the ICP, the more so since the 18th Congress will mark the completion of the discussions and make politically important decisions.

Naturally, ICP life and activities and politics in the 1980s have been and had to be influenced, above all because it is a mass party, by the existing changes which had taken place in the international situation and within Italy itself. Italy is now a highly developed industrial country, whose output and technology are known and valued throughout the world, including in the USSR. In terms of its per capita GNP, Italy is fifth among the capitalist countries, having outstripped Great Britain. The social structure of its population and its working class has changed substantially as well. Most working people are no longer employed in industry but in services. As a result of the restructuring of industry on the basis of new technology and the use of microelectronics, the working class became extensively dispersed among thousands of small and medium-sized enterprises. The professional and educational standards of the working people have increased (without which contemporary production is impossible); their way of thinking, level of information and cultural standards have become different.

Meanwhile, unemployment has increased, accounting for about 12 percent of the active population, which is another Italian feature. Here it is higher than in other Western European countries.

In the past, as we know, Italy supplied substantial amounts of manpower to other countries. In the past 40 years 8.3 million people emigrated permanently (6 million to other European countries alone). However, here as well a major innovation appeared: today Italy, with its 3-million strong army of unemployed, has begun to import manpower. The country is employing hundreds of thousands of immigrants, mainly from North African countries.

These and other changes faced the communists with a number of difficult problems. It is as though they must once again win over new social strata and new groups among the working class. There has been an outflow of young people from the party and a certain decline in its political influence and membership. In a single decade (1977-1987) the party lost 310,000 members. Whereas in 1976 more than one-third of all Italians voted for the communists in the parliamentary elections, their number declined to slightly over one-quarter in 1987.

As the ICP itself admits, it has fallen behind in the formulation of a contemporary, a dynamic political line and methods of working with the masses consistent with the changed reality, the conditions of the cultural and ideological struggle and the new role of mass information media, television in particular. As was noted in the party press, a 10 year lag and lack of confidence left their mark. One must pay for this. The communists reached the firm belief that all aspects of party activities need renovation—its appearance, policy and organization—and that a contemporary concept of socialism had to be formulated and refined. The word "perestroyka" firmly entered the political lexicon.

In 1985 and 1986, prior to its 17th Congress, the ICP developed within its ranks an unprecedently open debate covering literally all problems of politics and life and encompassing all party organizations. The result was the appearance of different and occasionally conflicting viewpoints on most important political and ideological problems. Was it possible and realistic, some asked, for Italy currently to be oriented toward the overthrow of the capitalist system and the building of socialism? To what type of socialism should Italian communists aspire? Or else, would it be more realistic, under contemporary conditions, not to formulate such objectives but strive, in the course of daily activities, to make progressive socioeconomic and political changes and reach a new quality of life, albeit within the framework of capitalism, but subject to change?

As a whole, the discussion indicated that the communists, without rejecting the need for comprehensive activities aimed at progressive change, did not intend to drop socialist tasks from their agenda. However, a feeling of having an undefined strategic objective remained. The situation within the ICP after its 1986 17th Congress as well remained stressed. This worsened the aggravation of differences and contradictions within the party and weakened the activities of the primary organizations.

The year 1988 faced the party members with new serious trials. To the outside observer the results of the administrative elections (which were partial, involving no more than 15 percent of the electoral body) may not have seemed all that important. In Italy, however, any election is a study of the mood of the people and their attitude toward one party or another; the assessment given by the people indicates trends in the dynamics of a party's political influence. Therefore, the results were expected with particular concern. They did not encourage optimism: the ICP garnered 21.9 percent of the vote, 10-15 percent in a number of cities, while the socialist achieved a substantial improvement, garnering 18.3 percent of the vote. The possibility appeared that within the foreseeable future the socialists could catch up with and outstrip the communists.

The electoral losses were viewed by the ICP as a major political defeat. This aggravated differences within the leadership. Something unprecedented took place: one of its provincial organizations—Arezzo—publicly demanded a change of the ICP leadership.

The developing situation demanded of the party maximal endurance and, at the same time, decisive actions. The renovation of its policy and organization became a matter which could no longer be postponed. In order to give scope to renovation trends, in June 1988 A. Natta resigned as secretary general and was replaced by Achille Occhetto, an experienced and authoritative party leader.

Unfortunately, we rarely discuss foreign communist leaders other than to list who among them has gone to jail or won victories, i.e., we discuss the senior generation of fighters. Achille Occhetto belongs to the middle generation. He was born in 1936 in Turin to the family of a noted antifascist. At age 17 he became party member and an activist in the youth communist organization. Three years later he headed that organization in Milan. In 1962 he was made secretary of the Italian Communist Youth Federation and, as such, member of the ICP leadership. He was a member of the party delegations which visited at that time Vietnam, China and the Soviet Union. In May 1966 he was elected member of the ICP Secretariat and leadership; in 1969, after the 12th ICP Congress, he became secretary of the Palermo Provincial Federation and, subsequently, the Sicilian ICP District. On 7 November 1969, in an article published in UNITA, on the anniversary of the October Revolution, we wrote that socialism "must manifest its entire democratic potential and that this is a task which, naturally, cannot be carried out by borrowing faults and obsolete myths from bourgeois democracy. This can be accomplished only by restoring the true spirit of the October Revolution." In 1976 he became parliamentary deputy and leading Central Committee official; in 1982 he became member of the Secretariat and, as of June 1987, deputy secretary general.

At the June 1988 Central Control Commission and Central Committee Plenum, after analyzing the political situation and the reasons for the party's failure in the elections, Occhetto formulated the tasks related to its radical renovation. The plenum decided to hold its following 18th Congress in the spring of 1989, as a "congress of perestroyka and renovation of the party's course," the purpose of which was to "refute those who spoke of the inevitable weakening of the communist party and its decline," and to give a firm rebuff to the "campaign of sinister and biased predictions, aimed at the liquidation of the ICP."

The party's political line is one of "democratic alternatives." Major innovations in all areas of social life, the party members emphasize, also require new alternate contemporary programs, reforms and methods in the management of the country; it is important to create conditions and possibilities for the restructuring of political institutions and broadening democracy and the rights of citizens. The fundamental elements of the party's political line were emphasized: efforts to reach agreements with all democratic forces on the basis of programs for specific progressive changes. This is addressed at the socialists and other democratic organizations and movements. A new concept was adopted in the differentiated approach to agreements with the capitalists: there should be no aspiration to conclude alliances will all of them but be oriented only toward their progressive segment.

The search for solutions based on compromise and consistent with the interests of the other social forces becomes the main, the real means of achieving the communist objectives. Under the present circumstances, reforms assume an entirely new significance. The correlation between revolution and reform changes. Having adopted as a base the concept of "structural reforms," familiar since the 1960s, and developing it under contemporary conditions, the party (as presented by Occhetto) formulated the concept of "strong reformism." What is its essence and difference from traditional reformism? Occhetto emphasizes that difference: "It does not apply to changes which are permitted by circumstances but to changing the circumstances themselves." Not petty reforms aimed at improving the existing system but the type of changes which would "ensure development under conditions of social justice, democracy and security." Such changes should affect, above all, the political system and the functions of the state. Another most important reform is shifting the tax burden from production and labor income to income from capital and from investments. In other words, this applies to reorganizations which would change the very essence, the nature of the social system in favor of democracy and the satisfaction of the needs and aspirations of the working people.

In the opinion of the ICP, the Italian government today has made it possible to violate the rights not only of people but of enterprises as well. The government has fallen prey to the "political-bureaucratic class." The law is ignored when it becomes a question of monopoly concentration. The communists believe that "the state must have, above all, the strategic ability to indicate to all social and private entities operating on the market the objectives and criteria consistent with the interests of the entire society...., and to enact a regulatory and institutional mechanism which could force them—whether through state interference or the instrument of the market—positively to interact among each other in the policy of accumulation and distribution." For that reason the party should struggle for the restructuring of the present state and, at the same time, for improving and democratizing the market, "act in a more modern and daring fashion in criticizing Italian capitalism," and systematically function as the main opposition force.

The ICP notes that it has permitted a lag in the development of some fundamental political problems, such as relations between the individual and the collective, between the state and the market, and so on. This gap was immediately filled by conservative ideas, which led to a weakening of the criticism of contemporary capitalism at the same time that its inability to solve the aggravating contradictions was detected.

The documents of the ICP Central Control Commission and Central Committee, on the basis of which the precongress discussion opened, emphasizes that the communist and all left-wing forces face the task of formulating and indicating the "possible transitional stages and possible reform objectives and the field and

type of struggle through which the totality of the power should be changed: in the economy, society and the state, and in the areas of science, ideas and culture."

The communists must wage "not only a social struggle for the redistribution of wealth, which would mean allowing new forms of domination." They must focus their struggle on "problems of people's control" in all areas of society and reformulate the problem of "ownership and correlation between the state and the market." In this case the "new correlation between power and rights and between the state and the individual," and "broadening democracy in the economic area" assume decisive significance.

"Freedom, in terms of the use of the multiplicity and variety of benefits (material and nonmaterial) from which no citizen, man or woman, should be excluded; equality of rights and possibility of access to culture, education, information and goods and services, without the elimination but, conversely, with a guarantee of differences; work in the area of the radical reorganization of relations between man and nature, development and resources, production and reproduction, working time and living time; cohesion, as a mandatory element of the moral autonomy and commonality of individuals.... We should not expect any renovation of favorable conditions for the implementation of distribution reforms but aspire to change the quality of development and distribution of wealth and power: that is what distinguishes a strong reformism...."

The formulation of such tasks, as we pointed out, does not mean lowering the combat capability or weakening the "conflict" nature of the party or the abandonment of its ideals and the struggle in defense of the interests of the working people. The party, however, the ICP believes, must proceed not on the basis of abstract plans and concepts of the past but of the real socially triggered contradictions among social groups and classes.

This time as well there were fabrications on the part of many mass information media. Some of them claimed, for example, that the communists were abandoning the class struggle and the ideas of Marx and Togliatti. However, the communists emphasize that the ICP is preserving its aspect as representative of the working people, as the party of liberated work. It is a leftist party but, under contemporary conditions, it must inevitably broaden the range of its alliances. It has possibilities of "expansion toward the center." What will be the contemporary policy of social alliances? For the time being, this question has been outlined in its general features only. However, judging by the statements of the ICP leadership, a more contemporary and flexible policy is becoming apparent. Obviously, this policy will be fully defined by the congress.

The main problems of the ICP are those of the new image, the essence of the party and its ideological orientation, standards of internal life and formulation of a contemporary concept of socialism, taking into consideration also the experience of perestroyka in the Soviet Union.

Answering the party members who called for limiting the horizons of the communists to the framework of the existing social system and striving for no more than "improving it," the ICP leader expressed new ideas and considerations.

It is a question, he said, not of "leaving one system in order to enter another which is already familiar and clearly outlined." Modern socialism must have a much broader look than in the past. It must become "a movement which can provide answers to the old and new contradictions within society." In the 1970s the ICP raised the idea of a "third way" to socialism. We are now living in a different age. At that time it was a question of the years of stagnation in the USSR and the crisis in the European social democratic movement. Currently major changes have taken and are taking place in both East and West. Under the new circumstances as well, the ICP can no longer proceed in formulating its political objectives on the basis of "being different from others." The communists must be "within" the new stage which is beginning in Europe. They must proceed from the fact that the motive force, the motor of the "new concept of socialism should be the broadening of democracy and maximal exercise of all personal freedoms and achieving true freedom for all." Socialist society is based on democracy, a democracy which is "more modern and broader, which is the key to the reorganization of the state, society and the economy and the attitude toward nature, a key to differences based on sex and to subjective and collective rights and international relations." In this case what is important is, precisely, the guarantee of freedoms within the framework of which the new social rights will appear.

In developing the contemporary concept of socialism, the Italian communists proceed from the idea formulated by the ICP in previous decades, developing them in accordance with the new international and historical conditions.

A socialism consistent with our time, E. Berlinguer insisted, not only guarantees the full satisfaction of basic social needs, such as job, health protection, education, defense of the rights of children and the elderly, and protection of nature and the environment; it should also guarantee, for example, the full emancipation of women, the reliable right of the working people to participate in trade unions, labor productivity and economic efficiency, pluralism of opinions and ideas, freedom of information, cultural and artistic activities, etc. I do not think, he emphasized, that one could accept a socialism which ignores any one of these important elements. It is always possible that in this case it even would not be

considered socialism. The main feature of the new society, in his view, was the indivisibility between political democracy and social change in the economic organization of society.

Today the ICP particularly emphasizes that it has adopted a broader approach in the formulation of the concept of socialism. The ICP is a mass party and has deep roots in the society. As we pointed out, it has extensive and varied experience in the struggle and activities in the trade unions, cooperatives, local self-governing authorities and other democratic organizations. Communists are directly involved in solving many social problems in the country, such as those related to health care, social security, the material situation of the working people, defense and broadening the rights of trade unions, and so on. Communist scientists have paid steady attention to such problems for many years and have compared their solutions to global experience.

Proceeding essentially from the phenomena and facts of development of capitalist and socialist society, they drew the conclusion that, although through other means, the socialist countries reached a state of aggravation in many similar contradictions. Here the negative trends were clearly manifested and, in some cases, so did critical factors; the advantages in the pace of economic development and the solution of social problems were lost. As a social system, at a given point socialism began to lose its attractiveness (this was pointed out by the ICP and it was hardly right to blame the party for it, assuming that it was accurate). There are those who ask whether it is worth today to adopt specific concepts which were formulated at a certain time and were consistent with the conditions which prevailed at that time. Entirely different concepts have emerged with the changes in the conditions themselves; entirely new political, socioeconomic and international situations have developed. Socialism, as the ICP Central Committee document stipulates, is not a system which has been established once and for all but a continuously developing process which cannot be tied to specific dogmas but must rely on a steadily updated study of reality.

In speaking of the need for updating the ideological values of the party and adopting a contemporary approach to the development of the concept of socialism, A. Occhetto emphasized in an interview granted to UNITA that today the problem is to define progressive reform views and party positions (objectives, way of thinking and processes). Socialism cannot be created exclusively on the basis of ideological concepts. It must be a society which can provide answers to contemporary questions and the problems of the year 2000, and to the contradiction between freedom and equality. Therefore, the problems of rights and the attitude toward the individual as a value, the restructuring of the correlation between the state and the individual and the reorganization of the state assume predominant significance.

The understanding has strengthened among the party members that "full socialization of means of production" and "totalitarian management with the help of traditional state instruments" are inconsistent with that which determines the socialist nature of a society. "Today we must agree with the idea that the main obligation of the state is its ability to set standards for pluralism in state and individual subjects. In other words, we need a state which would provide better guarantees for social rights and has less to do with administration."

In the past, in studying the experience of building socialism in the Soviet Union, the ICP focused its attention on shortcomings in solving problems of democracy. It was not a matter limited to criticism. Efforts were made to provide a scientific development to the theoretical and practical elements of socialism. "Those who would like to insinuate that today the ideas of and needs for socialist restructuring have become obsolete are wrong," an ICP 1981 document emphasized. "In reality, what have become obsolete are only the previous ideological and political concepts of socialism and of the organization of the state...."

Today, in analyzing the course of perestroyka in our country, based on factual data, the communists are reaching certain theoretical summations. It is pointed out, in particular, that steps are being taken in the Soviet Union to combine "the state with the market, the state with the individual and the collective with the individual. In other words, to give more scope to the problems of freedom, rights and individual initiative as opposed to (or along with) the situation in the past involving problems of obligations, collective organization, coercion and the plan."

The document of the ICP Central Control Commission and Central Committee asserts that "democracy is not a way to socialism but the way of socialism." Hence "no single socialist gain can be achieved and consolidated without democracy, without democratic management and without its rules and the institutions of democracy, without its expansion and development in all areas of social life."

"Democracy must encompass all major areas of power, which regulate relations among people in their governmental, political, economic and social activities.... There is no area of power which, in principle, could stand above democratic rules; there are no rights which can be exercised outside such standards."

However, it also follows from this that "full democracy and its rules cannot be acquired without socialist ideas," and without the use of the "new guarantees needed for such gains, without the socializing of functions which affect the common interests and the future of mankind."

In other words, such a concept should give a new impetus to the real movement toward socialism, understood as a process leading "to a more just society in which the freedom of the individual is a prerequisite for the freedom of all."

Realistically assessing the very process of the formulation of the concept of socialism, nonetheless the ICP does not claim that it would be able to achieve it within a short time and offer a perfect choice, which would provide answers to all questions. E. Berlinguer's thought, expressed in 1982, according to which "socialism should have a new, an original nature which it could acquire only thanks to real liberation and progressive movements and, naturally, thanks to the development of political thinking" remains valid. However, the communists should not be required to "determine all this right now, sitting at their desks."

The future success of the ICP political line and the fate of the ideas of socialism in Italy largely depend on the strength of the communist party, on whether it will grow and whether its political influence will strengthen. For that reason, under contemporary conditions, the situation within the party itself, its overall condition, assume particular importance.

Prior to the congress, the task was set of making a comprehensive reform within the ICP and strengthening its ties with the working people and their various categories and strata. In order to renovate the society the party must be able to engage in a dialogue with that society. Daring and efficient solutions are needed, along with a "spirit of investigation and experimentation and new management methods," which would contribute to surmount "trends toward limiting the leading role of the party to the framework of its apparatus." It is a question of broadening internal party democracy and ensuring the participation of all party members in the formulation of the most important decisions. The question has been raised of terminating the practice of co-opting members in the ICP leadership and democratizing the procedure itself of elections of delegates to congresses.

The party acknowledges that its organization has become obsolete and is no longer consistent with the changed conditions and requirements; the current organizational structure is no longer efficient; yesterday it made it possible to enhance its political influence in the country whereas today it threatens to become a hindrance to the party's renovation. For that reason the congress will be called upon to make major changes in some of the basic units in the party's structure and organizational life. Streamlining financial activities will be necessary. It is anticipated that the congress will consider the question of reducing the overall number of party officials and the apparatus from the present 2,400 to 1,600-1,700.

The process of renovation which has been initiated in the communist party and of the "restoration of socialist ideals," the ICP emphasizes, is stimulated not only by the changes which have taken place in the country but also, largely, by perestroyka in the Soviet Union.

"As a result of the profound crisis which spread throughout social life a persistent political struggle for democracy and human rights and freedoms was initiated as the only solution of the serious problems which accumulated over decades of centralized and command-administrative regime, with which socialism was arbitrarily identified in all countries which, only a few years ago, described themselves as countries of 'real socialism,'" the precongress document of the ICP stipulates. The Italian communists "are not observers from the outside," of the struggle taking place in those countries. They are "on the side of the people and social forces which are waging this struggle for the assertion of democracy and its institutions and values as an intrinsic part of socialism." The communists believe that "all European leftist forces, united and renovated as we wish them to be, would be able to make an ideological and political contribution to this struggle. They could contribute incentive and fruitful dialogue. It is in that direction that we try to act."

Invariably the leadership of the ICP has expressed its solidarity with and support of "Gorbachev's new course," particularly emphasizing the significance of steps taken toward the democratization of Soviet society and its political system, which could have a tremendous impact on the entire world and become a "decisive component in the positive development of international relations."

Such are the problems, views and positions held by the ICP on the eve of its next congress.

Naturally, differences remain between our parties in the assessment of one problems, event or fact or another. This is natural. However, today the CPSU tries to consider each fact and concept within the entire context of specific circumstances, without laying a claim to holding the absolute truth or monopoly on truth, and applying the mandatory prerequisite of showing respect for its partner, not to mention its comrade-in-arms. Our party is in favor of friendly and open relations with the ICP and the expansion and intensification of cooperation in the struggle for the common objectives and for socialism free from any petty accretion. Particularly valuable and necessary today is the fraternal dialogue between the CPSU and the ICP, as it is between communist parties in general. It is important for such a dialogue to develop and assume aspects consistent with the spirit and needs of our time.

"The CPSU does not dramatize the fact that there is not always total unanimity in everything among communist parties," our 27th Party Congress noted. "Clearly, there can be no unity of views on all problems without exception.... Unity has nothing in common with uniformity, hierarchy, interference of some parties in the affairs of other, or the aspiration of any given party to hold the monopoly on truth. The communist movement can and must be strong by virtue of its class solidarity

and equal cooperation among all fraternal parties in the struggle for the common objectives. It is thus that the CPSU conceives of unity and intends comprehensively to assist it."

This is not merely the CPSU's theoretical principle but today's practical action.

Economic Progress in a Changing World

18020007m Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 113-116

[Interview with John Kenneth Galbraith by A. Ulyukayev, KOMMUNIST correspondent]

[Text] **John Kenneth Galbraith, the outstanding American economist, is famous the world over for his works on problems of the contemporary capitalist economy, the role of bureaucracy and technocracy and the interaction between the two socioeconomic systems. His books have undergone dozens of printings in different languages. Galbraith's works published in our country include "The New Industrial Society," "Economic Theories and Social Objectives," "Life Today," and "Capitalism, Socialism and Coexistence" (a dialogue with Soviet economist S.M. Menshikov). Professor Galbraith is known not only as a scientist but also as a politician, diplomat and noted personality of the left wing of the U.S. Democratic Party. He has invariably favored reciprocal understanding and security in the world and the development of mutually profitable cooperation between the USSR and the United States. Following are Galbraith's answers to questions asked by A. Ulyukayev, KOMMUNIST correspondent.**

[Ulyukayev] Above all, how do you assess the course and prospects of the economic reform in the USSR?

[Galbraith] In the 30 years that I have known the USSR (I first visited the country in 1958) I have had the opportunity to study and compare. Let me immediately say that the changes are striking. This applies to production and the appearance of the cities, the well-being of the people and the public mood. Aware of the past and seeing such changes, it is easy to evaluate the present and look at the future.

I consider unquestionable the importance of the economic reform and perestroyka as a whole. They provide the necessary impetus for reorganization and make it possible to identify more fully the physical and spiritual potential of the Soviet people. Furthermore, we must take into consideration that today neither capitalism nor socialism can allow themselves a luxury such as immobility, a permanent image and sluggish structures. They must be transformed, I would say they must compromise with the demands of life. This approach promises a good future for the reform in the USSR.

I cannot provide specific recommendations and, in this sense, I beg in advance "to resign" from the position of "economic advisor" to the Soviet leadership. However, there is one thought which I, nonetheless, would like to express: in economics one must be guided not by ideological but by practical considerations. I know from the example of my own country that a strong pressure is exerted by ideological stereotypes. It is difficult to surmount them and make practically substantiated decisions. However, this is the most important thing. Naturally, each system has its basic values which it cannot abandon. We are familiar, for instance, with your achievements in the social area and your aspiration to achieve greater social justice. Incidentally, this has greatly influenced economic theory and practice in the West. However, there also were stereotypes which hindered the use of universally valid economic mechanisms, the market in particular. They must be surmounted. Economic policy must pursue pragmatic objectives and be formulated in terms of corresponding concepts.

I am not the greatest of specialists in Soviet economics. However, there are certain trends common to all contemporary economies. I am referring, above all, to the role and influence of large economic organizations. These gigantic bureaucratized structures show a clear trend toward ossification and rejection of innovations. For that reason it is extremely important (for both capitalism and socialism) to lower the level of bureaucratization by decentralizing decision-making and, through the market mechanism, prices and incentives. This is not simple. Thirty years ago as well you were discussing decentralization but matters did not advance beyond such discussions.

I am firmly confident that economic progress is possible only when decisions are made by the producer himself. By granting him a greater share of rights and responsibilities, you will be able to advance in solving the problems which are today the most pressing, food production above all.

I feel particularly close to this problem, for I consider myself not an economist in general but an agrarian economist. That was precisely the nature of my university training. Having studied Soviet agriculture for many years, I reached the conclusion that its successful development calls for the implementation of two basic conditions: the first is to reduce to a minimum any outside interference in the affairs and decisions of the rural producer. Agricultural management in individual, cooperative and state enterprises must not be subject to decisions made on higher levels. I believe that such decisions are frequently both incompetent and impersonal. The second is to pursue the efforts to ensure the true economic responsibility of every producer for the results of his work.

If we consider the way agriculture is managed throughout the world, it turns out that success lies wherever the energy and initiative of the producer are not obstructed.

You must not stand aside from world experience. Allow me to predict that if you combine what such experience has gained and the achievements of your system, in a few years the USSR would be able fully to solve its food problems and will no longer depend on grain imports. I fear, it is true, that such a view on my part would not be too popular in the United States, for we feel quite good when we sell to you our grain.

[Ulyukayev] Would economic decentralization and the use of the market mechanism not invariably lead to the manifestation of the economic ills characteristic of the West (unemployment, inflation, and so on)? Such fears are widespread in current publications.

[Galbraith] I disagree. To begin with, as it were, the USSR is already facing some of these problems although, naturally, in a somewhat different form that in the West. As I walked down the streets of Moscow, I saw huge lines in front of stores. This proves the existence of a peculiar "Soviet" form of inflation, i.e., a faster increase in the availability money compared to goods, although without any major price increase.

On the other hand, I believe that there is no inevitable economic ill. This largely depends on how well considered and consistent are the economic decisions which are being made.

I usually say in my lectures that the main distinction between capitalism and socialism is that under capitalism there is a constant reproduction of commodity surpluses while under socialism there is a surplus of money. Money turns out to be the most available commodity although no one seems to complain of too much money. The main problem, therefore, is to establish a sensible and close control over the influx of cash and income so that they may grow in accordance with the increased mass of goods.

My impressions from visits to the USSR indicate that the purchasing power of the Soviet people is growing although, probably, less than their wages. The proper strategy would be to maintain a constant trade backup for monetary income, countering its "stagnation" by increasing the possibility of spending the money. Controlling monetary income in accordance with the availability of goods is a complex and unpopular work in any society. I assume that under your circumstances you would not be able to do without administrative and governmental control over prices and income. Furthermore, the historical development of the USSR has been such that state control has played a very big role and the economic units were distorted under its influence and adapted to it. For that reason its sharp rejection would be unlikely to yield good results. Naturally, such steps are effective only providing that the commodity market itself and the availability of goods and services are expanded.

[Ulyukayev] Is there no contradiction between your current statements on the need for decentralization and what you wrote in the past on the objective basis for a "planning system," i.e., a system of large economic organizations?

[Galbraith] Yes, I know, it may seem that such a contradiction exists. Generally speaking, live and learn. I do not intend to avoid contradictions but to learn from them. However, I do not believe that this was a major contradictions. I have always claimed that in both the socialist and the capitalist economy large organizations are inherent, such as General Motors or the industrial ministries in the USSR. They control elements of the economic structure and its changes. It is in that precise sense I describe the basic production sectors as a planning system. However, I have never conceived this as an absolute necessity, as total control over all economic processes.

The more I studied the problem the more, particularly in recent years, I could clearly identify the negative trends in the development of bureaucratic and technocratic structures. One of them is to live with the intellectual achievements of the past and to believe that anything that has been accomplished is good and that only that which reminds of previous accomplishments could be good. The second is complacency and self-sufficiency, and fear of new developments. The third is the linear growth, the aspiration toward self-reproduction on an increasing scale, involving an increasing number of people and material and financial resources. The consequence of all of this is a state of stagnation which I describe as bureaucratic atherosclerosis. This is dangerous to society.

Under socialism the problem of big organizations is even more difficult than under capitalism, for here the power of the economic bureaucracy is backed by the power of the bureaucracy of the state apparatus. In the United States the bureaucracy of large organizations is independent of the departments, the state authorities. For that reason it nonetheless better reacts to changes in economic indicators and is more oriented toward the consumer. That is where the possibilities for making their functioning more efficient are located. Their monopoly is not absolute and there is some competition. The results of the use of such opportunities are demonstrated by the big corporations in Japan. Furthermore, their dynamic nature is urging on the American corporations which today are less inflexible than they were 10 years ago.

A certain positive principle may be found also in the activities of the multinational bureaucracy, the bureaucracies of huge corporations such as Shell or IBM. I see in them a kind of barrier to economic nationalism. Here is an example: after the war the big steel manufacturing corporations in France and the FRG fought for markets

and thus contributed to increased tension in relations between their countries. Today this factor has disappeared, for the corporations operate across the borders in both countries.

I have repeatedly said that I would be happy for multinational corporations to operate in the Soviet Union. This would be a contribution to peaceful coexistence between the USSR and the United States.

Naturally, I am joking. Seriously speaking, unquestionably the danger of bureaucratic sluggishness and stagnation is high and is a threat to the future. That is why for me there is no problem as to whether the omnipotence of big organizations should or should not be eliminated. The question is how to do it.

[Ulyukayev] What is your view on the present condition of economic theory in the USSR and in the West?

[Galbraith] I am more familiar with the problems of economic theory in the nonsocialist world and will address myself to them, although I suspect that they are not entire alien to Soviet science as well. They are related to the fact that for many long years, and to this day, we have noted the withdrawal of economists from reality. The science of economics is becoming increasingly schematized and technocratic. Better equipped with instruments, including a mathematical apparatus, theory ignores essential facts such as, for example, the influence of bureaucratic structures. Yet this influence greatly modifies all economic relations. What are instrumental fine points worth if we proceed from primitive prerequisites such as the existence of a free market competition!

Economists have focused their efforts on the problem of maximizing profits and are ignoring the fact that this is not the most important thing for big corporations. They have other, stronger motivations. Theory developed essentially along the line of perfecting its instruments and paid no attention to their correlation with reality. I already pointed out that it would be very pleasant to live in the world of such abstractions, in which there is no place for unemployment, inflations and depressions. Obviously, however, the building of such illusions is not the most successful method for learning about the laws of economic life.

[Ulyukayev] To the Soviet readers your name is largely associated with the theory of convergence. What do you think today on this subject?

[Galbraith] I have never believed that capitalism or socialism have exhausted their development potential. I assume that the future will see a growing variety of economic, social, political and cultural forms of existence for both systems. This is apparent already now. Capitalism in the United States is sharply different from the one in Japan. Equal differences between socialisms exist in the USSR, China or Hungary.

We live in a world in which both systems are developing not according to a model. Social progress provides us with ever new models of capitalist and socialist ways of development. Their convergence and trends toward rapprochement are, in my view, reciprocal enrichments of the systems. Capitalism has something to learn from socialism. This includes your successes in the social area and elements of planned production control. Conversely, socialism is adopting the achievements of capitalism such as, for example, the market mechanism.

Let me reemphasize that I do not have in mind in the least the possibility of the merger of capitalism with socialism in the foreseeable future and the loss of their specifics or the appearance of some kind of "sociocapitalism." My point is the growth of variety, the free exchange of achievements and reciprocal enrichment. It is precisely this that contributes to the further progress of human civilization.

From the Old Positions

18020007n Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 117-121

[Review by V. Danilov, doctor of historical sciences, V. Lelchuk, doctor of historical sciences, and A. Nenarokov, candidate of historical sciences, of the book "Vo Glave Stroitelstva Novogo Obshchestva" [Heading the Building of the New Society]. Historical experience of CPSU activities during the transitional period. Authors: N. Vasetskiy, V. Veryaskin, N. Ganin, S. Denisov, B. Zadarnovskiy, Ye. Zaytsev, V. Ivanov, Ye. Kozlov, A. Krasnov, Yu. Loginov, V. Melnikov, E. Novikova, A. Osadchaya, N. Romanovskiy, N. Trushchenko, Yu. Frolov, and V. Shumilina. V. Ivanov, responsible editor. Mysl, Moscow, 1988, 284 pp].

[Text] We are into the 4th year of perestroyka, the purpose of which is radically to renovate life in Soviet society. In the course of the development of this process, the significance of scientific works which describe CPSU experience acquired in previous historical stages, when the foundations of a modern economy were being laid and the command-administrative management system was taking shape, becomes increasingly important. Hence the unparalleled interest shown by the public in matters of internal party life in the 1920s, industrialization, collectivization, the problems of the NEP and, as a whole, interest in the transitional period from capitalism to socialism. A vivid confirmation of this is the practice of numerous roundtables, and the enhancement of political journalism dealing, one way or another, with such topics. This explains better the attention we have paid to this recently published book which, according to its authors, should describe the theory and practice of CPSU activities during the transitional period.

The authors consider as the essential feature of the new stage in our history above all the preservation of the vestiges of capitalist and other presocialist relations and corresponding social forces, for which reason they analyze all phenomena in socioeconomic life through the lens of the continuing and "occasionally aggravating" class struggle. The approach is not new. It is common knowledge that it was established as a theoretical substantiation of political practices as early as the 1930s and was codified, in its most general aspect, in the "Short Course of VKP(b) History."

Reducing the motive forces of development of Soviet society primarily to class confrontation and the activities of the "eternal heroes" and the search for "eternal enemies" deprived us of our own historical experience, deprived us of the full possibilities for self-training and strengthened recurrences of a barracks life style. The elimination of such a view of Soviet history involves major difficulties, as confirmed by the publication of this book.

The book is based on the interpretation of problems which are today the focal point of public attention and which have experienced the greatest radical changes. The most important among them is the internal party struggle in the 1920s and the attitude toward party leaders who opposed the establishment of an authoritarian leadership, as well as the violations and distortions of the Leninist norms and principles in social political life related to such violations and distortions. Anyone who had ever participated in debates on party policy (under Lenin this applied not only to the party leadership but also to his closest associates), all of them, according to the authors of this book, from the very beginning entered "the path of struggle against the Leninist party course, promoting its division and, in the final account, abandoning the traditions of Bolshevism and the ideals of the Great October" (p 20).

Particular attention is paid to criticizing the views of N. Bukharin, at a time when the final rehabilitation of this outstanding theoretician and ideologue of Bolshevism has triggered a tremendous increase in the interest of the public in both the person and his understanding of the way to socialism. The authors repeat the entire set of old accusations which, in their time, were grounds for removing Bukharin and his supporters from participation in the leadership of the party and the state for being "right-wing deviationists," which resulted in their political and, subsequently, physical annihilation.

Again and again, the "Economics of the Transitional Period," published in 1920 (see pp 23, 46 and other), which presents the military-communist concept of the path of building socialism (which was splitting at that time the entire party) is taken as the foundation of all of Bukharin's views. The authors include Lenin's critical remarks on individual concepts expressed in that work while ignoring the high rating he gave to other concepts and, above all, to the work as a whole. It is even more important that the authors fail to mention the fact that Bukharin surmounted his military-communist enthusiasms or his tremendous and, perhaps greatest, contribution to the criticism of the ideology of left-wing revolutionism within the communist movement.

It is precisely according the old canons that the authors apply also when they describe Bukharin's positions after the conversion to the NEP. His position is described as "evolutionist," pitting the "revolutionary" views held by the Stalinist leadership and, on this basis, actually identifying it with revisionism.

Sharp criticism is voiced of Bukharin's understanding of the transitional period. It turns out that it conflicted with the "Marxist theory of the historical process as a change in socioeconomic systems," for it allowed for the "possibility of multiplicities not of ways leading to the development of socialism but of different types of social systems placed in-between the capitalist and the communist systems" (p 47). But where is the ideological crime in this case? The reader will find merely an accusation without proof. Nonetheless, this is a very important problem. Is a difference in the ways of establishment and development of socialism possible without differences in their types (structure, nature, level of development, etc.) of social systems developing through these (different) ways? Is it possible to consider the socialist societies of the end of the 20th century, developing on the basis of capitalist and precapitalist structures, and based on radically different production forces, as belonging to the same type of social systems? Or else, according to the authors, could it be that belonging to the socialist system in itself eliminates the problem of differences in the "types" of such societies? At that point, however, the entire matter may be reduced to semantics and the question raised by Bukharin and confirmed by subsequent historical experience is not only not considered but is even ignored. Unfortunately, in all other cases ideological cliches have replaced analysis and argumentation.

It is worth considering the question of Bukharin's attitude toward the class struggle, for in this book, which came out in 1988, once again we come across the old charge that in Bukharin's works "the problem of the class struggle in its Marxist-Leninist understanding was eliminated and replaced by the term 'class relations'" (p 51). This leads to allegedly erroneous views according to which during the transitional period the center of gravity of the class struggle had been shifted to the economic area and was waged through "peaceful-economic" means and "suppression was allowed only in the case of open armed actions committed against the Soviet system" (ibid). (It would be interesting to find out in what other cases, according to the authors, should the state use force for purposes of suppression?) The reader will find in the enumeration of Bukharin's errors also the view that under conditions of peaceful economic building "the party of the working class becomes the party of the civilian world" (is economic construction possible at all

in the past, and why. But why is it necessary to do so today? As we know, Stalin asked that a distance which had been covered be a number of industrialized countries in 50 to 100 years be covered in 10. We now know what the arbitrariness and voluntarism of the 1930s, the breakdown in the pace which was allowed to occur at the beginning of that decade, and the real consequences of the abandonment of the Leninist principles of leadership cost the party and the entire nation. This does not bother the historians who have written this book. They even go further. Remember, in 15 years a leap equaling not 50 or 100 years but centuries was made....

How was this miracle made possible? The explanation is found on page 82: "The need to concentrate all the resources of society on the decisive, on the vitally important sectors of socialist industrialization in terms of the country's future, forced the party to take the path of reviving the administrative-command management system, which had been dismantled under the conditions of the NEP." (If we are to believe the book, this was also the policy of victorious socialism.) Subsequently, it is true, arbitrariness and disproportions which contributed to the "restoration of bureaucratism in individual units of the economic mechanism" are mentioned in general terms (p 82). The party, we read, "was forced to tolerate such violations of the principle of planned development of the socialist economy" (ibid). It is thus that our experience is interpreted: life demanded, forced, coerced.... And so that no one would doubt the accuracy of such generalizations, the authors claim that "the limit of the possible was what became the determining economic category in the struggle for surmounting technical and economic backwardness" (ibid). Let us be frank: we are unfamiliar with such an economic category.

The authors have become so attracted by the reanimation of the old evaluations that they deemed it unnecessary to analyze, even briefly, problems which characterized the practice of the utilization of the NEP in the interests of industrialization, the experience in creating and mastering new equipment, the lessons learned in training skilled cadres and organizing the creative activeness of the working class in the most important sectors of the industrial restructuring of the country.

The authors briefly mention decisions on essentially important problems of the unification movement among Soviet peoples. Yet it was precisely during the transitional period that the most important problems of national-state and national-cultural construction were formulated, along with problems of the economic autonomy of republics, languages, and national schools and the rejection of deviating arbitrary decisions. The authors do not say a single word about the origins and do not even attempt to depict the definite consistency of Stalin's idea of the need for rigid centralization of the Soviet federative state. Without this, however, it is impossible to understand the violations committed in the practices of national-state building, the results of which we are harvesting today.

The list of such examples could be extended. This is yet another repetition of the absolutely erroneous concept included in the "Short Course" of assertions to the effect that from the mid-1930s (specifically 1937) a socialist society had been essentially built in the USSR and that 1929 was the year of radical change proving "the existence of objective prerequisites for the accelerated pace of building socialism" in the country (p 76), etc.

The new headings given to the chapters do not eliminate the customary system according to which the primary feature of party work is considered to be not the elaboration of the basic trends of a scientific and prognosticated policy in all the aspects of changes initiated with the Great October Revolution, but the party's struggle "against".... Essentially, the entire experience of party activities during the transitional period is analyzed on the basis of the old views.

Politizdat News

18020007o Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 121-123

[Text] **Politizdat is the biggest publishing house for political publications in our country. Last year alone it published 339 titles of books in 76.7 million copies. Currently this large collective is reassessing past experience and seeking new ways to improve its work. The editors of KOMMUNIST asked A.P. Polyakov to describe the changes under way.**

Requirements concerning our output have indeed become much stricter than in the past. The time between the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th All-Union Party Conference, which created a new sociopolitical situation, it seems to me, has also shaped a new type of reader. We are realizing in practice that his attitude toward traditional style publications has changed greatly. The reader no longer accepts many of the old ways, the lack of an analytical approach and the bypassing of new phenomena or anything which falls within stereotypical evaluations and a repetition of sets of facts. Yet all of the shortcomings had been inherent so far in a large number of manuscripts received by the publishers on problems of party history and party building, philosophy, scientific communist, the country's economy and international relations.

The first symptom of a crisis in book publishing is the significant amount of unsold books in the bookstores. The USSR Goskomizdat believes that the marketing of books may be considered satisfactory if no more than 2 percent of a given book remains unsold in the stores. So far goods not in demand in our case slightly exceed 3 percent (not taking into consideration the works by the founders of Marxism-Leninism and party documents, which must be available in the stores at all times). Last year, when our publishing house was investigated by the

and violations of socialist legality" (p 254). Actually, Stalin formulated the concept of the aggravation of the class struggle as early as 1928 and already then it was used as a substantiation for violence (see J. Stalin, "Soch." [Works], vol 11, pp 171-172). As professional historians the authors are bound to know this. Shifting this fact by almost a decade is, in our view, in this case aimed at reducing the responsibility of Stalin's policy for undermining the country's economy, the drastic worsening of the life of the population, and hunger and mass violence over people.

Actually, today it is the history of classes and the class struggle that needs the most a scientific and emphatically objective interpretation, for it is precisely the primitive interpretation of such problems and exaggerations and straight distortions in works published in the past that triggered both a natural reaction of readers' mistrust but also a direct negation of classes and class struggle in the Soviet society after the Civil War. How are such truly sharp and relevant problems treated in this book?

In the view of the authors the rural kulak is the main enemy of the Soviet system. The information provided about the kulak by the authors is quite fantastic: "In the first 8 years of the NEP the share of kulak farms.... nearly quintupled (from less than 1 to 4-5 percent)" (p 100). Such a pace of development of capitalism would have been the envy of any bourgeois country. The authors, however, speak of a semidislocated country which had only begun to rebuild its economy and where such a growth of capitalism neither existed nor could exist even if the Soviet state had not been limiting its development. Scientific publications which came out both in the 1920s and later indicated that even with the most generous computations, the share of kulak farms in the total amount of peasant farms had increased from approximately 3 percent in 1920 to 3.3 percent in 1925 and 3.9 percent in 1927, i.e., by almost one-third. The economic position of the kulaks was incomparably weaker compared to prerevolutionary times and their situation was quite unstable. The very first opposition to Stalin's exceptional measures" in the grain procurement campaigns of 1928 and 1929 sufficed for the number of kulak farms to undergo a fast decline. By the end of 1929 their percentage had dropped to no more than 2.5-3 points. However, the reader will not find such information in this book.

The story of the elimination of the kulak class (see pp 102-104) is a formal description and inaccurate in all respects. For example, the authors mention the 30 January 1930 decree "On Measures to Eliminate Kulak Farms in Areas With Extensive Collectivization." This was the main directive which formulated the tasks, procedure and nature of the elimination of the kulak class. However, the authors neither evaluate this document nor analyze its content or report even the fact that the directive included a rayon breakdown of "quotas" for the number of kulak farms to be broken up and the subsequent resettling of tens of thousands of families to the North, beyond the Urals, in Siberia and Kazakhstan, dooming such population to suffering and extinction. The historians have not even tried to compare the enactment of this decree of full expropriation of kulak farm property with Lenin's views on the matter. Let us recall the statement made by V.I. Lenin in the spring of 1919: "We favor use of force against capitalists and landowners, and not only force but total expropriation of that which they have accumulated; we are for the use of force against the kulak but not for his total expropriation, for he is farming the land and some of his accumulations are the result of his toil. This difference must be firmly realized" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 38, p 19). This was said at the time of the Civil War, when clashes with the kulaks frequently involved the use of force and even weapons. Nonetheless, Lenin did not consider it possible to accept that which subsequently became the Stalinist policy of dismembering the kulak class.

Having undertaken the interpretation of one of the most sensitive problems of our history, the authors have managed to say essentially nothing and to avoid anything which might have provided an explanation to the tragedy which was taking place in the countryside. Nonetheless, they note one circumstance which "aggravated the political circumstances:" "...Frequently part of this (kulak—author) property (personal items in particular) was appropriated by peasants who participated in the dismember of the kulak class" (p 103). Such facts, as the saying goes "took place," but in the midst of circumstances which aggravated the "political situation" in the countryside they were secondary and, furthermore, they were the consequence of other circumstances ignored by the authors. Even when the authors cite actual facts or considerations, the purpose of the latter is not to clarify but to confuse the nature of the matter and to lead the thoughts of the reader astray from the main facts.

Nor are, in this case, passages dealing with party policy in implementing the industrialization an exception. Here again a series of traditional cliches have been used: allegedly the year 1929 marked a radical turn and by the end of the 1st 5-Year Plan in terms of output industry had greatly surpassed agriculture; in 15 years there was a leap which "under different circumstances would have required centuries" (p 86).

However, entirely different facts had already become known before the publication of this book. Thus, in 1929, Stalin's claim notwithstanding, there had been no change whatsoever in the growth of labor productivity. Nor was the problem of accumulations considered necessary to the development of heavy industry solved (which was the reason for a substantial emission of money, reliance on the mass production and sale of vodka, increasing loans, and so on). Not only at the end of the 1st 5-Year Plan, but also during the 2nd, i.e., in 1933-1937, the share of industry in the country's national income was below the respective contribution made by agriculture. We know who concealed such facts

under the conditions of a Civil War?), and that "the forms of class struggle, according to Bukharin, were to consist of political legislation and a taxation system," "competition provided by state industry, state trade and the cooperatives....," and "strengthening the soviets and public organizations in the countryside" (pp 51-52). All such "exposures" are supported by excerpts from statements culled out of different works and arbitrarily interpreted. And all of this is being done for the same old purpose: to prove the "revisionist" nature of Bukharin's ideological positions, ascribing to him "evolutionary and essentially reformist concepts concerning the nature and forms of the class struggle" (p 52); "his failure to understand the character of the kulaks" (p 53), hostility toward collective farming methods which, allegedly, in general and always have been considered by him to be "unpromising," (ibid) and so on.

In this connection, how not to recall assertions which entirely distort Bukharin's views and his statement at the April 1929 Central Committee Party Plenum: "This is the last time that I speak as a member of the Politburo. Could we, nonetheless, argue and clash and occasionally say sharp things to each other but agree on the basis of the elementary rule that we shall not ascribe to each other **obvious nonsense?**... How many times need we repeat that we are **for** kolkhozes, that we are **for** sovkhozes, that we are **for** the great reconstruction, and that we are **for** a decisive struggle against the kulaks? ...However, it is one thing accurately to promote the slogan of accelerating the offensive against the kulak and something else to implement all of this with the type of... methods which lead to the opposite results, that the poor have no bread, that the cities need bread, and that the middle peasantry is unsteady. Now, in addition to everything else, we need less shouting and pressure than reason and consideration."

Suffice it to turn to the texts of all of Bukharin's speeches prior to and after the 15th Party Congress to realize how accurate this claim is. Indeed, the difference between the positions held by Bukharin and Stalin was that, precisely in accordance with the spirit and letter of Lenin's cooperative plan, according to Bukharin collectivization completed the process of cooperativization of peasant farms rather than initiated it, as Stalin believed, and that the offensive against the kulaks should be mounted with the help of economic tools, preserving the NEP as the policy of the transitional period and ensuring the economic upsurge of the poor and middle rural strata rather than applying administrative-repressive means, despite the fact that this would wreck the NEP and production would drop. Yet, in summing up the results of their investigations, the authors claim that the evaluation of Bukharin's views, imposed by the Stalinist leadership and described as "a variety of bourgeois restoration" and its supporters "as agents of the kulaks," was not exaggerated (p 54).

Naturally, in a book published after Bukharin and his supporters were already rehabilitated (the book was signed to press on 26 July 1988) we were bound to find also "negative aspects" which appeared in the "final stages" of the struggle and were based on the "beginning of the abandonment of the Leninist traditions of internal party democracy and the establishment of Stalin's autocracy" (p 55). However, this incomprehensible stipulation does not change anything in the understanding and evaluation of one of the most important and dramatic turns in party history.

Here is yet another essentially important matter: the assessment of the mass repressions of the 1930s. Today it is no longer possible to ignore them and to mention in passing certain errors, as was very recently the case. The authors, therefore, developed the theory of the "preventive repressive strikes" (p 93) against the counterrevolution, the power of which, allegedly, had been poorly estimated, and which was the reason for the mass repressions. Is it not blasphemous regarding all the victims of the crimes caused by Stalin's arbitrariness to read the following extensive quotation which we must present in full: "In protecting the foundations of socialism, the agencies in charge of protecting the gains of the revolution occasionally made errors in evaluating the situation, and exaggerated the scale of activities of anti-Soviet elements in the USSR. As a result, many members of the nonparty and previously bourgeois intelligentsia and, subsequently, a significant percentage of party cadres, were accused, without sufficient grounds, of espionage and subversive activities. This included also those who, under V.I. Lenin's leadership, had honorably gone through the school of revolutionary struggle and building, during immeasurably more difficult historical periods" (ibid).

Naturally, the authors agree, "the destruction of hundreds of thousands of honest people caused tremendous harm to the cause of socialism and is justly considered by the party a crime which can be neither forgiven nor forgotten" (p 94). Immediately after that, however, they hastily add a statement which essentially voids that: "...It is inadmissible to ignore also the fact that before the end of the transitional period the class struggle had not abated. It was simply that the center of this struggle had shifted from the area of politics to that of economics and ideology" (ibid).

It is precisely in that manner that the other indications of errors and crimes, occasionally included in the text, are reduced to naught. Characteristic in this sense is also the attempt of the authors to provide a general explanation for the origin of arbitrariness and repressions during the cult of personality. Once again they repeat the thesis that "at the February-March 1937 Central Committee Plenum Stalin expressed the erroneous thought that as the Soviet Union advances toward socialism the class struggle will become allegedly more and more aggravated. This was stated when socialism in the country had already won, when the exploiting classes and their economic base had been eliminated and when the sociopolitical unity of the people had been achieved. In practice, this formula was a ground for substantiating repressions

Of late we have heard a great deal of justified blame addressed at the social sciences which, during the period of stagnation, themselves became quite stagnant after a noticeable revival by the turn of the 1960s. In the 1970s the "concept of developed socialism" was proclaimed as the peak of theoretical thinking. All the efforts of sociologists were directed toward substantiating it philosophically, economically and politically. The role of the individual as the subject of historical process was underestimated in both theory and practice.

Starting with the April Plenum, the party took a sharp turn in politics, proceeding from the fact that not a single step forward could be made without enhancing the human potential of man, who was being ignored. For more than 3 years we have been considering the ways and means with which to accomplish this. Positive trends have already become apparent in many areas of life.

From the very first days of perestroyka, our socioeconomic publications engaged in a "combat reconnaissance" in search of the most efficient ways of social development. The social sciences, including philosophy, are, for the time being, merely listening to the rumble of our time, expecting, as Hegel said, Minerva's owl, which he identified with wisdom and which "will start its flight only when darkness falls." Time does not wait, however, and the owl remains asleep while the first larks are already taking off. It is gratifying that this is occurring with increasing frequency not only in the central but also the republic publishing houses.

A case in point is the book under review. It is an attempt to consider the historical process as one of human activities and, on its basis, to understand the specifics and the future of the enhancement of the human factor in the dynamics of socialist society.

The author considers the category of human activities the starting point with which the history of society and, consequently, its theory, begins. Marx and Engels wrote that history is nothing other than the activities of a person pursuing his objectives, for which reason "the premises with which we started... were those of real individuals and their activities and material living conditions, both those which already exist as well as those which they have created as a result of their own activities" (K. Marx and F. Engels, Soch. [Works], vol 3, p 18).

One may say that these are all elementary truths which have been known to us from our student or even our high school years. However, it is those same school desks and textbooks that teach us that we are ruled by some kind of fatal and impersonal historical forces, independent of us and of our actions: production forces and production relations, base and superstructure, and classes and nations. All we are is their obedient subjects, the silent and obedient executors of their will. Is this not a restoration of economic determinism, the shortcomings of which were mentioned by Marx? Unfortunately, such a mechanistic materialism is frequently found in the works of our social scientists to this day.

However, production forces and production relations are only forms and results of human activities. Man is the main production force, for equipment in itself does not produce anything. Production relations, therefore, are relations among people.

The elementary truth that man is a subject of the historical process has never been more accurate than as applied to the present period in building socialism. Although elementary, however, it was precisely its practical neglect that was the silent slogan of the period of stagnation.

The author justifiably points out that whereas to Marx man was a combination of all social relations, in our country he was considered primarily only against the background of production relations, for which reason the specific political-economic methodology was given universal significance.

The classical creative Marxism, which is the only one usable as a basis for the development of the social sciences, proceeds from the fact that the comprehensive development of human activities is a means for the comprehensive development of the personality. Such are the foundations of social life and the purpose of social dynamics. Man is not a means of development of material production. It is the latter, in the final account, that is "an aspect" of the development of the personality. This is an essential concept in the theory and practice of perestroyka in defining our entire sociopolitical strategy for the immediate and long-range future.

It is on the basis of such initial methodological premises that the author solves the problem of criteria of social progress. This includes not only the extent of development of production forces and the means of appropriation of means of production but a measure used by this method in perfecting the human individual, and a measure of freedom for his comprehensive creative activities. This concept was developed in our literature by a number of philosophers despite the opposition of opponents. It is this concept that is emphasized by the author who submits substantial arguments in its favor.

The identification of two aspects of human activities, the material and the cognitive, is the author's major and interesting idea. He traces the dialectics between these two aspects and the interpenetration of opposites and their interchangeability. On the one hand, this is manifested in the fact that cognitive activities are stimulated by the requirements of material activities and thus acquire a physical dimension. Knowledge is embodied in technology and tools of production. V. Yegorov sums it up by saying that the contradiction within human activities as the relationship between subject and object is the motive force of social development.

"Currently many interesting political and theoretical books of the 1920s are being restored on the shelves of public libraries. Does Politizdat plan to reissue some of them, and if so which ones?

We have already published a volume of the selected works of N.I. Bukharin, compiled by the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism. Another volume of his theoretical works is being prepared for publication. We are planning to reissue in the immediate future the work by N.Ye. Kakurin *"How the Revolution Fought"* (which was published only once in 1925), and the work by A.G. Shlyapnikov *"The Year 1917"* (published in 1931), and the book *"Bolsheviks. Documents On the History of Bolshevism from 1903 to 1916 of the former Moscow Security Division"* (published only once, in 1918).

We shall also publish the memoirs of F.F. Raskolnikov *"Kronshtadt and Peter in 1917"* (first published in 1925).

Naturally, book publishing standards are defined, above all, by the improved quality of the entire stream of published works. However, the prestige of a publishing house is largely related, in the eyes of the reader, to the sharp problems raised in the books. Could you name some already published or planned "best sellers?"

The question is simple but the answer is not for, considering the paper shortage, many books are being sold out amazingly quickly. I doubt that all of them are "best sellers." Perhaps it is simply a question of small editions. Read the meaning of this term in the dictionary: a most popular book published in a large edition.

Politizdat recently published the collection *"Marshal Zhukov, the Way We Remember Him,"* in an edition of 200,000 copies. This is a first publication of the recollections by writers Ye. Dolmatovskiy, Ye. Vorobyev and V. Sokolov and previously unknown letters by this military commander. The book sold out in literally a few days. This may look like a best seller. However, in order to determine how many readers would like to acquire the collection on G.K. Zhukov, we should print as many copies as there is demand. For the time being, this is impossible. Let me mention among the books which have come out, the one by Ye. Plimak *"V.I. Lenin's Political Testament,"* which was sold out (despite a 100,000 volume edition) in a few days.

I am confident that other works on historical topics, which will be published in the near future, will also trigger a great deal of interest. One of them is the book *"Know and Remember. Dialogue Between the Historian and the Readers."* I find it difficult even to classify it as far its genre is concerned. It includes several works by Academician A.M. Samsonov, which were published in periodicals and on which the author received more than 3,000 responses from readers. We have selected some 200 among them. They will account for the second part of the book. The third will be the author's comments to the letters in which he will analyze the questions raised in them. I believe that another equally successful work will be the study *"Historians Argue,"* which is structured as a polemic. It includes the participation of specialists in various problems of the science of history. Their topic is the socialist revolution, the NEP, industrialization and collectivization, the war against fascism, personality and political system, national-state building, and culture and democracy.

Let me point out two among the books which are being printed or being prepared for publication: *"J.V. Stalin. Political Biography Landmarks,"* by Yu.S. Borisov, and *"Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev. Biographic Materials,"* compiled from materials written by different authors. Obviously, another book in great demand will be the collection *"The Harsh Drama of the People,"* which describes the nature of the command-administrative system and Stalinist management methods.

The readers are justifiably displeased with the excessively long time it takes to publish many of the books. To what extent is Politizdat promoting the efficient publication of topical works?

To us as well this is quite a serious problem. We are trying to solve it. We have acquired substantial experience in the fast publication of materials of party congresses and Central Committee plenums and collections of party documents. In the past 18 months 62 different titles were published under the "flash" program. However, in order to ensure the radical solution of this problem we need new equipment (for publishers and printers) and a new system for the distribution of current publications.

The most responsible task for Politizdat this year is the publication of the materials of the 19th Party Conference in 18 million copies. I believe that we solved this problem successfully. Currently we are working on the minutes which will be published in two volumes in a total of some 50 printer's sheets. The first came out at the end of November 1988 and the second will come out in January 1989. The total edition will consist of 350,000 copies. If demand is greater we shall immediately print as many more copies as is necessary.

05003

Short Book Reviews

18020007p Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) pp 123-126

[Text] V. Yegorov, "Dialektika Obshchestvennykh Otnosheniy" [Dialectics of Social Relations]. (Experience in interdisciplinary study). Vishcha Shkola, Kiev, 1987, 207 pp. Reviewed by Professor G. Volkov, doctor of philosophical sciences.

CPSU Central Auditing Commission, the commission justifiably emphasized that to have left-overs on this level, considering the current paper shortage is inadmissible. Based on the results of the investigation conducted in June 1987, the party's Central Committee passed the resolution "On the Work of CPSU Central Committee Publishing House For Political Literature," which noted that the collective was reorganizing itself too slowly. Basic recommendations aimed at improving its work were formulated.

In the 18 months since that resolution we have strengthened our cadre structure: the General Editorial Board was significantly renovated and currently the entire publishing apparatus is in a stage of renovation. Structural changes were made in order to achieve a more efficient organization of the editorial and publishing process.

Nonetheless, these are primarily our internal problems and hardly affect the reader, who judges of a publishing house according to its output. By buying or not buying a book he not only assesses it but also brings his judgment of the author and the publishing house. That is why we need information on book sales not 2 years after publication, as is the case now, but no later than 1 year.

Judging by publications which have appeared in recent years, Politizdat has still not entirely eliminated the practice of publishing books for accountability purposes, for "covering" all parts of the topic plan. What is being specifically done fully to block access to worthless stereotyped works?

The creation of interesting and sharp books, consistent with the times, and formulating a topic plan based on the study of readers' requirements has been and remains the most important and difficult task. I emphasize the word difficult, for the way of thinking of an author and his style and knowledge of the material, including the use of archives, do not depend on the wishes of the editors. Naturally, after the CPSU Central Committee resolution on book publishing, the topics of books were studied and organizational work was intensified. We are looking for new authors who can interest the readers with a fresh view on various problems and a nonstandard interpretation of topical subjects. Furthermore, our traditional authors are restructuring their work and, I believe, can create many other interesting works.

It is very difficult for us to publish books on current economic problems. Although not as rapidly as we would like, we are addressing ourselves to this most important problem as well. We published the study "*Public Production Intensification: Socioeconomic Problems,*" and the popular books "*Perestroyka In Economic Management: Answer to the Challenge of Our Time,*" and "*Collective Contracting in the Countryside.*" The following collections came out: "*Cost Accounting, Self-Support and Self-Financing: Problems and Experience,*" and "*Economic Investigations,*" which discuss progressive experience at enterprises in industry and transportation, in agroindustrial associations and in services. A new VUZ textbook was published on "*Political Economy*" (by a group of authors headed by V.A. Medvedev). We are currently ready to publish pamphlets in the series "Radical Reform in Management." We are preparing the publication of a number of books in which the authors discuss, against a wide historical and economic background, the reasons for stagnation and the need for and ways of surmounting the economy of inertia. We are planning for the immediate future a series of pamphlets on "New Developments in Economics" (leasing, socialist competition, the consumer goods market and other problems). We are also planning collections such as "*There Is No Backtracking*" (G.Kh. Popov, editor) and "*Social Strategy of Perestroyka*" (T.I. Zaslavskaya, editor), a work by VASKHNIL Academician V.A. Tikhonov on the cooperative, and others.

Today historical awareness is being subjected to a major change. It is related to the reinterpretation of many events and facts, and the role which one personality or another played. Naturally, all of these difficulties directly affect the publishers. Therefore, for the time being it is too early to speak of a wide flow of books new in spirit, methodology and factual data. The reference books we recently reissued "*At the Walls of the Kremlin,*" and "*The Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945,*" were subjected to substantiated criticism for their stereotypical approaches and neglect of the new realities. We have also received many letters which extensively criticize notes about Stalin published in a tear-off calendar. Currently a new reference work on the Great Patriotic War is being edited (we shall try to time its publication for the 45th anniversary of the victory over fascism); the work "*At the Walls of the Kremlin*" is being extensively rewritten. It will show the truth (occasionally blunt) about some historical personalities.

Nonetheless, let me point out that the publishing house has prepared and has undertaken the publication of a number of works in which an attempt is made to take a truly new look at many historical problems. They include "*Correspondence On Historical Topics,*" in which some sharp problems of our history are given a new interpretation (the conflict within the first Soviet government, the meaning of the "great change," "blank spots" in the Great Patriotic War and others). The main landmarks of party history are being traced, in the spirit of truth, in the book "*The Lesson of History,*" based essentially on materials with which the readers are already familiar from "PRAVDA's Fridays." Bearing in mind that the new textbook on CPSU history is still not ready, this collection will unquestionably be useful to the broadest possible circle of readers.

The work by L. Gordon and E. Klopov "*What Was This?*" Provides a comprehensive study of historical alternatives which existed during the period of the country's turn to collectivization and industrialization.

It is on the basis of this viewpoint that the author considers a number of topical and debatable problems of the socialist maturity of society. He notes, in particular, that in recent years the party has had repeatedly to put a stop to anticipation in defining the extent of maturity of our society. This is no accident, for one of the most important characteristics in the dialectics of production forces and production relations at the present stage of historical progress is that socialism won in a country with a relatively low starting point of development of production forces, while capitalism continues to develop in countries which reached the highest possible level of production forces as a result of the active utilization of the latest achievements of the scientific and technical revolution and flexible social maneuvering. It is important to bear this circumstance in mind in revising extant dogmatic concepts.

The author presents a number of thoughts on the "sensitive" spots of the economic reform under way. Unfortunately, this part of the work is substantially inferior to the others in terms of the depth of analysis and is not free from obvious simplifications and certain stereotypes of old approaches. As a whole, however, the author provides a meaningful interpretation of this topic, which makes this book interesting.

L.I. Abalkin. "Perestroyka: Puti i Problemy" [Perestroyka: Ways and Problems]. Ekonomika, Moscow, 1988, 190 pp. Reviewed by K. Mikulskiy, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member.

This is a somewhat unusual book both in terms of form and content. It is a collection of interviews granted by Academician L.I. Abalkin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics, to Soviet and foreign journalists. The author answers questions on the objectives, principles and methods of perestroyka in the Soviet economy. He not only describes some phenomena but also analyzes the evaluates them without concealing the complexity and contradictoriness within the current stage of perestroyka.

The book helps us to clarify the main thing: in itself, public ownership does not automatically guarantee socioeconomic progress (see page 28). In this connection, the author expresses a number of essential concepts on the dialectics of interaction between production forces and production relations under socialism and substantiates changes in the forms of the exercise of socialist ownership, aimed at ensuring an economic upsurge.

Answering those who question the consistency between some concepts of the radical economic reform and the fundamental principles of socialism, the author explains that it is precisely perestroyka that sets the task of strengthening socialism and the systematic implementation of its principles. However, in order to understand the core of events, it is necessary to abandon simplistic and simply erroneous concepts of the incompatibility between commodity-monetary relations and the development of socialist society, confusing social justice with equalitarian distribution, etc. Such concepts make it difficult for the masses to understand the requirements of perestroyka. The book convincingly proves that a number of criteria and forms of rational economic management, previously considered as being specifically capitalist, such as profit, market, and so on are, in the long run, natural and necessary for the development of socialist production forces. "...The characteristic of the socialist system," the author emphasizes, "is precisely that it must ensure achieving high efficiency of output while preserving, strengthening and multiplying the principles of social justice, lack of exploitation, and broadest possible development of the freedoms and democratic principles in the organization of social life.... I consider far-fetched the alternative of either economic efficiency or social justice and as conflicting with the logic of the social development and the meaning of our ideals" (p 67).

Today a great deal is being written about the scope of perestroyka, the conversion of enterprises to cost accounting, the dissemination of the collective contracting system, and so on. Yet, for the time being, changes in the production process itself and in its efficiency as a whole, have been small. It is necessary properly to understand why this is taking place in order not to yield to doubts as to the accuracy of the choice. It would be useful here as well to take into consideration the assessment of the economic situation as described in the book. The author emphasizes that the use of cost accounting, self-financing and contracting is taking place so far under the conditions of the preservation of many elements of the old economic mechanism in price-setting, finances and material and technical procurements. Taking all this into consideration it becomes clear that what we must do is not to complain about the poor results of the new economic management methods but decisively to eliminate anything which prevents them from manifesting themselves, not stopping half-way but systematically developing the reform.

The reader will find in this book some concepts which, to a certain extent, may be unexpected but which are entirely substantiated and which allow us to cast a more sober look on our economic life. Such is, for example, the conclusion that "the main channel for unearned income is not individual labor activity, not the area of cooperative production and not even speculation but work in the state sector of the national economy. Unearned money is paid for simple or unfinished amounts of work, the production of substandard goods and violations of various norms of expenditure of material resources.... and huge sums are being paid not according to the work done" (p 90). The more frequently and frankly science draws the attention of society to such problems, which reflect the complexity and contradictoriness of social development, the more opportunities will there be to control them.

We cannot agree with everything said by L.I. Abalkin. For example, his conclusion that the conversion of ministries to cost accounting would be erroneous is arguable (see p 97). One cannot imagine the extensive development of economic management methods with a "noneconomic" status of managerial authorities. The fact that the activities of the central economic authorities, considering the variety of their tasks, may combine various principles is a different matter. Perhaps we should be oriented more toward ascribing to such authorities the functions of servicing the enterprises, applying economic feedback, developing voluntary enterprise associations and assigning tasks of greater national economic significance to special authorities—"customers of change"—whose status would be qualitatively different from that of today's ministries.

Another arguable matter is that of the use of the second form of cost accounting. I believe that L.I. Abalkin is excessively cautious in assessing its possibilities (see p 156).

The book contains materials published in the press for the past 2 years. These were years of unparalleled quick emancipation of our thoughts and enrichment of our concepts. Unquestionably, it is to the credit of the author that his thoughts, even those expressed 2 years ago, have not lost their novelty and become a "past stage." The relevance and cognitive value of the materials included in this book are obvious to this day.

Bookshelf

18020007q Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) p 126

[Text] 1. "Marks, Engels, Lenin, KPSS o Nauchno-Tekhnicheskom Progresse" [Marx, Engels, Lenin and the CPSU on Scientific and Technical Progress]. Compiled by N.A. Lavrenov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1989, 368 pp.

2. Marx, K., Engels, F. and Lenin, V.I. "Ob Estetike i Esteticheskom Vospitanii" [On Aesthetics and Aesthetical Education]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1988, 495 pp.

3. "XIX Vsesoyuznaya Konferentsiya Kommunisticheskoy Partii Sovetskogo Soyuza" [19th All-Union Conference of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union], 28 June - 1 July 1988. Minutes. In two volumes. Vol 1. Politizdat, Moscow, 1988, 352 pp.

4. Gorbachev, M.S. "K Polnovlastiyu Sovetov i Sozdaniyu Sotsialisticheskogo Pravovogo Gosudarstva" [For Full Power of the Soviets and the Creation of a Socialist State of Law]. Report and concluding speech delivered at the extraordinary twelfth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, eleventh convocation, 29 November - 1 December 1988. Politizdat, Moscow, 1988, 47 pp.

5. Gorbachev, M.S. "Vystupleniye v Organizatsii Obyedinennykh Natsiy, 7 Dekabrya 1988 Goda" [Speech to the United Nations Organization, 7 December 1988].Politizdat, Moscow, 1988, 32 pp.

6. "Razvivat Arendu, Perestraivat Ekonomicheskiye Otnosheniya na Sele" [Develop Leasing and Restructure Economic Relations in the Countryside]. Meeting at the CPSU Central Committee with heads of kolkhozes, sovkhozes and enterprises of the agroindustrial complex and collectives working on the basis of leasing, party raykom secretaries, scientists and agricultural specialists, 12 October 1988. Politizdat, Moscow, 1988, 45 pp.

7. "Zhiznennaya Neobkhodimost Sotsialno-Ekonomicheskikh Preobrazovaniy na Sele" [Vital Need for Socio-economic Change in the Countryside]. Conference of first secretaries of central Committees of communist parties of Union republics and party kraykoms and obkom on topical problems of CPSU agrarian policy at the present state, held in Orel. Meetings and talks held by M.S. Gorbachev in the Orel area on 14-15 November 1988. Politizdat, Moscow, 1988, 127 pp with illustrations.

8. "Vizit Generalnogo Sekretarya TsK KPSS, Predsedatelya Prezidiuma Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR M.S. Gorbacheva v Indiyu, 18-20 Noyabrya 1988 Goda" [Visit to India by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, 18-20 November 1988]. Documents and materials. Politizdat, Moscow, 1988, 64 pp with illustrations.

9. "Vsemirnaya Istoriya Ekonomicheskoy Mysli" [Universal History of Economic Thinking]. In six volumes. V.N. Cherkovets et al., editors. Vol 2. Mysl, Moscow, 1988, 575 pp.

10. "XXVI Syezd Frantsuskoy Kommunisticheskoy Partii" [26th Congress of the French Communist Party]. Saint-Ouen, 2-6 December 1987. Translated from the French. E.A. Drozdov, general translation editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1988, 246 pp.

11. Ibarruri, D. "Vospominaniya" [Memoirs]. Struggle and life. In two volumes. Vol 1. "The Only Way." Vol 2.. "1939-1977. I Did Not Have Enough of Spain." Translated from the Spanish. Politizdat, Moscow, 1988. Vol 1, 480 pp. Vol 2, 286 pp.

12. "Kommunisticheskoye Dvizheniye i Borba za Obshchestvennyy Progress" [The Communist Movement and the Struggle for Social Progress]. Textbook for Marxism-Leninism universities. V.V. Zagladin, general editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1988, 302 pp.

Marxism-Leninism, their chosen subject and a foreign language and will submit a paper on a topical subject as well as a list of their publications, including articles in newspapers and journals.

The central committees of communist parties of Union republics and the party kraykoms and obkoms will send to the rectorate of the academy the documents of those recommended for postgraduate studies by no later than 15 February and for those accepted for correspondence-full-time studies by no later than 1 April 1988.

Applicants for the correspondence-full-time department of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences will be invited for a talk in April-May and those recommended for postgraduate studies, for their entrance examinations in May-June 1988.

Paid leave, not to exceed 30 calendar days, will be granted for preparations and taking entrance examinations for postgraduate studies.

Classes at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences will begin on 1 September. Postgraduate students will be offered hostel accommodations (without their families).

Regular Enrollment of Students in Higher Party Schools

18020007t Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) p 128

[Text] The regular student enrollment in higher party schools is hereby announced.

Enrollment will be based on recommendations issued by the central committees of communist parties of Union republics, party kraykoms and obkoms and the Moscow City Party Committee. Personnel of the central organizations and ideological institutions will have their documents processed by the party committees (collegiums) or these organizations and establishments via the Moscow CPSU Gorkom. he selection for the higher party schools will be conducted publicly, taking the views of the primary party organizations and the labor collectives.

The higher party schools will accept CPSU members with a party membership of no less than 3 years, among personnel of the party apparatus, released secretaries of primary party organizations, personnel of soviet and Komsomol agencies and ideological establishments and organizations, workers kolkhoz members, specialists who are members of party committees, and members of soviets of people's deputies, as follows:

Individuals with higher training, for 2-year full-time and 3-year correspondence departments;

Students with secondary education, for 4-year full-time departments.

The full-time departments of the higher party schools will accept personnel under the age of 35.

By no later than 1 April 1988 the central committees of communist parties of Union republics, party kraykoms and obkoms and the Moscow Party Gorkom will submit to the higher party schools the applications of personnel recommended for training, excerpts from buro resolutions., cadre files, health certificates and character references.

Applicants recommended for the 4-year departments will take tests in social science, Russian language, and literature (composition) at the higher party schools in May-June. They will be granted paid leave not to exceed 15 calendar days to prepare themselves for the examinations.

Candidates for 2-year full-time and 3-year correspondence departments will be invited to the higher party schools for a talk in April-May.

Classes in the higher party schools will begin on 1 September. Students will be provided with hostel accommodations (excluding their families).

Publication Data

18020007u Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89

English Title: KOMMUNIST, No 1, January 1989

Russian title: KOMMUNIST, 1 (1335), Yanvar 1989

Editors: N.B. Bikkenin (editor-in-chief), A.I. Antipov, E.A. Arab-Ogly, B.S. Arkhipov, K.N. Brutents, Ye.T. Gaydar, 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: December 1988

Signed to Press: 23 December 1988

Copies: 935,000

END

13. "Politicheskaya Ekonomiya" [Political Economy]. Textbook for higher educational institutions. Authors: V.A. Medvedev (head), L.I. Abalkin, O.I. Ozherelyev and others. Politizdat, Moscow, 1988, 735 pp, charts, diagrams.

14. "Razmyshleniya o Bezopasnosti v Yadernyy Vek" [Thoughts on Security in the Nuclear Age]. Dialogue between East and West generals. S.P. Fedorenko, editor. Progress, Moscow, 1988, 181 pp.

15. Samsonov, A.M. "Znat i Pomnit" [Know and Remember]. Dialogue between historian and reader. Politizdat, Moscow, 1988, 368 pp.

16. "Sovetskaya Ekonomika: Novoye Kachestvo Rosta" [The Soviet Economy: A New Quality of Growth]. Textbook edited by L.I. Abalkin. Politizdat, Moscow, 1988, 350 pp, tables.

17. "Statisticheskiy Yezhegodnik Stran-Chlenov Soveta Ekonomicheskoy Vzaimopomoshchi" [Statistical Yearbook of CEMA Member Countries], 1988. Finansy i Statistika, Moscow, 1988, 511 pp.

Meetings With the Editors. Chronicle

18020007r Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) p 127

[Text] The editors were visited by Norbert Hansel and Freimuth Duwe, FRG Bundestag deputies, representing the German Social Democratic Party. The topics of their discussion included current problems of perestroyka in the USSR, glasnost and socialist pluralism, as well as the basic trends of work of KOMMUNIST and its international relations.

The editors were visited by E. Hewett, editor in chief of the American journal SOVIET ECONOMY. The discussion covered problems of the radical economic reform, improvements of the financial system and prospects for the cooperation between Soviet and American economists.

A meeting was held between KOMMUNIST associates and the party aktiv and propagandists at the Moscow Radio Engineering Plant. An extensive discussion took place on the ways and means of development of the political and economic reforms and the participation of the journal in the restructuring of ideological work under contemporary conditions.

Editorial associates met with representatives of Bulgarian organizations and establishments accredited to the Soviet Union at the Bulgarian Cultural Information Center. A long comradely talk was held in the premises of the Bulgarian Cultural Information Center on a wide range of problems relative to the participation of the journal in the theoretical and political interpretation of the processes of perestroyka in the country, and summation of the experience gained in socialist renovation gained by the fraternal parties in recent years.

Ideological problems of perestroyka, the democratization of the party and society and the course of preparations for the election of USSR people's deputies were discussed at a meeting with the party aktiv of the USSR Gosteleradio.

Regular Enrollment of Students and Graduate Students in the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences

18020007s Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 1, Jan 89 (signed to press 23 Dec 88) p 127

[Text] The regular enrollment of students and graduate students in the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences is hereby announced.

Enrollment will be based on recommendations issued by the central committees of communist parties of Union republics and party kraykoms and obkoms. The personnel of the central organizations and ideological establishments will be processed by the party committees (collegiums) of these organizations and establishments via the Moscow CPSU Gorkom.

Personnel will be accepted for correspondence or full-time training as cadre reserves for leading work on the republic, kray and oblast levels and within the apparatus of the central organizations and establishments. The correspondence-full-time form of training will be for a 3-year term. The correspondence cycle will not exceed 2 years and the full-time cycle will not exceed 1 year on-the-job training.

Postgraduate studies will be offered in the following departments: CPSU history, philosophy, political economy, scientific communism, USSR history, party building, Soviet state building and law, ideological work, socialist culture, national economy, management of socioeconomic processes, world politics and international CPSU activities, mass information media, applied sociology and psychology, and the scientific atheism institute.

Applications for postgraduate studies, based on competition, will be opened to personnel of party, soviet and ideological agencies, teachers and scientific associates of party training and scientific institutions with higher education, not older than 35, and with a party membership of no less than 3 years. Applicants for graduate studies will take competitive entrance examinations on

10

22161
64
NTIS
ATTN: PROCESS 103
5285 PORT ROYAL RD
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

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 personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

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 rendered phonetically 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. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, 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, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly 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.

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. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735,or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense 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.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. 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.