


050082

JPRS-UKO-85-017

14 November 1985



# USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 11, July 1985

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED

19980304 100

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

10  
164  
A08

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

14 November 1985

## USSR REPORT

### TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 11, July 1985

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

### CONTENTS

|                                                                                                                           |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| EDITORIAL--On the Course of Intensification .....                                                                         | 1  |
| Speech by M. S. Gorbachev at the Inauguration Ceremony of<br>the 12th World Youth and Student Festival 27 July 1985 ..... | 12 |
| Statement by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary<br>M. S. Gorbachev.....                                             | 15 |
| TOWARDS THE 27TH PARTY CONGRESS                                                                                           |    |
| Labor Productivity and Machine Quality<br>(D. Belenkiy) .....                                                             | 17 |
| Biotechnology in the Forefront of Scientific and Technical Progress<br>(Yu. Ovchinnikov) .....                            | 23 |
| Higher School Contribution to Production<br>(G. Malyshev, Yu. Ryzhov) .....                                               | 33 |
| In Order To Work Better<br>(A. Ponomarev) .....                                                                           | 40 |
| OUR KNOWLEDGE, STRENGTH AND WEAPON                                                                                        |    |
| Loyalty to Principle and Flexibility of Tactics<br>(Ye. Bugayev) .....                                                    | 54 |
| Thoughts on Lenin<br>(Aziz Muhammed) .....                                                                                | 69 |

## FOR OUR SOVIET MOTHERLAND

|                                              |    |
|----------------------------------------------|----|
| The People's Resistance<br>(P. Zhilin) ..... | 77 |
|----------------------------------------------|----|

|                                                      |    |
|------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Battlefield Medical Personnel<br>(Ye. Smirnov) ..... | 89 |
|------------------------------------------------------|----|

## UNDER THE BANNER OF INTERNATIONALISM

|                                            |     |
|--------------------------------------------|-----|
| Abreast of the Times<br>(B. Leybzon) ..... | 100 |
|--------------------------------------------|-----|

|                                                                 |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Victory Over Fascism and the Arab Peoples<br>(A. Vavilov) ..... | 114 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

## REALITIES OF THE CONTEMPORARY EPOCH

|                                                        |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Peace and Security for Europe<br>(A. Chernyshev) ..... | 124 |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----|

## CRITICISM AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

|                                                                                         |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| The Working Class and Workers Movement in the Liberated Countries<br>(A. Madatov) ..... | 137 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

|                                        |     |
|----------------------------------------|-----|
| Short Book Review<br>(F. Petrov) ..... | 145 |
|----------------------------------------|-----|

|                                             |     |
|---------------------------------------------|-----|
| The Journal's Mail: January-June 1985 ..... | 147 |
|---------------------------------------------|-----|

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 11  
July 1985

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author(s) :

Editor(s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : July 1985

Signed to press : 30 Jul 85

Copies : 930,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",  
"Kommunist", 1985

## EDITORIAL--ON THE COURSE OF INTENSIFICATION

AU220706 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85)  
pp 3-11

[Text] The materials of the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the speeches of Comrade M. S. Gorbachev in Leningrad, Kiev, Dnepropetrovsk, and Minsk, and a number of conferences have outlined a package of important tasks which determine the strategic course of our economy for the near and distant future. Among these tasks are: the shift of the national economy onto the track of intensive development on the basis of a sharp acceleration of scientific-technical progress; the implementation of a structural reorganization of production; the introduction of effective forms of managing, organizing, and stimulating work; the creation in the final analysis of an integrated system of economic operations and management which meets contemporary demands; the further increasing of the welfare of Soviet people; and the strengthening of the USSR's defense capabilities.

Man and his needs are always at the center of the party's policy. The growth of the people's welfare is the main goal to which the solving of all other economic tasks is subordinated. Thanks to this policy our country has achieved the heights of economic and social progress. A comprehensively developed unified, national, economic complex and a mighty army of qualified cadres of workers and kolkhoz members, specialists and scientists have ensured the Soviet Union a leading position in the world in many areas of the development of production, science and technology.

Social achievements are characterized primarily by the position of the working person in society. In our country he has become for the first time master of the country and creator of his future. Education, social security, broad political rights, and direct, constantly deepening and widening political participation in administering the state are all the invaluable achievements of the working people who have built socialism. The dynamic shifts presently taking place in the whole of our life require a transition to a new qualitative state of Soviet society. What is involved are achievements of the highest world level of labor productivity, the perfecting of social relations, primarily economic ones, deep changes in the sphere of work and in the material and spiritual conditions of life, the deepening of socialist democracy and of the people's self-government, and the activation of political and social institutions.

The final goal of our development is the construction of communism. From the point of view of this prospect the party is evaluating its position in the national economy and all other spheres of social life, and is setting the tasks for the future.

The successes which have been achieved must not weaken the attention we pay to the fact that from the beginning of the 1970s certain difficulties arose in our economic development. The reasons for this are varied: insufficient and not always timely account taken of changed production conditions, of possible ways of intensification, of changes in methods of economic management, and others. It cannot be said that these circumstances were not noticed. However, and this is the main point, persistence was not shown in developing and implementing large-scale measures in the economic sphere. Frequently good words about what should be done did not lead to painstaking work every day to fulfill what had been outlined. And there was not enough sharply critical and self-critical evaluation of real results.

It was necessary to consistently strive to achieve intensification of the economy on the basis of accelerated scientific progress, of the decisive introduction of its achievements into practice, of the serious perfecting of management and planning accordance with the demands of the time, of a change in structural and investment policy, of the strengthening and increasing everywhere of organization and discipline, and of a radical improvement in the style of work.

A sharp turn for the better in these areas will have a positive effect on all aspects of our life. We will be able to more successfully solve the vital tasks of food supply, of increasing the production of goods, the provision of services, and the construction of housing, of the improvement of health care and education, and of the development of science and culture. The acceleration of scientific-technical progress will contribute to the further strengthening of our country's defense might.

"...We want to continue along the road of improving the conditions of life and work of Soviet people and comprehensively perfecting the socialist way of life, to maintain the country's socialism in the world arena," the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said at a meeting with the collective of the Dnepropetrovsk G. I. Petrovskiy Metallurgical Plant.

The intensification of the economy presupposes the fullest utilization of the existing production apparatus, on the one hand, and the creation of a more effective technological system which embodies the newest scientific-technical achievements, on the other.

Achieving high results with the use of the already formed production apparatus is a most important task. Thanks to this there can and must be a substantial increase in the output of products, accelerated commission of new capacities, and overfulfillment of adopted plans. In 1983 and 1984, as in this year, we achieved positive shifts in essentially all branches of the national economy on the basis of the strengthening of technological work, and functioning of

the economic mechanism, of the organization and stimulation of highly productive work, and of an increase in the quality of work.

And this should be consolidated and augmented and become an everyday norm. The paramount task of today is to do everything for the successful completion of the current five-year plan. On the basis of careful analysis of the results of the fulfillment of the plan in the first half-year, and of the reasons which are hampering the acceleration of production development, the measures necessary to fulfill the 1985 plan must be developed and implemented, and without any corrections, either.

Concurrently, in order to achieve acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development on an intensive basis over a lengthy period, it is necessary to shift production to a new technological basis, the creation of which is connected with the introduction of the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution. All this will require considerable expenditure of material resources and time. Under such conditions the comprehensive utilization of reserves of existing equipment and technology acquires an important additional meaning: It makes it possible to acquire the necessary material resources and to carry out reconstruction in the national economy, not only without decreasing the level of production and consumption, but also constantly increasing them in the course of fulfilling and overfulfilling the adopted plans.

Qualitative transformation of the material-technical basis requires perfection of investment and structural policy in the economy. This means that reconstruction and technical reequipment on the basis of the latest technology should occupy the central place in capital investments in the national economy. It is necessary to increase the share of the resources directed at these purposes from one-third to at least one-half of the total volume of production capital investments.

Why is it impossible to continue along the former path in widening production, by increasing its volume on the basis of new construction and postponing the reequipment of existing enterprises? The fact is that such a policy requires the constantly increasing use of new labor, materials, raw materials, and natural resources in production. The rapid growth in the volume of production funds and capacities on a stable or relatively slowly changing technical basis was a well-grounded method of creating the material-technical basis of socialism and of forming the country's national wealth in the past. Continuation along this road in conditions where the possibilities of using additional labor, materials, raw materials, and natural resources in production are decreasing would lead to an increase in the number of unoccupied work places and to excessive growth of expenditures on the extraction and transportation of raw materials and on the protection of the environment. This kind of development now has no future: Ever greater expenditures would produce ever smaller results. Under current conditions this is a dead-end road.

The growth of the economy on the basis of intensive renewal of basic production funds, with a predominant allotment of funds to compensate for their depreciation has good prospects. There are, of course, circumstances in

which new construction is unavoidable. The development of uninhabited territories as well as the appearance of new branches of production which is conditioned by the progress of science and technology and by the necessity of protecting the environment, may require new construction which limits the share of production capital investments which is directed toward reconstruction and technical renewal. But these same limitations confirm the necessity of strict observation of the principles of reconstruction and of averting attempts to carry out a simple quantitative widening of production under the guise of reconstruction. Such a formulation of the question requires that a thorough understanding be gained of the projects being built, and that, bearing in mind the goal which has been outlined, the construction of some be sharply accelerated and that of others, perhaps, held up.

The shift of the economy onto an intensive path of development and the implementation of reconstruction and technical renewal on the basis of the latest equipment and technology are closely connected with the effective utilization of resources and with their rational economization everywhere and in all areas. Wealth is incompatible with wastefulness. After all, economizing on raw materials, materials, energy, and work time and gaining additional output from this is a great deal cheaper for society than gaining the same output from new resources used in the economy. An enormous unused reserve in this respect is secondary raw materials and the waste from production and consumption. According to present evaluations, the share of secondary resources in the country's raw materials supply could be increased tenfold.

The rational utilization of resources is a multifaceted process. It is both the creation of waste-free technologies and the use of new resource-saving equipment, of economical processing methods, and of contemporary methods of utilizing secondary materials. Reserves for economizing also exist among organizational, economic, and social factors.

What is waste for some production units can be valuable raw material for others. The stumbling block on the road to putting this sensible formula into practice is departmentalism. The experience of overcoming this, such as has been accumulated, for example, in the town of Poti (Georgian SSR) deserves to be carefully studied and spread. Guaranteeing a regime of economy everywhere is an all-party and nationwide task.

Ensuring the high quality of products delivered occupies a most important place among factors for accelerating the country's socioeconomic development on the basis of the intensification and growth in efficiency of production. The quality of products and their competitiveness on the world market are indexes which incorporate the scientific-technical level of production and the standard and discipline of work. It is precisely the improvement of quality that makes it possible to satisfy the growing demands of the national economy and the population to a greater extent and with less expenditure of labor and materials, and widens the country's export potential. Although an improvement in technical-economic indexes and in the quality of a number of products did take place in previous years of the current five-year plan, and although this process is continuing in the current year, quality nevertheless continues to be one of the most vulnerable points in our national economic activity.

The struggle for quality is closely connected with the economizing and rational utilization of resources. After all, the incompatibility of products with consumer demands, and even worse, clearly defective goods, in point of fact represent plundering of the material goods and waste of the work of our people. "That is why," Comrade M. S. Gorbachev stressed, "increasing product quality in every way possible must be at the center of economic policy. Quality and again quality, that is our slogan today."

When what is involved is the reequipment of all branches of the national economy with the use of contemporary achievements of science and technology, and also the terms of carrying out this reequipment, it is necessary to evaluate the potential of such a branch as capital construction. Unfortunately, it is still lagging behind for the moment. Resources are utilized inefficiently not only on a number of projects, but also in entire branches (ferrous metallurgy and the petrochemical and oil-refining industry). The volumes of incomplete construction are slowly decreasing, and unjustified increases in the cost of projects under construction frequently occur. The latter circumstance today requires special attention in the conditions of the mass shift to new technological means. The ways of overcoming the tendency toward an increase in the cost of construction are varied. They include, for example, the increasing of the quality of design and estimate documentation, the choice of a fundamentally less capital-intensive alternative of creating capacities through reconstruction instead of new construction. A general saving of means for capital investment is achieved by using the least fund-intensive alternatives of solving national economic tasks (for example, through investments for the purpose economizing in fuel and energy resources and the intensification of the struggle against losses of agricultural raw materials instead of increasing the volume of output of the corresponding products, and so on. There are also numerous other methods of pulling up capital construction. It is important not to lose a moment in putting them into action and achieving real success in this sphere.

The intensive utilization of the existing production apparatus, the reequipment of all branches of the national economy on the basis of the contemporary achievements of science and technology, and the substantial increasing of the coefficient of replacement of equipment considerably increase the national economy is needed for new equipment. This means that the burden on the entire complex of machine-building branches increases, which in turn calls for intensified development of machine-tooling building, the basic branch of all machine building, as well as of branches directly connected with the making of modern machine tools, that is, electronics, electrical engineering, instrument making, and other branches.

The key role of the country's machine-building industry in accelerating scientific-technical progress in the national economy is clear. In order to fulfill this dominant role it will be necessary to increase its rates of growth by 1.5 to 2 times, even in the 12th Five-Year Plan, and at the same time to manufacture new generation equipment on a mass scale, equipment which will ensure automation and robotization of production and a multiple increase in labor productivity.

Flexible production systems can serve as a clear example of the fundamentally new means of production in the machine-building industry. They make it possible to solve the most important task of comprehensive automation of production on the basis on the new technology. Where does the meaning of this task lie? Until recently, successfully operating automated production lines, machine tools, and automatic equipment could only be used effectively in mass production and were thus designated for processing a narrowly limited range of articles. According to the specialists' evaluations, mass production makes up only one-quarter of the volume of products of the machine-building industry. The remaining three-quarters of the articles are produced under conditions of serial, small-scale serial, and individual production, where the level of automation is low. The prospects for the development of technology show that rapid rates of scientific progress will lead to frequent changes in design and consequently to an increase in product range. The importance of small-scale production will become ever greater. Only flexible and mobile production processes can ensure automation in these conditions. Their creation has become possible as a result of the synthesis of the achievements of automation, electronics, microprocessor and robot technology, and successes in producing equipment controlled by programs. We now have over 50 flexible production systems. By the decision of the USSR Council of Ministers (May 1984), it is planned to manufacture and put into operation more than 30,000 flexible production modules designed for various technological purposes, and over 1,800 flexible production systems. The introduction of the flexible production systems will make the increase in labor productivity a reality for the machine-building industry, not by a few percent, but many times over.

The creation of flexible production systems in the machine-building industry is of revolutionizing importance not only for our country but also for the entire socialist community. In the interests of further development and deepening of economic and scientific-technical cooperation in the sphere of the automation of machine building, the Agreement Between the USSR and the CSSR on the Formation of the "Robot" International Scientific-Technical Association was recently concluded. The flexible production systems are thus receiving a new accelerator in their development.

The cardinal reconstruction of machine-building cannot be reduced only to the introduction of flexible production systems. The catalyst of progress is microelectronics, computer technology and instrument making, and the entire data-processing industry. The introduction of progressive technologies based on new forms of energy and on laser technology is of principle importance. The flexible production system is one of the shining examples of the fruitful combination of the potential of various areas of science and technology. And this potential is inexhaustible. That is why the front line of the struggle to accelerate scientific-technical progress lies through science. The successes of Soviet scientists in various spheres--from outer space to the microcosm in mathematics, mechanics, electronics, and many other spheres--makes it possible to give a high evaluation of the influence of science on the shift of the national economy to a new quality of development. But in order for science to play such a role, it must make a decisive turn toward the needs of production, just as production must do toward the requirements and demands of science.

What is involved, consequently, is the strengthening of the link between science and production, a link which the new technology serves to put into practice. We have worthy examples of the implementation of this link, for example, the engineering centers attached to the Ye. O. Paton Electric Welding Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences. These centers have become the place where technical interpretation of the institute's scientific research developments is carried out and where the introduction into production of products which are created is ensured. The experience of organizing the centers and also their activity needs to be spread as widely as possible.

At the same time, the importance of the fundamental sciences, the development of which must be a matter of priority, must not be forgotten. The higher educational institutions, the volume of scientific research work of which is still markedly below that required, possess great potential for assisting scientific-technical progress in production. Interesting experience in this regard has been accumulated by the Moscow M. V. Lomonosov State University, which carries out creative collaboration with the ZIL production association. The high level of the scientific research carried out by the university's scientists, the topicality of the problems, and the material supply which the association undertakes, all produce useful results which are used in the introduction of laser technology, in the technological application of the energy of explosion, in the development of automated design systems, and in other cases. But the same experience shows that the results could be greater if a third participant--a properly specialized organization for introduction of these results in production operations--were always present when production problems were being solved.

Today the most serious claims must be made on the branch sciences, which amount to hundreds of scientific-research institutions. Many of them are distant from production operations and frequently do not have significant final results of their work. In order to liquidate this division it is expedient to incorporate a number of institutes and planning and design organizations within production associations and enterprises by widening the number of scientific-production associations which should become the outposts of scientific-technical progress. The work to accelerate this progress also requires the active support of inventors and rationalizers and the swiftest introduction of everything valuable which they create.

In examining questions of the party's economic strategy and approaching it from different sides, it is impossible not to see that, as the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee noted, "in the final analysis everything rests on the need for serious improvement of management and of the economic mechanism as a whole." In fact, while science and the new technology are the motive forces in the intensive growth of the economy, they cannot be given the opportunity to function unless the economy has been made maximally receptive to scientific-technical progress.

The strategic task in the sphere of management lies in fuller utilization of the advantages of socialism in order to develop an economic mechanism which will stimulate the development of our society's production forces to the greatest extent. Its solution must lead to the creation of an integrated

system of economic operations and management which will incorporate the results of a large-scale economic experiment.

The principle of democratic centralism must be embodied in this system. There should be an increase in the efficiency of centralized planning and management, which ensure the primacy of nationwide goals and interests, preserve the necessary interbranch and territorial proportions, and rigorously implement a scientifically substantiated investment and structural policy. This means that the Leninist idea of Gosplan as the main scientific-economic organ of economic management must be consistently and fully put into practice. There should be an increase in the role of indexes and norms in the plan, which are expected to orient enterprises toward the introduction of innovations, the economizing of resources, and the improvement of product quality. In this connection the central management organs must bear a greater responsibility for the quality of plans and must effectively control their fulfillment.

Increased exactingness toward cadres and the struggle against formal methods of work and against the substitution of deeds with talk and numerous empty promises are again necessary here.

Increasing the effectiveness of central leadership makes it a matter of urgency to solve the question of creating organs to manage groups of branches that form large national economic complexes. There must be an intensification of the role of ministries in satisfying the needs of the national economy for the products of their branches, in introducing the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution on a wide scale, and in preparing high-quality, scientifically substantiated plans for the long term.

The perfecting of the management organs' work presupposes reorganization of their structure in the direction of greater efficiency and sensitivity for what is new and advanced. Ahead lie a shift to a two-tier management system of branches and a simplification of the structure of republican organs through the abolition of superfluous links and the reduction of the management apparatus itself.

The consistent implementation of the principle of democratic centralism in management also means the development of democratic principles in management. This requires widening of the independence and responsibility of enterprises, further development of the initiative and creativity of the masses, and greater participation by working people in developing, making, and implementing management decisions on the basis of the Law on Labor Collectives. Such an approach inculcates a proprietary feeling in workers and contributes to strengthening discipline, order, and organization. It must always be remembered that increasing the role of the human factor in contemporary production requires that the leader take constant care of the development of initiative in the labor collective, of enterprises, and of the readiness to assume responsibility. A psychological atmosphere in which it is good to work well and bad to work badly is necessary.

The reorganization of management in contemporary conditions presupposes the consistent introduction of full economic accountability in production and the

application of its principles in every workplace. The organization of the brigade contract is a powerful means of putting this proposition into practice. This form ensures considerable widening of democratic principles in management, the direct dependence of the remuneration of work on the final results of work, and an interest in economical and effective utilization of equipment, raw materials, other materials, and energy.

The system of price-formation needs to be seriously perfected, and it should assist to a greater extent the "anti-expenditure" processes in production and also the interest in introducing what is new and advanced. It is important that in the conditions of full economic accountability associations and enterprises have the opportunity to earn for themselves the means to increase the technical level, product quality, and social development. In this connection credits should be used more widely and independence in using them should be deepened.

Perfecting the economic mechanism is expected to ensure consistent implementation of the socialist principle of remuneration according to work and the observance of social justice in society. Questions of the remuneration of engineering work are becoming particularly topical in connection with the tasks of scientific-technical progress in production.

The existing system of stimulating the work of technologists and designers is poorly linked to the real returns from that work, and consequently cannot ensure intensive work by engineering and technical personnel to create and introduce new equipment, to observe a regime of economizing, and to achieve a high quality of products. Experience in solving this problem has been accumulated in the enterprises of Leningrad, Moscow, Ulyanovsk, and some other cities. The sense of this experience is that tasks are fulfilled by a smaller number of people, and the wages thus released are used for supplementary payments to those who do shock work. The generalization of this experience and the transition from experiment to the formation of an established system will not bear postponement.

The measures outlined in the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions "On Perfecting the Remuneration of Work of Scientific Workers, Designers, and Technologists in Industry" are aimed at the intensification of the material and moral interest of scientific workers, designers, and technologists in industry in accelerating scientific-technical progress and in creating and introducing into the national economy new equipment and technology, the indexes of which meet the highest world level. The new conditions of remuneration of work have the aim of ensuring a closer link between the activity of scientific workers, designers and technologists and their personal contribution to the acceleration of scientific-technical progress.

The strategy of economic development, which presupposes the reconstruction and technical reequipping of production, the implementation of a regime of economizing, and the achievement of a high quality of the results of work, regards scientific-technical progress as the decisive condition for achieving

successes in all areas of economic policy. This approach also presupposes profound changes in party work, and primarily the need to concentrate cadres' attention on questions of scientific-technical progress.

An example of the correct approach to work, and one which was approved by the CPSU Central Committee, is the initiative of the Leningrad party obkom in developing a territorial-branch program of intensifying the economy on the basis of acceleration of the introduction of scientific-technical achievements. The creation of the "Intensification-90" program is evidence of the increase in competence of party leadership in the economy and of the raised level of organizational and political work in the collectives. The program, which was compiled by the party committees and by the Council for Economic and Social Development and for Acceleration of Technical Progress, and with the participation of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Gosplan, and the State Committee for Scientific and Technical Development, purposefully defines the key tasks and methods of solving them. Attached to the party committees and bureaus are permanent commissions for control over product quality and the reconstruction and technical reequipment of production capacities. Socialist competition is aimed at solving topical tasks and at fulfilling the entire program, which combines the activity of many production and scientific collectives into one system. The large-scale nature and the contemporary scientific level of the program have required an orientation toward the maximum use of computer technology, which has become the main condition for carrying out the program.

The experience of the Leningrad party members in developing the "Intensification-90" program is being spread. The Muscovites have prepared a similar program, one has been compiled in Georgia, too, and work in this area is being conducted in Belorussia, other republics and large industrial centers. Of course, the changes in party work do not amount only to leadership in the compilation of scientific-technical programs. In many other areas it is necessary to learn to work in a new way and to reorientate one's psychological attitude. The human factor continues to be the main and determining factor in this connection, and it is necessary to be able to reveal the specific nature of its actions in various spheres of social life.

The Central Committee demands that the Leninist style of work be affirmed everywhere and in all areas, in large and in small matters. This style is characterized primarily by a scientific approach to solving existing tasks and by realism in evaluating the position in any sector. Inherent in it are unity of word and deed, socialist enterprise, and a developed sense of responsibility. It requires efficient control and verification of fulfillment, collectivity of leadership, and skillful selection, deployment, and education of cadres. An inseparable feature of it is the firm link with the masses, critical evaluation of what has been achieved, and a self-critical attitude to one's own activity. It is of a creative nature and will not accept dogmatism or a thoughtless approach to work. "Fewer words, assurances and promises, and more real deeds, practical results, responsibility and principled attitude, coordination in work, attention to people and personal modesty are, in the party's opinion, the main measure of evaluation of all cadres, their ideological preparedness, and their competence, and are the essence of the party's demands on the style and methods of work."

The April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum set the task of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development as a task of paramount importance. The main means of solving it is through the introduction of the latest achievements of science and technology into production and through ensuring that social labor productivity is high everywhere. These tasks are already being fulfilled today. The competition for successful fulfillment of the 1983 plan and for worthy preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress is growing in the country. The lagging of the development of the national economy which was allowed in the winter period is being overcome, and measures to accelerate the rates of the growth of production in the second half of the year are being developed and implemented. The entire growth in its volumes in this period must be achieved through an increase in labor productivity. The condition for this is the wide-scale utilization of the achievements of science and technology, the deepening of intensification of the national economy, the active introduction into practice of new methods of management and economic operations, the intensification of the regime of economizing and the increasing of organization, discipline, and exactingness toward cadres. It is also important to concentrate efforts on developing the complexes to mobilize the resources and potential of economic units to fulfill the plans adopted for this year and also to ensure further progress in the implementation of the country's Food Program.

Under the guidance of the resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 3 July 1985, there should be a fundamental improvement of all work for protection of the environment and for rational utilization of natural resources.

It is necessary to implement economically effective measures to fulfill the plans for retail trade turnover and for everyday services for the population.

Shock work in the final year of the 11th Five-Year Plan must become the foundation for further accelerated progress. Front-rank collectives are putting high indexes of the growth of labor productivity, of the output of products and of the perfecting of production technology into the plans for the next, 12th Five-Year Plan period. The party is preparing for the 27th Congress in a working, practical atmosphere. This is a time of intensive work and of the development of responsible decisions.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17-F

SPEECH BY M.S. GORBACHEV AT THE INAUGURATION CEREMONY OF THE 12TH WORLD YOUTH AND STUDENT FESTIVAL 27 JULY 1985

PM281842 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85)  
pp 12-13

[Text] Dear friends, esteemed guests,

On behalf of the people of our country I hail you in the capital of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Moscow. I congratulate you on the inauguration of the 12th World Festival of Youth and Students.

Such festivals are always a grand holiday, a major international event. A holiday because young envoys from all the continents, people with different world outlooks and national traditions come together. They meet in order to share all the best accumulated in the spiritual repository of every nation, and in so doing pave the shortest way toward mutual understanding and friendship. Soviet people are sincerely glad to host this meeting. Their hearts are open to you.

Naturally, however, festivals are not just a holiday. The problems of life affect and concern youth no less intensively than the senior generations. With all the ardor of youth, young people rise to the battle for social justice and genuine freedom, for making the benefits of the earth and blessings of civilization accessible to all; for banishing violence and racism, inequality and oppression, militarism and aggression from the life of man and mankind.

The world of tomorrow, the world of the coming century is your world, dear friends. Your thoughts and deeds today largely determine what it will be like.

Here in the native land of the great Lenin, you can see for yourselves how deeply our youth is dedicated to the lofty ideals of humanism, peace and socialism.

I believe that all of us will agree that at the present time mankind has no more important, vital task than to safeguard and strengthen peace. Our concern for the future and remembrance of the past mandate us to do so.

Your forum is held in the year of the 40th anniversary of the defeat of Hitlerite fascism and Japanese militarism and the end of World War II, the most blood-shedding and bitter war. This war left so much suffering and sorrow that these still affect the lives of several generations now, and imperatively demand that we prevent such a disaster from recurring.

The peoples shall not forget that 40 years ago the world shook from the first atomic blast. The echo of that blast appeals to the conscience and reason of every honest man. Everyone should ask himself: What has he done to prevent nuclear weapons from ever being used again, either on earth or in space, to eliminate these weapons completely and for good. He should ask himself that question and do what he can for our common home, the planet Earth.

Unfortunately, as you are aware, reactionary forces to which wars and the arms race bring huge profits are still actively at work. These forces would like to turn back the course of history, to retain their power and privileges, to dictate their will to peoples.

As to the Soviet Union, I would like to say yet once again with all certainty that a world without wars and weapons, a world of good-neighborliness and cooperation in good faith, the world of friendship among nations is the ideal of socialism, the goal of our policy.

We set ourselves the task of doing away with the arms race not in word, but in deed; we advocate the most radical solution of the problem of nuclear weapons--their complete banning and elimination.

We advocate the strength and energy of people, as well as the human genius, to be channeled not into the creation of ever new means of destruction, but to the elimination of hunger, poverty and disease, to working for prosperity and peaceful development. We oppose the policy of threats and violence, the trampling of human rights and, in the first place, such sacred rights as the right to life and the right to work. We oppose the turning of liberated and developing countries into a source of enrichment of monopolies and their utilization as sites for military bases and staging areas for aggressions. We say openly and clearly: the Soviet Union sides with those who fight for freedom, national independence and social justice.

Dear friends! The Soviet people are engaged in peaceful creative labor. We have achieved much and built much. However, even more remains to be done. There are many spheres to which Soviet young people can apply their skill and knowledge. We highly appreciate their contribution to the current work of the Soviet people. We are firmly confident that our youth will continue to honorably measure up to its noble predestination: to continue the building of a new society.

You, participants in the festival, boys and girls, personify the spring of mankind, the progress and aspirations of your peoples.

So, let us tirelessly work for the present and the future of mankind without wars, violence and oppression!

Let the 12th World Festival of Youth and Students become a convincing demonstration of solidarity, of allegiance to peace and friendship between nations!

I wish you success and happiness!

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17-F

STATEMENT BY CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE GENERAL SECRETARY M. S. GORBACHEV

PM291547 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85)  
p 14

[Text] The continuing arms race carries within it tremendous danger for the future of the whole world civilization. It leads to the growth of tension in the international arena and the intensification of the war threat, diverting colossal intellectual and material resources from creative objectives.

From the very beginning of the nuclear era the Soviet Union has waged a consistent and vigorous struggle to end the buildup of nuclear arsenals, curb military rivalry and strengthen confidence and peaceful coexistence between states. All USSR activities in the UN and at multilateral and bilateral talks on arms limitation and reduction--activities carried out on an enormous scale--are subordinated to this. The Soviet Union does not seek military supremacy. It advocates maintaining equilibrium of military forces at the lowest possible level.

It is our conviction that the ending of all nuclear weapon tests would constitute an important contribution to the strengthening of strategic stability and peace on earth, for it is no secret that new and even more dangerous forms and types of weapons of mass destruction are being developed and perfected in the course of such tests.

In the interests of creating favorable conditions for the conclusion of an international treaty on the total and universal prohibition of nuclear weapons the USSR has repeatedly suggested to the nuclear powers to agree on a moratorium on any nuclear explosions as of a mutually agreed date. Unfortunately, as yet it has not proved possible to implement this important step.

In a desire to promote the ending of the dangerous competition in the buildup of nuclear arsenals and wishing to set a good example, the Soviet Union has decided to unilaterally end any nuclear explosions as of 6 August of this year. We urge the government of the United States to end nuclear explosions as of the same date, which is marked throughout the world as the day of the Hiroshima tragedy. Our moratorium will last through 1 January 1986. It will remain in effect beyond that date, however, if the United States for its part refrains from conducting nuclear explosions.

There is no doubt that a reciprocal moratorium by the USSR and the United States on any nuclear explosions would also serve as a good example for other states possessing nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union expects of the United States to react positively to this initiative and end its nuclear explosions.

This would be in keeping with all peoples' aspirations and hopes.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17-F

## TOWARDS THE 27TH PARTY CONGRESS

### LABOR PRODUCTIVITY AND MACHINE QUALITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85) pp 15-19

[Article by Professor D. Belenkiy, doctor of technical sciences]

[Text] Our industry is steadily developing new models of machines, upgrading their power and productivity and broadening their functions. Naturally, their use should lower production costs. Yet, compared with 1977, the 1984 average cost of power-generating equipment in the electrical engineering industry was 12 percent higher.

The use of new high-powered tractors has lowered the cost of their output only minimally. Replacing the SK-4 grain-harvesting combine with the more modern Niva and Kolos combines even led to a certain increase in the cost of crop harvesting and the use of the higher-capacity KamAZ trucks by some motor vehicle enterprises increased hauling costs. Consequently, the use of new equipment is still having a minor influence on work costs.

The current procedure for certifying machine-building output as well has no noticeable influence on machine quality from the viewpoint of lowering the cost of the work they perform.

Both before and after the war extensive work was done to develop machines for power generation, industry, transportation, construction and agriculture. Each type yielded tremendous results in terms of lowering the amount of manual labor. Thus, for example, on an average, a single excavator replaced 150 ditchdiggers. Work on primary mechanization was completed roughly toward the end of the 1950s. Subsequently, some machine models began to be replaced with more advanced ones. However, the results of the growth of labor productivity gradually declined. This circumstance confirms the need to control machine quality, thus lowering costs per unit of work and correspondingly increasing labor productivity in the national economy. Machine quality must be assessed not on the basis of the sum total of several features, conventionally considered under the current procedure for awarding the Emblem of Quality, but on the basis of the end result--the growth of labor productivity.

That is why the most essential feature of quality must be singled out: consumer value, i.e., the ability to meet certain requirements (earth removal work, harvesting, etc.). Naturally, the consumer value of a machine increases

the lower the cost per unit of the work it does becomes. The average value per unit machine work (removing 1 kilometer of dirt, amount of crop harvested per hectare) should, in our view, become the economic criterion of its quality.

Determining the consumer value of a machine and of a product made by the machine-building industry will enable us, on the one hand, to determine the consumer value of the materials used for its manufacturing and, on the other, to establish more accurately the value of the various types of goods produced in the national economy with the help of the machine. The introduction of said indicator of the quality of the machine and a product of the machine-building industry will enable us to substantiate the planned amount of machines produced for the needs of the national economy and accurately to determine their price, thus stimulating the personnel at machine-building plants.

However, despite the high volume of available norming and technical documents relative to quality and reliability, an integral indicator of machine quality, determined as early as the 1960s, has still not been defined and, naturally, not taken into consideration. Nor do the standards provide for a clear regulation of the work on perfecting it during the design, manufacturing and operational stages. That is precisely why we are not obtaining the desired results from upgrading the quality of machines produced by the national economy.

It takes approximately 5-6 years to develop a new machine model, after which it is produced for 8 to 10 years. The machines currently developed will be produced for a longer period of time. This means that the integral quality indicator of a model currently used is substantially different from the same indicator applied to its predecessors. It is based on outlays for wages to the machine operator, the cost of fuels and lubricants or electric power, purchasing and installation, repair of breakdowns taking, into consideration losses from machine idling, technical servicing and current and capital repairs of the machine as a whole and its components.

To a certain extent, all such outlays depend on the structural perfection of the machine and the consistency between its parameters and operational conditions, considered as a set with other machines, the technology and quality of manufacturing, and technical servicing in the course of the work. Therefore, the choice of means and methods for improving the integral quality indicator should be based on a systemic approach in designing, manufacturing and operating the machine, in the course of which these three stages in its "life" become a single entity aimed at ensuring the main feature: lowering production costs.

The first two types of outlays can be easily determined in the period of prototype testing. Outlays for purchasing and assembling a machine depend on the actual resource (number of work hours until the end of its operation). The machine resource as stipulated in the technical documentation is usually much higher than the actual one. Similarly, once the series production of a machine has been mastered, outlays caused by breakdowns and planned repairs and technical servicing remain unknown. Their assessment in the technical and

economic substantiation of the new model, as indicated by the use of the machine, has been severely underestimated. In this connection, the unexpected nature of outlays related to reliability leads to the inaccurate determination of the integral quality indicator and the impossibility, with the help of this indicator, of accurately assessing the needed control and management aimed at improving labor productivity.

One may think that such shortcomings are eliminated with the application of state equipment reliability standards. However, all existing state standards deal with specific problems of reliability only: terminology, assessment of a large number of indicators, reliability tests, repair suitability, etc., totally ignoring the main problem: determination, control and reduction of specific outlays influenced by reliability. This creates an adverse situation concerning machine quality and increased productivity.

The study of current practical experience in the development of machines and their operation enables us to establish extensive possibilities of substantially reducing specific outlays and earmarking ways to improve the integral quality indicator. It is precisely this approach that yields good results. Thus, by the end of the 1950s the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Machine Studies imeni A. A. Blagonravov initiated and, subsequently, the USSR Gosplan Institute of Comprehensive Transport Problems continued, the development of motor vehicle types (models and their parameters) with subsequent improvements on the basis of the structure of the trucking industry. This took into consideration the natural and climatic conditions of the various parts of the country, the state of the roads, and the size of freight flows. The work was aimed at lowering trucking costs. The recommendations which were formulated were taken into consideration in the resolutions of the 24th and subsequent CPSU congresses. Their implementation enabled us to lower overall fuel consumption by 49 percent, to reduce the size of the motor vehicle fleet and servicing personnel by 45 percent and lower trucking outlays by 7.5 billion rubles.

Another example of the systematic approach in machine design is the experience of the Combines Plant imeni K. Ye. Voroshilov in Dnepropetrovsk, which was described in KOMMUNIST (No 8, 1984). The plant has been producing the RKS-6 beet-harvesting combines as a set with the SPS-4.2 beet loaders for a number of years. The power is generated by the Belarus tractor (without wheels), which is used for other types of work after the beet harvest. The combine has its originally designed assemblies which ensure high harvest productivity of about 2 hectares per hour.

However, examples of a different nature could be cited as well. Thus, the effectiveness of operating progressive power-saturated tractors (K-701, T-150, T-150K and others) has been drastically reduced because of the incomplete set of work machinery. The uneconomical nature of MAZ and KamAZ trucks is explained by the insufficient number of trailers and mechanization facilities for loading and unloading.

A number of machine-building sectors are in no a hurry to improve the structural variety of the machinery they produce and do not always provide the necessary variety of models and sizes. As a result, it frequently becomes

necessary to use machines not suited for a specific project: a machine tool with digital programming may be used in manufacturing simple parts; an automated machine tool may be used in processing small batches of parts and a high-capacity truck in hauling a small load. This lowers the effect of the use of such machines, for their productivity, power, freight capacity and other technical parameters remain underutilized.

In order to improve the integral quality indicator in machine design we need precise information on the factors affecting its basic elements (mechanical and electric power loads, heat, dust, humidity) as well as characteristics of the resistance of the machine elements to such factors (mechanical and electrical strength, durability, wear and tear, corrosion).

The external factors which affect the elements of the machine are manifested objectively. Thus, in digging into frozen ground, obstacles arise caused by changed temperature conditions; an increased amount of dust in the air is inevitable in harvesting farm crops and so is the fast heating up of the coils of traction motors in electric locomotive engines, etc. Obviously, in the course of testing experimental models ranges of maximal loads and other factors which influence the elements of the developed machine must be determined, taking all possible operational conditions into consideration. In the majority of cases, however, this is not done. For example, the most dangerous breakdown in a mainline electric locomotive engine is the overheating of the coils of the traction engines. Since the actual heating of the engines under real operational conditions is unknown (rolling with stops and under different temperature regimes) while the admissible overheating temperature of the insulation of the coils is known only quite approximately, powerful fans are installed to cool off the engines, which accounts for approximately 14 percent of the power consumed by the electric locomotive engine. This, however, does not entirely guarantee their faultless work.

Measurements of the heating of engine coils with the help of a specially developed on-board electronic system across heavy-duty sectors along the North Caucasian, Virgin Land and Far Eastern railroads indicated that the maximal temperature at which the coils heat up is 60 to 70 degrees centigrade. This is substantially below the admissible level. It was experimentally proved that if the coil temperature is steadily controlled, approximately 7 percent of the energy consumed by the electric locomotive engine could be saved (on a national scale this would be a huge amount) and engine breakdown caused by overheating could be eliminated entirely.

Conducting faster and complete tests (before establishing the service life) of a representative batch of experimental machines of the new model is an important opportunity for improving the integral quality indicator. Frequently such tests bring to light various types of breakdown, the number and variety of which increase with the length of operation of the machine, i.e., as the machine "ages." The reasons for the overwhelming majority of such breakdowns could be studied and eliminated before the series manufacturing of such machines has been undertaken.

Let us note that, as a rule, currently short tests of several experimental models are conducted and the integral quality indicator is not taken into

consideration before the decision has been made to produce a given machine serially. Furthermore, reasons for breakdown are neither determined nor eliminated and the periodicity and extent of repairs and need for spare parts are set arbitrarily, without proper substantiation. All of this complicates the problem of machine reliability and causes tremendous harm to the country's national economy. Lengthy tests of the Niva grain-harvesting combine have indicated that although its standard service life is assessed at 9 years, in some cases combines are written off after 5-7 years due to increased idling caused by breakdowns.

The incompleteness of the work, explained with the lack of comprehensive tests of the experimental batch of machines, can be clearly seen by taking as an example a promising truck model, such as the KamAZ. Despite the fact that new progressive solutions were applied in designing this machine, in the course of the operational period of the first series models only 85 to 90 percent of the combines proved to be in proper order; particularly serious breakdowns were related to the work of the engine and the breaking system. The Kama Automotive Vehicles Plant did extensive work to eliminate structural faults and a large number of changes were made in machine design over a 5-year period. A different situation prevails with the automotive fleet of the country, whose vehicles are operated for rather long periods of time with the help of capital repairs, the labor outlays for which are approximately triple those required for the production of new motor vehicles, not counting the need to manufacture a tremendous number of spare parts. Obviously, the current state of the national economy makes it possible to eliminate the need for repair work and to concentrate the attention of economic managers on the production of modern reliable machinery.

Unfortunately, the widespread view prevails that upgrading the quality of machine-building output requires capital investments and increased labor and material resources. Actually, the labor and economic potential which exists in virtually any production facility makes it possible for the enterprise itself to solve the problem. This is well understood by any thrifty manager. However, by no means are all managers prepared to publicize their reserves.

What is the solution? Obviously, in establishing a method for controlling machine quality two concepts should be studied: the consumer value of the machine and its integral quality indicator. They characterize the material nature of the problem and are a combination of an endless number of internal and external relations, aspects and features. Clearly, they should be considered from the viewpoint of the consumer value of the item, i.e., with the knowledge of the way the social demand of socialist society is met. Under the conditions of a planned development of our economy, increased consumer values require machine quality control on the state level. In the interest of the highest possible development of all types of production facilities, assignments must be set on upgrading machine consumer value.

The profound aspects of this value (the integral quality indicator) may be determined most completely if related to other quality indicators, such as reliability, machine life, and convenience of machine operation.

Regardless of level, all machine quality control is the same and obviously should form a single national system. In order to meet the respective requirements, we should begin by developing and applying a system of state standards which would clearly and simply regulate work procedures in evaluating and improving the integral quality indicator. They should become mandatory for all machine-building enterprises and for those who operate the machinery. Furthermore, the standards should call for reducing individual outlays per machine unit of work, such as labor, metal and energy.

It is necessary to automate machine quality control, i.e., to ensure steady control over integral quality indicators. To this effect, we should establish a national machine quality data gathering system. To begin with, we must formulate enterprise standards based on the new state standards which call for improving the integral machine quality indicator. Secondly, the comprehensive quality control system must be enlarged with a system for controlling machine reliability, for it is the latter which controls machine quality. Finally, the comprehensive quality control system should include a system of automated machine design (SAPR), which, combined with flexible technological production lines, would enable us to convert from the production of one machine model to another within the shortest possible time.

The implementation of all such measures will accelerate the development of a nationwide automated quality control system for machinery. The possibility will appear of making the integral quality indicator the basic plan indicator in the work of machine-building enterprises, along with the indicator of the net-standard output and others. Its development and application will be a major step in resolving a key problem for our economy: a substantial increase in labor productivity.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17

## BIOTECHNOLOGY IN THE FOREFRONT OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL PROGRESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85) pp 20-28

[Article by Yu. Ovchinnikov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text] The communist party considers scientific and technical progress the main lever in the acceleration of our country's socioeconomic development. This was emphasized yet once again, clearly and convincingly, in the resolutions of the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. This set Soviet science a major and responsible assignment, an assignment of truly historical significance: to concentrate its efforts along the most important directions, maximally to harness the entire creative potential and to ensure for the Soviet Union the possibility of advancing to the forefront in key scientific and technical areas. Naturally, this also applies to biotechnology, a new rapidly developing sector.

At the present stage, scientific and technical progress is characterized by considerable successes in the study of the animate world and the practical utilization of the new facts and discoveries in this area. Knowledge of elementary life mechanisms is increasing at a headlong pace. The clarification of the role of large and small molecules in the living cell was an important accomplishment. It turned out that, in the final account, the cell operates on the basis of the laws of chemistry. Every minute it synthesizes hundreds of most complex compounds, including gigantic biopolymers, proteins above all; matter is recreated in accordance with the requirements of the growth and development of the organism.

As is the case with any multicellular organism, the "program" of cellular activities is encoded in the molecules of nucleic acids in a sequence of specific chemical links, based on the genetic program in the cell resembling a "programmed machine tool": ribosomes are synthesized from amino acids of numerous proteins and the structure of each protein is encoded in a DNA sector, known as a gene. Proteins are the main working bodies of the cell, performing a great variety of functions as catalytic ferments, protective agents, growth factors, etc. As a rule, it is precisely the proteins which interest us from the practical viewpoint.

The main feature of current events in biology is the possibility which has appeared, albeit on the level of the simplest possible systems, of controlling

cellular processes. Cells with the necessary features for microbiological synthesis are now being artificially created under laboratory conditions; experiments are under way to combine cells of superior organisms to obtain essentially new cellular hybrids; conditions have been established for growing cells of plants, animals and even man outside the organism, in artificial environments. Methods have been developed for restructuring the genetic apparatus and creating artificial genes implanted in the cellular genes and, on this basis, obtaining hundreds of new very small organisms unknown in nature but carrying features needed by man. This led to the development of genetic and cellular engineering as an essentially new scientific trend. Its revolutionizing impact on resolving practical problems in agriculture and medicine was noted at the 11 June 1985 CPSU Central Committee conference on the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. Combined with microbiological synthesis and the extensive application of the methods of biochemistry and bioorganic chemistry, it became the base of the new biotechnology, the achievements of which are universally known.

Generally speaking, biotechnology means the utilization of biological processes and agents for industrial purposes. The term "biotechnology" was already used at the beginning of our century. It was applied to ancient areas of practical human activities, such as baking, cheese and wine making, silaging, etc. Achievements in biology today have given this concept a new meaning.

A biotechnological area, such as industrial microbiological synthesis, began to develop rapidly after the war. It is used in the manufacturing of hundreds of different antibiotics and, in recent years, feed protein, vitamins, ferments and other physiologically active agents. Biotechnical methods are applied, in particular, in the food industry in the production of sugar from starch and cellulose, which yields millions of tons of output. Incidentally, today direct biotechnological methods for obtaining sweet peptides and proteins have been developed, exceeding the sweetness of ordinary sucrose hundreds or thousands of times and, furthermore, not counterindicated for use by diabetics. Biotechnology is irreplaceable in the creation of treatment systems. It is used in extracting metals from ores and industrial waste, increasing yields from petroleum deposits and in fuel production.

Within a short time biotechnology has developed into a powerful production sector. Its level is determined by that of the science of biology, whatever the area of application. Today, in progressive biological areas, such as microbiology, cellular, gene and protein engineering, immunology and bioorganic chemistry, the road from basic science to the creation of an industrial production method has been shortened to a minimum. In other words, that which only yesterday was completed by a research worker in an academic institute may be used tomorrow in a plant laboratory. This imposes particular responsibility on those who are plowing the first furrow in science and, in this specific case, the leading biological institutes in the country.

Over the past decade the level of work in biological scientific establishments has increased substantially. A decisive role was played in this case by the steps taken by the communist party, the Soviet government and the USSR Academy of Sciences in developing the latest trends in biology. As we know, in 1974

the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers issued the decree "On Measures To Accelerate the Development of Molecular Biology and Molecular Genetics and the Utilization of Their Achievements in the National Economy"; the most important CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On the Further Development of Physical-Chemical Biology and Biotechnology and the Utilization of Their Achievements in Medicine, Agriculture and Industry" came out in 1981. Currently, a major comprehensive program has been approved and is being implemented in the USSR on biotechnology, coordinated by the Interdepartmental Scientific and Technical Council on Problems of Physical-Chemical Biology and Biotechnology of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology and the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium.

We can assert that in the 1970s and 1980s Soviet biological science advanced rhythmically and consistently, successfully surmounting the familiar difficulties of the postwar years. It is based on the outstanding traditions of Russian biological science linked to I. M. Sechenov, I. I. Mechnikov, A. O. Kovalevskiy, D. I. Ivanovskiy, S. N. Vinogradskiy, K. A. Timiryazev and many other scientists. It is creatively developing the priceless legacy of the leading lights of Soviet biology--I. P. Pavlov, I. V. Michurin, N. I. Vavilov, A. N. Bakh and others.

The latest most essential changes are related to physical-chemical biology, above all works in biochemistry, molecular biology and bioorganic chemistry. Scientific schools have been developed in the USSR for the study of the structure and functions of proteins, nucleic acids and carbohydrates. Important projects have been completed in the areas of genetic molecular biology and protein biosynthesis. Soviet scientists have made a major contribution to the study of biological membranes and to understanding the mechanisms of ion transfer and the transformation of energy in the cell. Let us also note the high level of work done in plant physiology, including the study of the transportation of matter in plants, and processes of photosynthesis and hormonal regulation.

Our country operates a wide network of contemporary biological centers, including those in Moscow, the Moscow area, Leningrad, Novosibirsk, Kiev, Tashkent and Riga. Most recently biological institutes were set up in Saratov, Kuybyshev and other cities. Today the results of studies and developments of many Soviet scientific collectives are in the forefront of world science. The growth rates of biological output have increased in the USSR, above all at the enterprises of the Main Microbiological Industry Administration and the USSR Ministry of Medical Industry.

While assessing positive achievements, we must, nevertheless, acknowledge that nationally the quality and scale of biotechnological developments are inconsistent with current requirements. Immediate measures must be taken to accelerate the development of biotechnology and to concentrate the efforts on its main trends.

Although it may seem that microbiological industry is developing at a good pace in the USSR, it remains unable to meet our full needs. We must convert to the production of feed protein from natural gas and methanol, increase microbiological production of irreplaceable amino acids, develop the

production of new generations of antibiotics for medicine and animal husbandry, ferments, vitamins, growth substances and pesticides, etc. A key problem in biotechnology is developing methods for cellular and genetic engineering of high-grade strains of farm crops resistant to adverse environmental factors and diseases. It is important to increase drastically research on the identification of genes which determine the resistance of plants to a high-saline content and temperature, genes for nitrogen fixation and genes responsible for the high efficiency of utilization of solar energy and photosynthesis. All such projects are of prime importance, for they will determine scientific and technical progress in crop growing in the immediate future.

Let us also note the promising nature of efforts to diagnose viral diseases in plants with the help of immunoferment analysis; such experiments are being conducted in particular by scientists at the Estonian Academy of Sciences together with specialists working at Moscow State University and VASKhNIL. The question of developing domestic diagnostic facilities on this basis must be resolved on an urgent basis.

Biotechnological approaches in animal husbandry as well open broad horizons.

The natural regulators of the human body, of which one could only dream in the past, became accessible to medical practices thanks to biotechnology. The universal antiviral agent--the human interferon--which was developed last year by Soviet specialists with the help of genetic engineering is now undergoing the final stages of medical tests. We are completing the development of technologies for the production of insulin, used in the treatment of diabetes. The creation of preparations for stimulating immunity, the most important blood proteins, including those which prevent blood clotting, etc., is on the agenda. The development of vaccines against dangerous infections, such as hepatitis, malaria and tick encephalitis, and for diagnosing a number of diseases, has become firmly established in practical work.

Unfortunately, the application of the latest achievements in biotechnology is complicated by the fact that our medical industry has fallen drastically behind current requirements in terms of its methodical and material base. We are still producing a large number of old and sometimes ineffective preparations for health care, substantially poorer in terms of variety than those produced by the main pharmaceutical companies abroad. Strengthening the academic experimental plants and perfecting the system for testing new pharmaceuticals is a vital task.

Let us now try to consider the future of biotechnology from a broader viewpoint, so to say, from the viewpoint of the problems of the biotechnology of the future.

The main expectations are related to genetic engineering, for today, essentially, it is possible to isolate or artificially create any kind of gene or group of genes controlling a specific feature of the living organism of interest to us, and then reproduce this feature in a simpler organism or even outside it. This is indeed the case in principle. However, the problem is not so simple.

To begin with, the required gene must be identified. Even if we have a precise method for searching for it, it is easy to become confused in the tremendous variety of genetic structures. It is no accident that currently banks of microorganisms, plants, animals and man are being created with the help of powerful computers. For example, there are some 3,000 genes in the intestinal bacillus; there are at least twice that number in plants and there are hundreds of thousands in animals and man.

Another difficulty is that one feature, seemingly quite simple, may be determined by several genes, sometimes, by dozens of them. For example, the capacity of microorganisms in tuber plants, which live symbiotically with leguminous plants, to bind atmospheric nitrogen, is determined by at least 17 different genes of bacteria together with plant genes. Equally complex is the "genetic code" of acquired features, such as resistance to temperature extremes or high protein productivity. A major characteristic of a gene is not only its structure but its position in the huge linear DNA molecule. Particularly intriguing in this connection was the recently discovered fact that animal and human genes can "jump" from one place to another and that this shift is of major functional importance in the work of the hereditary apparatus. Finally, some genes "work" while others are "silent," and the entire order and guidance of individual genes and their system can still not be controlled or even entirely understood.

On this basis, it is easier to assess the possibility and time needed for obtaining one solution or another based on genetic engineering in agriculture, medicine and industry. For example, it is entirely possible to develop in the immediate future microorganisms which could process all kinds of substances and materials with great efficiency, including metals, plastics and minerals, as well as microorganisms which could produce rich food proteins. At the same time, the question of attaining fast results from genetic operations on animals remains more problematical. It is true that it recently became possible to introduce a gene of a rat growth hormone in the bone marrow of dwarf mice, thus developing giant mice half as big or double the size of the normal animals! The consequences of this operation, however, including the possibility of stopping the growth at the proper time, could not be predicted in advance. More complex manipulations become even more problematical.

The question is frequently asked: Could such experiments be made with people in the future? What kind of moral-ethical and social problems could arise? The answer to the latter question is quite clear: the nature of man is social and it would be stupid to think of biologically "perfecting" man on the level of improving his moral aspect, character, behavior and intellect.... Incidentally, many of these qualities are simply not determined genetically and although they have a clear material foundation in the human body, the determining role in their development is played by society and the environment, by whatever is relative to the upbringing and molding the personality. That is why the achievements of contemporary biology can in no way strengthen the positions of eugenics or its contemporary varieties; they only convincingly prove the laws of dialectical materialism and strengthen a progressive outlook and progressive modern philosophy.

The medical aspects of the problem remain a topic of thorough study by many research centers. It has been established, among others, that some severe consequences of a disease (a blood disease, a disease of the nervous system) are related to the existence of a single dominant gene. Is there a way to treat the patient without any consequences by "removing" this gene, the way one can extract a rotten tooth or remove a malignant tumor? For the time being, no simple answer exists. However, we must not exclude the possibility. It has been confirmed, for example, that oncogenes or "cancer genes" are found in the human body which, in the presence of adverse factors, take part in the malignant degeneracy of cells. Subsequent to their discovery, many ideas were formulated on the need for preventive genetic operations, before it was established that these genes were also necessary for normal growth. Therefore, such problems are not so simple and further work on their solution is necessary. One must work with a clear idea of all scientific, ethical and conceptual aspects involved.

The situation in the area of cell engineering is somewhat clearer. In the case of multicellular organisms--microorganisms--it is common knowledge that they have been used in resolving a number of practical problems quite successfully and for quite some time. In the future as well, these tireless toilers will help us to resolve a number of difficult problems. It is obvious that in order to perfect these "living factories" so that they may serve industry, the methods of gene and cellular bioengineering will be used. In particular, studies are currently under way to obtain cellular hybrids of microorganisms, such as protein producers, and other microorganisms, such as halophilic bacteria, which survive by drawing energy from the sun.

The cells of higher organisms have their specific characteristics. Although they grow more slowly and not all of them can be grown in an artificial environment, nevertheless the culture of plant cells is already being used under industrial conditions for the production of physiologically active compounds. This is the way the biomass of ginseng, dioscorea, is produced and used in the manufacturing of pharmaceuticals.

Today the technology of combining plant cells is successfully applied in developing new hybrids which cannot be created through usual cross-pollination because of barrier incompatibility. This technology has already led to the development of potato, tomato, apple, cherry and other hybrids. Possibilities in this area are tremendous.

As we pointed out, traditional cellular technology has long been used in livestock breeding, in the development of highly productive animal strains. Today, for example, it is entirely realistic to obtain as many as 15 to 20 purebred calves per elite cow from a single producer in one season, by implanting artificial embryos developed on the basis of their cellular material, in any type of low-breed cow. In all likelihood, quite soon breeding in all animal husbandry sectors will be entirely based on biotechnological achievements and yield guaranteed results. This problem is directly related to animate nature in general, for the use of genes and cells of precious animals and plants and the development of corresponding banks can help us to preserve the unique animate world on our planet.

Of late cellular engineering has achieved a truly revolutionary breakthrough in the field of immunology. As we know, lymphocyte cells are the main material carriers of immunity. Alone or with the antibody proteins they produce they can destroy any alien agent. Lymphocytes produce thousands of various antibodies simultaneously, covering, as the saying goes, all cases in life, including the specific agent they fight. However, the content of required antibodies is low and so is the effectiveness of the immunereaction. Furthermore, lymphocytes can be cultivated in artificial media quite poorly and slowly. It is difficult to develop antibodies "in reserve," so to say. The concentration of antibodies in the organism can, naturally, be enhanced with the timely use of vaccines, a method which is familiar and extensively applied. But could this process be perfected qualitatively, with the help of biotechnology? It turns out that this is possible. If we take an ordinary lymphocyte and stimulate its agent of interest to us (a virus, for example) and then combine it with a lymphocyte cell stricken by cancer (so-called cellular myeloma), the result would be a rather unusual hybrid. It would inherit from the initial lymphocyte the ability to produce exclusively antibodies for the introduced agent and from the cancerous cell the ability rapidly to grow and multiply. Such a new cell has been given the name of hybridome and it can produce only individual or monoclonal antibodies. Hybridome technology has opened a new era in immunology. Today a hybridome can be developed for any agent in any amount. It is on this basis that powerful and reliable means for diagnosing any plant, animal or human disease, means for indicating the presence of agents which pollute the environment, and so on have appeared. In terms of sensitivity and selectiveness they are unequal. A hybridome industry and hybrid banks have developed as most important areas in biotechnology. Yet all of this was started with ordinary immunity, with an ordinary lymphocyte. However, the organism has many other specialized cells--the cells of the brain, the liver, the blood and the muscles. Unquestionably, they will find their place in the biotechnology of the future.

Speaking of prospects in biotechnology, we must not fail to mention ferments. Ferments or enzymes are universal proteins--catalysts with the help of which all processes in the living cell take place. A comparison between ferments and industrial catalysts would show that their effectiveness is substantially higher; they are more selective and they can operate under normal pressures and temperatures. Let us recall how easily a green plant synthesizes most complex organic substances from carbon dioxide and water, drawing on the energy of the sun and releasing pure oxygen in the air. To this day man has been unable to model photosynthesis.... Already now ferments are used quite extensively in the food industry, which should become in the future the main agent in the chemical industry in the development of fabrics, hides, paper and many other materials. This would enable us not only qualitatively to improve technology but also, essentially, to resolve the problem of environmental pollution. Ferments are obtained with the help of biotechnology and in some cases, in order to increase their stability, they are secured to polymer carriers or membrane systems. This has led to the development of the concept of engineering enzymology. Unquestionably, engineering enzymology and the biotechnology of engineering preparations will assume a proper position in tomorrow's industry.

Finally, let us try to assess the possibilities of biotechnology in resolving energy problems. Above all, we must not ignore that all naturally extracted fuel--petroleum, natural gas, coal, peat or shale--is of biological origin and that processes of biotransformation of plant organisms played a decisive role in its formation in the past. The limited nature of natural reserves of petroleum and natural gas means that already now a number of countries are using bioconversion in the production of alcohol, which is used as fuel for internal combustion engines and power-generating systems of other varieties. We are familiar in this respect with the experience of Brazil, which is producing alcohol from sugar cane through biotechnology. That country is planning to meet at least 75 percent of its needs for liquid fuels by the year 2000, and a number of developing countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America would like to follow its example. The generating of biogas from the anaerobic bioconversion of livestock, communal and other waste is becoming very popular throughout the world. In addition to gas, methane primarily, organic fertilizers are also obtained. National programs for the production of biogas with small systems have been formulated in the PRC, India and Indonesia, accounting for a substantial percentage of the fuel requirements of these countries. In particular, the PRC uses biogas as a fuel for internal combustion engines, running local power plants and irrigation systems. In the Soviet Union, experimental systems for the production of biogas have been created in the Latvian SSR, based on the work of the institutes of the republic's academy of sciences. Far-reaching plans for the industrial production of biogas on the basis of replenishable plants or microbe raw materials are currently being developed in the FRG and Japan.

Scientists are convinced that biotechnology could ensure the profitable and rhythmical production of biogas and alcohol and other synthetic fuels, including fuels with properties similar to those of petroleum or gasoline. It is entirely likely that soon biotechnology will become the basic means of obtaining liquid fuel which will be more efficient and promising compared, in particular, to coal processing.

Let us now return to the vital problems of the development of domestic biotechnology and attempt a sober evaluation of our tasks at the present rather crucial stage in its development. What are the prerequisites for ensuring a broad front of biotechnological developments in our country?

The main thing is to maintain basic biological research on a high methodical level. Today scientists should in no case weaken the creative thrust in the area of physical and chemical biology, characteristic of recent years. Another very urgent task is that of ensuring a drastic upsurge in the level of practical developments, above all in the new trend of biology and biotechnology in the numerous agricultural and medical centers dealing with biological problems. Such "escalation" should develop rapidly, with the participation of the country's leading institutes, on the basis of mastering the best foreign experience and the radical restructuring work topics, approaches and trends. In this case the criteria should be set not by departmental scientific institutions but by interdepartmental and supradepartmental bodies which will recruit scientists capable of making objective and qualified assessments.

Nevertheless, we must not fail to emphasize that it would be inadmissible for academic developments in biology to suffer from excessive abstraction or even scholasticism. It hardly makes sense, for example, to take years to measure "in width and in length" the parameters of a specific biological process only because the laboratory has the proper equipment to do so. The cell with its components are extremely complex targets and it may take decades to record its characteristics under various conditions and to obtain "something new" each time.

Nor should we fail to mention the need to tighten up work in general biology, particularly in areas which are the foundations of contemporary trends. This applies, above all, to genetics, plant and animal physiology, systematization and ecology.

The system for training and retraining cadres in the new biological areas must be improved. Unfortunately, many universities and agricultural and medical VUZs are not offering courses in genetics, immunology, bioorganic chemistry or elements of biotechnology. I am convinced that it would be quite useful for children in secondary schools not only to master the use of computers but to acquire greater knowledge of animate nature and to study the foundations of biotechnological production.

The leading biological institutes in the country have major tasks. In particular, it would be useful and necessary, above all in the interests of the agroindustrial complex, to develop contemporary biotechnological centers in the main agricultural areas of the country, and to assign the work to the leading institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences. For example, this could apply to Volgograd, Stavropol, Krasnodar, Voronezh, Vologda and many cities in the Urals, Siberia and the Far East and, perhaps, some union republics. It would be suitable to use the facilities of existing scientific research institutes and VUZs or else to find other efficient solutions. However, the time has come to restructure qualitatively, organizationally, ideologically and methodically, our agricultural science and to make it consistent with advanced biological requirements.

Essentially, the leading biological institutes determine the pace and trend of scientific and technical progress in a given field. The facilities of many of them have been significantly strengthened in recent years. Suffice it to mention the USSR Academy of Sciences Scientific Center for Biological Research in Pushchino, near Moscow. However, a number of scientific research institutes still lack suitable conditions for research, although they employ leading scientists and specialists in the country. This applies, above all, to the institutes in Moscow and Leningrad, in which our main potential in the field of biology is currently concentrated. However difficult such problems may be, they must be resolved, for no other solution exists. Here as well, the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium and the local party and soviet bodies must show great persistence. We are losing a great deal by failing to create a contemporary base for institutions such as the Institute of Evolutionary Morphology and Ecology of Animals imeni A. N. Severtsov, the Institute of Biochemistry imeni A. N. Bakh, the Institute of Microbiology and the Institute of Development Biology imeni N. K. Koltsov in Moscow, the Institute of

Physiology imeni I. P. Pavlov in Leningrad, and others. We must also resolve more quickly the problem of producing in the country the necessary variety of equipment, preparations and reagents for biological research, strengthening to this effect the experimental facilities of a number of academic institutes, build modern experimental production facilities for general academic purpose and issue corresponding assignments to a number of industrial departments.

Let us particularly emphasize the significance of international cooperation in biotechnology. Such problems are important to all nations and to the progress of human society, and a unification of efforts in this area is necessary. Let us emphasize that biotechnology will be one of the main components of the comprehensive program for scientific and technical progress of CEMA members through the year 2000. The Soviet Union maintains good relations in the areas of new trends in biology and biotechnology with France, Italy, the FRG, Sweden and other countries. Our cooperation with developing countries, India above all, is being organized quite successfully.

A work program for our country for the 12th Five-Year Plan in the most important areas of biotechnology has been already formulated and measures are being planned to strengthen its material base. We hope that the program will be adopted in the immediate future.

Taking into consideration the currently discussed proposals for strengthening a number of departments and increasing their reciprocal coordination, particularly in the area of the agroindustrial complex, I would consider expedient a discussion on strengthening our basic biotechnological department, the Main Microbiological Industry Administration, and the creation of a competent biotechnological sector in the USSR. This would be consistent with the true significance of this trend in the country.

In conclusion, let me emphasize that contemporary biology and biotechnology play a special role among the other areas of scientific and technical progress. Their achievements are quite important not only from the economic but the social viewpoint as well, for they are directly aimed at the satisfaction of human requirements. The Soviet scientists are fully resolved to work with all their strength to implement the most important party assignments: reaching the forefront of science and making a maximal contribution to the blossoming of our great homeland.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17

## HIGHER SCHOOL CONTRIBUTION TO PRODUCTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85) pp 29-34

[Article by Professor G. Malyshev, Academician V. Mishin, Hero of Socialist Labor, and Yu. Ryzhov, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member]

[Text] The importance of the Soviet higher school in the field of scientific and technical progress is comprehensive. In resolving the basic problem of cadre training, it directly participates in updating the theoretical and material base of the production process. Its role is growing steadily.

This autumn the young specialist of the year 2000 will sit at his desk in the classroom. In the course of his training in secondary school and the institute, technical progress will update the technological and material base twice or even three times. The higher school will change its curriculae and programs an equal number of times. However, will its structure and form of interaction: student-institute-industry, which largely determine the quality of training of the specialist and his role in contemporary dynamic production remain unchanged?

The first satellites studied near space; the Luna-1 station became an artificial planet; candidates for cosmonauts were being selected at the time that Chief Designer S. P. Korolev raised the question of the specialized training of engineers in space technology. Fliers became the first cosmonauts. The Moscow Aviation Institute imeni Sergo Ordzhonikidze (MAI) actively undertook the training of space engineers.

Cadres of designers, technologists and operational workers are trained long before the wide-scale introduction of new equipment in the national economy. Scientists and engineers, the closest fellow workers of the chief designer and his old associates and friends from the GIRD [Group for the Study of Jet Propulsion] M. K. Tikhonravov, Yu. A. Pobedonostsev and others undertook to develop previously unknown engineering areas. Fourth-year students, who were volunteers from the MAI departments designing aircraft, helicopters and flight engines--converted to the study of the new areas. Practical engineers and retrained professors and docents became their instructors. Production shops were converted into training laboratories and, subsequently, the one-of-a-kind demonstration hall of the chief designer at the enterprise became a sectorial training-research laboratory. Two years later the first graduates completed

their training. This marked the beginning of the thorough, detailed and painstaking work in developing new design skills.

Every year, several groups of young specialists in the daytime and evening departments earn the right to the title of space technology engineer at the chair of designing and engineering flight apparatus at the Department of Cosmonautics and automated flight engines. The chair has gone beyond the walls of the institute: it has a branch at the leading enterprise in the industry. Its alumni include USSR cosmonauts and Twice Heroes of the Soviet Union V. I. Sevastyanov, V. V. Lebedev and A. S. Ivanchenkov, who continue to interact with the institute as in the past: they lecture, submit reports and work on candidate and doctoral dissertations. The distance covered should be considered a kind of test in the development of the Soviet higher technical school.

We know that the personality of the teacher determines the quality of the training to a tremendous extent. Today half of the chair's faculty are professors and doctors of sciences. Most of them have practical experience from work in design bureaus and are the authors of tens of original scientific works and inventions. Three-quarters of the teachers are party members. The tradition initiated by S. P. Korolev is being maintained: attracting to scientific work the most talented designers and practical researchers working in industry. The desire for direct returns from construction work and construction vision are developed through all forms of training in an atmosphere of tireless design research.

The leap into space, which opened a new technological era, required the development of new scientific concepts. It also summed up the development of flight technology. The link between cosmonautics and the science and practice of aviation made it possible to use the new methodology which had developed by that time. By adopting the high aviation design standards and transferring to a new physical base the traditional methods of analysis, criteria of mass and energy returns and systems reliability, Soviet cosmonautics was organized on the industrial track of a qualitatively new computer technology. Design and engineering problems were resolved alongside problems of mathematics, mechanics of movement, control and steady advancement of the technological base. The theoretical interpretation of accomplishments and its application in training naturally developed into the establishment of original scientific concepts and schools.

In regulating the development of the chair's laboratory as the scientific and technical base for the training process, we did not forget that a "specialist is like flux." The sensible broadening of the field of scientific activities of the professor and paying attention to the development of a harmonious complex of scientific trends guaranteed the high quality of lectures in the specialized disciplines as well as the individual creative interest shown by educators and scientists. At first we concentrated essentially on a single advanced enterprise. To this day the majority of the gradual design developments of S. P. Korolev are concentrated in the one-of-a-kind training laboratory built with the help of industry. However, it became clear that limiting the training base to a chair laboratory would be erroneous. Currently permanent relations have been established with several leading

enterprises in one of which a branch of the chair is successfully operating with its own laboratory and computer base. A target program was implemented for providing training computers. A separate computer complex was developed consisting of several medium-sized machines and terminals, using ES machine series--the computer center of a contemporary industrial design bureau.

Relations with industry can be described with the word "interaction." Good examples may be cited of unquestionably useful initiatives, such as the joint publication of textbooks and monographs, organizing training classes directly at one-of-a-kind production laboratories and experimental production stands. However, these are achievements of individual members of the institute and industry and are the exception rather than the general rule. It is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain contemporary equipment and, sometimes, to train the future specialist with the help of yesterday's equipment.

The development of contemporary centralized sectorial or VUZ training-scientific laboratories on the basis of the latest specialized and computer equipment is a topical task which can be resolved only through the joint efforts of all interested organizations. It would be hardly expedient for a number of sectors to develop such laboratories in related VUZs. The pressing need has developed to organize sectorial and intersectorial training-information centers-laboratories, using new equipment to be produced on an industrial basis with the direct participation of leading institutes, which will assume methodical leadership, and to introduce such laboratories in the training process in the big areas of the country. We have examples of the active influence of sectorial ministries on the trend of VUZ training, the systematic and planned development of their scientific and training base, the construction of hostels and concern for the health and way of life of their future cadres. So far, however, this has not developed into daily reality.

It would be natural for scientific-production associations to supervise their own (sectorial) specialists, starting with their student years. In this case, the experience of developing student research and rationalization laboratories and to organize complete worker and engineering practice training and construction detachment movements, in order to resolve the most important sectorial problems at enterprises may prove to be quite useful.

To this day the training of specialists is not considered a social assignment to the higher technical school and the sectorial ministries which will be using the most valuable "human capital"--the ideas and energy of young specialists who are the movers of tomorrow's science and technology.

Unfortunately, the prestige of engineering professions has been declining in recent years. Despite all kinds of organizational-methodical efforts on the part of the institutes, student grades are worsening and the quality of engineer training is declining. It is precisely at this point that the cadre problem comes closer to the social task of upgrading the efficiency and significance of engineering work.

At the stage of accelerated growth rates of labor productivity and intensive methods for perfecting the production process the leading role of the engineer is unquestionable. We know that promising technical concepts will be embodied

in the majority of domestically produced machines. However, many types of machinery and equipment are more material and power-intensive compared to the best world models. For an equal amount of output we spend more metal and cement. Some 50 million people are still engaged in manual labor. The development and application of new technologies is being delayed and the production updating plan is not always implemented in many sectors.

Currently more than 200,000 specialists with higher training are employed as workers in industry; two-thirds of them have engineering training. Perfecting the organization and salaries for the creative toil of the engineer is a powerful and most important lever for the intensification of the contemporary production process and a way for the qualitative updating of the higher school.

In the 1950s, three to five and more applicants were competing for each opening in a technical VUZ. This guaranteed the high overall training of graduates. How can we ensure this quality now, when the number of applications is only slightly higher than enrollment openings? How to energize the interest of the students in their profession?

Our higher aviation-technical training has deep roots. It was founded by N. Ye. Zhukovskiy and a galaxy of talented students, such as A. N. Tupolev, B. N. Yurev, V. P. Vetchinkin, B. S. Stechkin and G. Kh. Sabinin. The laboratories which were set up by the turn of the century at the Moscow Higher Technical School and Moscow University, became the basis for the development of new theories and designs. It was also they which laid the foundations of the domestic aviation schools. Subsequently, the unity of training, science and production began to disappear. The "physical technology system," which appeared in the period of spasmodic development of applied physics, was a type of return to the organic combination of science with creativity and of close interaction between teacher and student. However, this led to the training of relatively few "whiz kids." Individual training requires a 1:6 teacher-student ratio. In the technical VUZs this ratio is 1:12.

The solution of topical problems of scientific development required in subsequent years an increased number of specialists with higher and secondary specialized training. Such training can be provided only with stable curriculae and standard training methods essentially at institutes and technicums. Sectorial ministries and enterprises are distancing themselves from the education and training of cadres, considering the higher school as a "middleman" which ensures the production of specialists (alongside raw materials, machine tools and energy). Furthermore such concepts are not directly related to any type of obligations and outlays. To this day they remain practically depersonalized: enterprises are given specialists on a general basis, regardless of individual capabilities, interests, concerns and requirements. The practice of work assignments after the fourth year has still not led to the solution of the problem of the early adaptation of the specialist to the specific production process, which is not in a hurry to accept him.

On this level our chair has acquired some useful experience. A scientific research laboratory has been set up at one of the leading enterprises, which

includes a student design bureau. Jointly headed by the chair and representatives of the enterprise and working according to the plan for new equipment, it is a binding link between science and industry. Here institute scientific associates, enterprise engineers, night school students and daytime students assigned to the enterprise work side by side.

Such laboratories can resolve long-range problems on the basis of the latest technological achievements. The joint work done by students of different years will ensure the continuity of the training process. Like in a large labor family, the "elder children" become the educators of the "juniors." Over the past 2 years alone 16 requests for suggested inventions have been submitted to the laboratory and the student design bureau. Authorship certificates or positive decisions of the USSR State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries have already been received for six of them.

Scientific work by students is closely related to the "big science" of the chair's research laboratory. Every year 10-12 chair students submit papers at the all-union Gagarin, Tsanderov and Tsiolkovskiy lectures.

As a rule, applied works are followed by the creation of experimental systems and flight prototypes. These include systems for the Salyut orbital station and the Radio and Iskra student artificial satellites, which were launched between 1978 and 1982.

New forms of curatorship have been developed, in which, starting with junior courses, students are oriented toward specific subsequent assignments and work in close touch with teachers, directly relating their training and scientific activities to the work of specific enterprises.

All of these are means of individual purposeful training and combining studies with production activities and converting from the simulation of the creative process and game tasks to really creative work in the course of mastering new theories and scientific methods. Obviously, enterprises and sectorial ministries must do their share in such interaction. Assigning training functions to scientific-production associations and setting up within them training centers with a well-organized mechanism of ties with the higher school would constitute a new stage in the development of engineering training. Such centers could also play an invaluable role in the steady updating of engineering knowledge.

It seems to us that perfecting the organizational forms of the higher technical schools should be based on updated criteria concerning the quality of engineering training. Engineering specialization is born and withers away; its significance and ratios change; the life cycle of such specialization is being reduced. However, their number is steadily growing in accordance with the needs of industry.

An urgent problem today is that of intensifying engineering training while reducing the length of the primary training cycle and creating an efficient centralized system for steadily updating engineering knowledge.

The familiar suggestion of combining machine-building VUZs and technicums within a complex with its own powerful industrial base and systematic 2-year training terms for technicians, 4 years of training for production engineers and 5-6-year training for research engineers does not in itself resolve the problem. It is important to bring training activities closer to production. Training as a type of creative work done by the student and the engineer must be encouraged both morally and materially.

The question of the differentiated training of general and specialized engineers has become imminent within the framework of higher schools. It would be expedient to allocate 3.5 years of full-time training as a basic training stage for a limited number of combined specialties. After this first stage higher specialization on the latest technological trends should take 2-2.5 years and involve no more than one-quarter of the first-stage graduates.

The accelerated training of specialists is nothing new in the higher school. The experience of the Aviation Industry Academy of the 1940s-1950s and the training of specialists in automated control systems in the 1970s are clear proofs of this. Here a scholastic approach is inefficient. However, intensive means and methods are both possible and necessary, with training programs involving the extensive use of computers, adjustment courses with independent study cycles and 40-hour 5-day training weeks, saturated with applied practical training at the place of assignment. In addition to training time we should also plan for recreation and Saturday social and health activities and use of sectorial facilities. Graduates in modern engineering skills could also be certified as general engineers and issued diplomas to this effect.

The specialized level, oriented toward specific production requirements, should make use of all the advantages of individual training. It would be expedient at that stage to set up groups consisting of 10-12 students and make extensive use of individual training schedules and curriculums with 1:6 teacher-student ratio. In our view, the certification of this level of training and minimal wages after graduating should be higher than general state standards.

Without increasing budget outlays, such a program followed by the higher school would resolve many problems. The possibility of obtaining contemporary training in 3.5 years would encourage the fast maturing and the struggle against a certain infantilism shown by some young people. Restrictions to specialized training would upgrade training quality. Student ratios based on the training level would enable us to increase the second-level scholarships to 100-120 rubles per month without increasing state budget outlays.

In our view, such steps would enable us to eliminate specialist shortages. If training consistent with these principles is undertaken by a number of VUZs in the 1985-86 school year, the number of specialists they will graduate will increase by 35-40 percent during the 12th and by 50 percent during the 13th Five-Year Plans. One-quarter of the total number will consist of particularly highly trained specialists based on direct sectorial requirements.

Our time urgently requires improvements in the structure of the higher school within the system of the national economy and the qualitative reorganization of the means and methods of training and upbringing of young specialists. We should not rely on some kind of saving suggestion which would resolve once and for all the accumulated problems. We must follow the path suggested by the party in formulating efficient means of contemporary economic management--the path of large-scale experimentation.

The higher school is emerging on a new level of development, when the individual interests of the student and the young specialist should be correlated more completely and accurately with social requirements. The training of the student must blend with the productive and creative toil of the worker, engineer and scientific worker. This is a prerequisite for steadily upgrading the efficiency of the higher school and harmoniously developing the creator of technology and production organizer and manager of the 21st century.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17

## IN ORDER TO WORK BETTER

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85) pp 35-46

[Article by A. Ponomarev, first secretary of the Belgorod CPSU Obkom]

[Text] Verkhopene village is located 2 kilometers from the road leading from Moscow to the south. In their time, quite frequently the young people of Verkhopene followed this road, leaving the present Krasnaya Zvezda Kolkhoz for work in Belgorod, Kursk and Kharkov. Things reached a stage in which there were fewer mechanizers than tractors and combines in the kolkhoz and the farm managers had to issue schedules for people to milk the cows. Correspondingly, the level of output declined despite the increased technical facilities supplied to agriculture.

These negative processes were a specific reaction to the then very slow social development of the village. Housing without conveniences, unorganized and frequently unnormed work day, limited opportunities for meaningful use of the leisure time and shortcomings in commercial and consumer services could not fail to adversely affect the reputation of rural life.

For the past few years, however, the opposite has been taking place in Verkhopene: more people are coming to the village than are leaving. The situation began to change after the new kolkhoz leadership, V. A. Atanov, its chairman, above all, a local resident who had previously worked as party committee secretary, energetically engaged in the social reorganization of the village.

With the help of the Ivnyanskiy party raykom, the farm managers accurately formulated the main ways to resolve social problems and to improve the moral and psychological climate in the collective. They began with the reconstruction of the livestock farms, where working and living conditions for the personnel were improved drastically. Today a livestock breeder house operates at the largest farm. Some 10 kilometers of intrafarm paved roads were laid. Virtually all labor-intensive operations were mechanized. In the past few years about 100 apartments have been built and the village is being supplied with natural gas. A consumer service house and a machine laundry were opened. The size of the small hospital was tripled. An impressive memorial to soldiers of the Great Patriotic War was inaugurated in the center of Verkhopene. Recently a sports palace and a house for traditional meetings were built next to the school and not far from the house of culture.

The people saw that they were the subject of real concern. This could not fail to influence their increased production activeness and the inflow of cadres. Over the past 5 years the number of able-bodied people here has increased by one-third and many of those who had left for the city have returned to their native village. Currently some 200 petitions submitted by people who would like to become permanent kolkhoz residents are piled on the chairman's desk.

Concern for the people does not mean in the least to give them everything ready-made or to encourage dependency which, as we know, is still frequently the case. It is much more useful for both people and the work to find internal reserves for growth and to mobilize the forces of the labor collective itself for the reorganization of the village. This is what was done in Verkhopene, where a great deal was accomplished with the forces of the kolkhoz itself. Bank loans were used as well. However, returns were substantial. The sovkhoz's economy strengthened to such an extent that now the kolkhoz has its own funds for the further development of production, culture and way of life. The farm is overfulfilling the plans for commodity production and sales to the state; the annual growth of output of valuable produce, such as meat and milk, averages 10-15 percent. Over the past 2 years kolkhoz profits totaled 1,662,000 rubles with a profitability of nearly 30 percent.

Naturally, a number of farms in the oblast have reached significantly higher economic indicators. However, we are discussing a kolkhoz which, no more than 5 or 6 years ago, had an output lower by 50 to 100 percent to the current one, with losses estimated at hundreds of thousands of rubles. Yet, there is no secret in this change.

I have had numerous conversations with kolkhoz rank-and-file members and leading personnel. I can only be pleased by the mood prevailing here. The people realize that what they have done so far is less than is necessary and that any further improvement in the quality of life directly depends on the constructive power of their labor which they do not spare in order to increase the public wealth. However, they realized equally well that one works better when one lives better. Daily practical experience, including that in our oblast, offers most outstanding examples of the way the production and social activeness of the working people increases under the influence of social progress, the pace, nature and content of which are based on the most exacting scientific concepts of socialism.

The contemporary level of the economy and the party's course of comprehensively perfecting the developed socialist society today dictate higher norms of investments in social and cultural construction, housing, hospitals, schools, theaters, sanatoriums and sports stadiums--anything which allows the much more efficient utilization of leisure time for the spiritual development of the Soviet person; according to Marx, this is the yardstick of the social wealth (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 46, part II, p 217).

However, it is no secret that mentality and views on life frequently fall behind the pace of economic development and the opportunities it provides. Only yesterday, as they did 20 or even 10 years ago, many of our oblast economic managers dedicated all their efforts to the development of output in its material manifestations--machine tools, machines and raw materials, postponing for the indefinite future concern for the person and the satisfaction of his growing needs. The inertia and stereotypes of economic thinking, which has accumulated in the course of the years, were manifested not only on the level of the enterprise, where social development funds are used, but also on the level of ministries and departments, i.e., where such funds are allocated.

The party organizations and collectives of Belgorod enterprises have frequently encountered this type of approach to problems of social development and have made great efforts to surmount the conservative way of thinking of some senior managers. A clear example is that of the Belgorod mica factory, which was commissioned some 20 years ago. Although in terms of labor conditions this enterprise was planned as being predominantly staffed by women, and although it was known that monotonous work at the enterprise had little prestige, particularly among young people, the sectorial management did not allocate timely funds for the building of housing and children's preschool establishments for the collective. Let us also admit that at that time neither the party nor the Soviet organizations in the oblast, which was experiencing a type of period of tempestuous industrialization in the 10th year of its existence, displayed proper persistence at that time. The consequences were not slow in coming: the cadre turnover curve rose sharply and output suffered.

The solution to this situation was seen by the factory party bureau and management and, above all, its permanent director party member A. M. Sovenko in the formulation and implementation of a comprehensive plan for the collective's socioeconomic development. This plan, properly weighed and thought out, was successfully defended at the USSR Ministry of Construction Materials Industry. Today this enterprise, which employs about 1,400 people, has two hostels, five residential houses and two kindergartens. The plant workers do not have to wait in line for placing their children in kindergarten. The consumer building includes a workshop, a beauty salon, reception centers for dry cleaning and shoe repairs, stores selling foodstuffs and durable goods and cookery. The factory has a dining room for dietetic nutrition and an out-of-town rest base.

At the same time, working conditions are being systematically improved. In particular, the workplaces of mica threaders have modern equipment; they have adequate lighting and radio, which has helped to "enliven" monotonous labor with functional music. The shops themselves are spacious and beautifully and properly appointed.

The enterprise is fully staffed and turnover is low. People leave it essentially due to moves elsewhere, retirement and other major reasons. Although with every passing year the number of workers is showing a slight decline, output is increasing steadily.

Let us emphasize that the factory does not have any exceptional facilities at its disposal. The social infrastructure is developing here on the basis of the sensible utilization of economic incentive funds. The entire collective participates in the implementation of the plans for socioeconomic development. No single project exists in the development of which the workers, engineering and technical personnel and employees themselves are not involved.

The experience of the mica factory and other collectives, which were the first to realize and practically to prove the importance of comprehensive plans for social development, was supported by the party bodies. Seminars on social planning and practical science conferences were held in a number of cities and rayons in Belgorod Oblast. Our comrades went to study the experience of other party organizations and the topic was extensively covered in the press. The party committees not only recommended that the valuable experience be applied but also supervised the work and helped those who, for various reasons, were unable independently to reach accurate solutions and define proper prospects.

The party bodies particularly cautioned against adopting a one-sided approach to problems of social development, which some people tended to reduce merely to the construction of housing, children's institutions, clubs, sports halls, hospitals, etc. The social development plans assigned a proper place to perfecting the vocational training of the workers, upgrading the level of their political and economic knowledge, broadening their cultural outlook and shaping sensible needs or, in a word, anything which would contribute to the growth of the social and labor activeness of the people and would help them to work better and live a richer and more meaningful life.

Mastering the experience of social planning and implementation of plans for economic and social development were of exceptional importance to us. In the initial stage of its development, Belgorod Oblast, which was formed in 1955 from the outlying rayons of Kursk and Voronezh Oblast, was substantially behind its neighbors in the construction of housing, schools, hospitals and cultural institutions. Although to this day we have not reached the republic and union levels for a number of indicators, the previous gap has been surmounted or, in any case, noticeably reduced. The number of hospital beds has increased by nearly 500 percent and the number of motion picture facilities has more than tripled; kindergartens and nurseries can accept today more children by a factor of 12 compared to 30 years ago. The volume of population consumer services has increased by a factor of more than 15. The initial experience in social planning convinced many managers of the need to amend their attitude toward resolving problems of daily life and culture.

Naturally, such changes in the mentality of economic managers did not occur by themselves but as a result of intensified party influence on the entire course of the socioeconomic development of collectives, rayons, cities and the entire oblast, and of improving control over the implementation of decrees passed on problems of social construction.

This five-year plan, for example, such problems were considered at the 1981 CPSU Obkom Plenum; in 1981 and 1983 they were discussed at oblast meetings of the party-economic aktiv. Ways to enhance the role of labor collectives in the upbringing of the people were earmarked at the January 1985 aktiv's

meeting. We keep returning to such problems at sessions of the CPSU obkom bureau and secretariat. It would be difficult to find a problem related to party management of industry, agriculture and capital construction in the discussion of which the social development of collectives, strengthening sociocultural life and, generally, the "human factor," without which no firm economic accomplishments could be hoped for, are not discussed.

Comprehensive target programs for the basic areas of development of the social sphere, affecting the way of life, trade, transportation, communications, the communal economy, health care, the construction of schools and kindergartens, the reorganization of the countryside, etc., developed by the oblast services jointly with ministries and departments, were ratified at sessions of the CPSU obkom bureau. One such program calls for significantly increasing the production of consumer goods. Its substantiation, realism and implementation control contributed to the positive results which were achieved. Whereas at the beginning of the 10th Five-Year Plan less than two-thirds of all oblast industrial enterprises were involved in the production of consumer goods, currently such goods are produced by virtually all of them. The annual volume of output of consumer goods has more than doubled, totaling today 1.5 billion rubles. This is merely a single example of the implementation of the instruction of the 26th CPSU Congress to the effect that in no area of the national economy do local possibilities and reserves play such a role as in satisfying daily consumer demand and need for population services.

To this effect the utilization of local possibilities and reserves is particularly important now, when purposeful, painstaking work is being comprehensively carried out to implement the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Measures To Eliminate Drunkenness and Alcoholism." The party obkom, gorkoms and raykoms not only took decisive measures to curtail the production and sales of alcoholic beverages but are also promoting their substitution with other goods and the organization of sensible recreation for the population. New premises for commercial establishments and public catering enterprises are being reconstructed or refurbished. With the active participation of labor collectives, the decision was made to open another 600 or so youth coffee shops and summer trading areas and to build simple sporting, game and other installations.

The CPSU obkom, which pays constant attention to the oblast's social development, takes as the cornerstone the education of managers in a spirit of attentive attitude toward the needs and requirements of the working people. A new substantial argument in favor of precisely this type of approach was provided with the resolutions of the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. "We must be extremely attentive to anything affecting the person, his work, material well-being and recreation," the plenum stated. "To us this is a key policy problem."

Whenever the CPSU obkom bureau noted the unsatisfactory work done in managing local industry by the oblast executive committee on increasing the production of consumer goods, whenever the implementation of the various parts of the plan for social development was reported to the obkom by the Korochanskiy, Borisovski, Volokonovski and other party raykoms, and when a set of measures related to organizational-party and ideological work and consumer services to

the working people developing the territorial-production complex, based on the mineral resources of the KMA [Kursk Magnetic Anomaly] in Belgorod Oblast was ratified, we brought to light not only accomplishments but also failures and the positions taken by managers, their approach to problems and their willingness and ability to show effective concern for the people.

Based on the acquired experience and making fuller use of their rights, with the constant support of the party bodies, the local soviets as well undertook to approach the solution of economic and social problems comprehensively, on the basis of improved territorial planning. For example, consolidated indicators for all enterprises and organizations relative to improving sociocultural and consumer services to the population, environmental protection, increased production of consumer goods, production of local construction materials, construction work, and the development of the housing and communal economy, transportation and communications, have been included in the five-year and annual plans for economic and social development of the city and rayon, starting with the 10th Five-Year Plan of the Gubkino City Executive Committee and as of 1978 by the Rakityanskiy Rayon Executive Committee. Taking into consideration what must be done and where and within what period of time in order to ensure the further social development of the collectives, the local soviets formulate conclusions on draft enterprise and organization plans under superior jurisdiction. The soviets are not satisfied merely with coordinating scattered efforts, and combining funds appropriated for housing, sociocultural measures, urban planning, etc., but demand of ministries and departments with jurisdiction over enterprises and organizations working in the oblast to take into consideration local requirements, proving to them the need to go beyond the limits of departmental interests.

On this level, not everything but a great deal is being accomplished by the Gubkin City Soviet of this mining town. In particular, on the suggestion of the city executive committee, supported by the CPSU obkom and oblast executive committee, the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy reviewed the plan for capital investments for the development of the housing and communal economy of the Lebedinskiy Ore-Mining and Concentration Combine for 1982 and allocated an additional 1.5 million rubles.

Thanks to the comprehensive plan for the economic and social development of the city as a whole, 22.3 million rubles of enterprises and organizations under superior jurisdiction were allocated and used for the construction of housing and sociocultural projects during the first 4 years of the five-year plan. All of this made it possible to install running water and sewer lines and central heating in virtually the entire residential area in Gubkin; 87 percent of the buildings have hot water; food stores and public catering enterprises meet population requirement standards. By the end of the five-year plan the problem of children's preschool institutions will have been essentially resolved.

Any social measure, and even more so a plan for social development, is directly related to the working people. However, when we say "for the working people" this should not be interpreted as "despite the working people themselves." Socialism, V. I. Lenin taught, opens to the people's masses "the opportunity to work for themselves, on the basis of the latest technological

and cultural accomplishments" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 35, p 196). In organizing joint work, one must not exclusively rely on the general view that under socialist conditions its purpose is to increase the social wealth and, in the final account, to enhance the well-being of all working people. As the party points out, one must show great concern for any socially useful project to be perceived as more directly and tangibly related as those who do it, i.e., as being work for themselves.

In planning social development and implementing the plan, one cannot rely on high returns unless managers and economic and soviet bodies do not rely on the people in everything, seeking their advice as to what to build and where, what to open and what to develop. This is first. Second, it is harmful from the viewpoint of both upbringing and practical results, to offer the people everything ready-made, "on a silver platter." Territorial development, road construction, the creation of sports grounds and recreation zones and the participation of future new apartment owners in doing the finishing work of their assigned apartment is merely an approximate and very partial list of the matters in which one could and should rely on population help.

As to the first condition--the consideration of public opinion--a variety of means and methods for its accomplishment exist. They include speeches at party committee plenums, party aktiv meetings and soviet sessions, the formulation of remarks and suggestions by party members in the course of accountability and election conferences and suggestions and remarks formulated by the working people at worker meetings, permanent production conferences and accountability and election kolkhoz meetings. This also includes the letters addressed by citizens to different agencies, articles in mass information media and reception of citizens who discuss personal problems, carried out by party, soviet and economic managers who hear out the complaints, claims and suggestions of the visitors.

Nor should we ignore the instructive lessons of our oblast center. The priority assigned to industrial construction led 20 years ago to the fact that Belgorod fell seriously behind in its social development. The city suffered from an acute shortage of hospital beds, public catering enterprises and cultural and educational institutions. The disproportion which the "common efforts" of the local authorities and central departments had allowed to develop became so obvious that the alarm had to be sounded repeatedly on different levels.

The situation has substantially changed since that time. Currently Belgorod has dozens of cultural and educational institutions, including modern palaces of culture, four higher educational institutions, several technicums, two theaters and a number of medical establishments, consumer service enterprises, etc. However, even the most modern buildings do not make a city. It was natural, therefore, that the idea was born of initiating a movement for turning Belgorod into a model city in terms of production efficiency, culture and public order.

The managers and party organization secretaries of enterprises, establishments and schools, soviet and trade union bodies and various economic organizations were assigned the task of gathering and summing up views and considerations of

citizens and, on this basis, formulating specific suggestions for a work plan which could be confidently described as a plan for the social development of the town. The proposals were then analyzed and discussed on all levels, from the party groups and shop party organizations to party raykoms, and from small establishments to the largest enterprises. The results of the discussions were then summed up by the CPSU gorkom. This marked the completion of the preliminary work of the concepts which were adopted at the city party committee plenum, which was held at the beginning of 1980, on organizing the movement for turning Belgorod into a model city and the conditions governing the competition among enterprises, organizations, establishments, schools and hostels.

In developing the material base of sociocultural life, it is important to be equally concerned with appointing people who are responsive and attentive and, naturally, who are skillful and well familiar with the fine points of their profession and who try to perfect their skills. For the final objective of all party activities is to improve the life of the Soviet people. The party approaches this on a broad basis. As was pointed out at the April 1981 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the party considers as the highest meaning of the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development, the enhancement of the well-being of the people steadily, step by step, and the improvement of all facets of life of the Soviet people and the creation of favorable conditions for the harmonious development of the individual.

This basic concept makes it incumbent upon us to be concerned not only with the development of a material base for a modern way of life, recreation and culture. It is also important steadily to enhance the quality of the work of clubs, sports stadiums, consumer service workshops and polyclinics. Participation in independent creative work and involvement in other meaningful and useful projects which enrich spiritual culture and develop aesthetic taste have a great impact on the work mood of the people.

Cultural-sports complexes, the practical experience of which was approved at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, play an important role in organizing the recreation and upbringing of the working people. The party obkom paid great attention to their development in the oblast's towns, settlements and villages. Currently more than 50 such complexes are operating in the Belgorod area. Every single one of them is a unified creative collective, consisting not only of cultural and educational workers but also propagandists, agitators, lecturers, medical workers, teachers and representatives of public organizations, whose efforts are concentrated on organizing the meaningful recreation of the working people and the harmonious upbringing of the individual.

The Urazovskiy Culture and Sports Complex in Valuyskiy Rayon is a model in this area. It is headed by a coordination council, which resolves a great variety of problems. The council deals with the state of the work of the population at home, youth recreation, utilization of the cultural-sports facilities of the complex in organizing the summer recreation of the working people and the participation of the subdivisions of the complex in the nonunion review of amateur creativities dedicated to the 40th anniversary of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War.

As an efficient form of organization of the recreation of the working people, the cultural-sports complex has already acquired extensive recognition. Its further dissemination will require the solution of a number of problems on the union and republic levels. For example, so far no general regulation on the cultural-sports complex has been drafted. Yet such a document is extremely necessary in order efficiently to earmark the areas of work of the complex and to determine the role played in it by trade union and other organizations not under the jurisdiction of local soviets but which, nevertheless, must energetically participate in its activities. In our view, the financial aspect of the matter should be legally codified as well.

The substantiation of the formula that in order to live better one must work better is unquestionable. But what does "work better" mean today? "We must," the extraordinary 11 March 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum noted, "achieve a decisive turn in converting the national economy to the track of intensive development. Within a short time we must emerge on the most advanced scientific and technical positions and the highest world level of public labor productivity."

The party organizations in the Belgorod area pay constant attention to the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. This five-year plan the oblast enterprises installed more than 200 mechanized assembly and automated lines; about 250 sectors, shops and production facilities were comprehensively mechanized and automated and dozens of industrial robots installed. A number of enterprises in the machine-building, chemical and ore-mining industries were substantially retooled. Work aimed at upgrading productivity and reducing manual labor outlays is continuing. This is also promoted by the certification and rationalization of work places. In this area we rely on the experience of the country's leading enterprises and our own practical experience. Thus, job certification at the Stariy Oskol Plant for Tractor Electric Power Equipment has been taking place since 1979. More than 600 different organizational and technical measures were implemented during the 11th Five-Year Plan to raise work places to a standard consistent with the requirements of the scientific organization of labor and modern progressive solutions, which resulted in savings of 1.4 million rubles. During the past period 436 people were released and 96 jobs closed down. This is of exceptional importance to the rapidly developing Stariy Oskol.

In the entire oblast the efforts of party organizations and labor collectives, aimed at upgrading labor productivity, have yielded good results. Between 1960 and 1984 labor productivity increased by a factor of 2.4 in industry and 2.7 in kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

The brigade contracting order, which enables us to establish in all sectors of economic production activities two inseparably related principles--greater autonomy and greater responsibility--plays an important role in this matter. At industrial enterprises the number of cost-accounting brigades has exceeded 1,000; nearly one-half of all brigades in construction are signing contracting orders and nearly 1,500 brigades in kolkhozes and sovkhozes are practicing the same method; approximately two-thirds of them are in crop growing and one-third in animal husbandry.

Nevertheless, we should acknowledge that the collective contract, particularly in industry, construction and transportation, is being applied sluggishly. That is why in June 1984 the CPSU obkom bureau passed the decree "On the Long-Term Plan for the Development of Collective Forms of Labor Organization and Incentive in the Oblast's Economic Sectors," which, on the basis of local conditions, clearly defined the scale and qualitative aspects of this work. However, the implementation of this decree is still not developing as one would wish, for which reason the party obkom should pay greater attention to this matter. This becomes even more necessary considering that in individual years of the five-year plan the oblast's national economy was unable to cope with assignments on the growth of labor productivity. The reason for this, as was pointed out at the January 1985 meeting of the aktiv of the oblast party organization, may be found in the poor organization of labor, the low level of responsibility and discipline on the part of some personnel and poor reliance on progressive experience. The oblast party members can eliminate these and other noted shortcomings through their own efforts.

However, local possibilities are inadequate to cope with the lack of machine sets for the mechanization of animal husbandry farms, for example, feed preparations, loading and unloading work, road construction, and so on, or with even half of the required amount of funds for updating production facilities in sectors such as the canning industry. As a result, managers are forced to resort to primitive methods and, wherever good technical solutions already exist, to recruit additional manpower. The consequences of this adversely affect the economy of the enterprise and the growth of labor productivity and, consequently, the enhancement of the quality of life. As to the moral and psychological climate, it leaves something to be desired precisely in collectives where the percentage of manual labor remains high.

The development of any socioeconomic process faces growth difficulties caused by internal and external reasons. They exist in the activities of the party members and all working people in Belgorod Oblast. The difficulties of the first kind we surmount by perfecting explanatory work, disseminating progressive experience, upgrading exigency toward cadres and improving the organization of the work. We cannot surmount the second type of difficulties without the interested help of central departments. We have the right to expect of them today a balanced allocation of funds for capital construction and the accurate consideration of the place and time of their use. Long practical experience has confirmed that the lack of funds is compensated by curtailing investments in the social infrastructure. However, the still active efforts to "save" on improving labor conditions and housing and sociocultural life lead, in the final account, to double the amount of losses and outlays. A convincing example of this is provided by the construction of the Oskolskiy Electrometallurgical Combine imeni L. I. Brezhnev. By order of the USSR Ministry of Construction of Heavy Industry Enterprises, this enterprise was to be built as a model. The order called for firm calendar construction plans, coordinating planned construction volumes with the capacities of construction organizations and material and technical, labor and financial resources, and equipment procurements. Initially, this system yielded positive results, for which reason the builders of the initial target complexes of the combine had their work rated "excellent."

However, the complexes were delivered with great delays, above all because the calendar plan for their construction had not been coordinated with the capacities of the construction organizations. This affected, above all, the construction of housing and other facilities for the construction workers themselves. Instead of seeking the solution in improvements in working and living conditions and accelerating the construction of projects which would provide normal living conditions for the people, the ministry and other departments decided on the nonfulfillment of the social program. This decision made it necessary for the oblast party organization to seek internal reserves, the use of which made it possible to correct the situation and to engage in all kinds of "mobilizations." As it were, their efforts were not entirely successful, and other economic sectors suffered tangible losses.

Briefly, every time society must pay a high price for the inability of some economic managers to resolve social development problems promptly and in accordance with modern requirements.

Exercising its legal rights, the Belgorod Oblast Executive Committee is taking steps aimed at preventing imbalance in meeting population requirements. In particular, suggestions were sent to ministries and departments 2 years ago on lowering their planned worker and employee staff increases, increasing capital investments in the construction of housing, schools, children's institutions and environmental protection projects and increasing the production of consumer goods. Our requirements were met in a number of cases. Thus, for 1984 the USSR Gosplan increased the amount of housing to be completed by the USSR Ministry of Construction of Heavy Industry Enterprises, children's institutions for the enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Installation and Special Construction Work and school construction for the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy.

However, the necessary capital investments for nonindustrial construction were not appropriated for 1984 for the USSR Ministry of Meat and Dairy Industry and the RSFSR ministries of Heavy Machine Building, Chemical Machine Building and Food Industry, although the working people in the enterprises of these ministries are experiencing major difficulties in placing their children in kindergartens and nurseries. During the season, the Alekseyevka Sugar Refinery of the RSFSR Ministry of Food Industry employs more than 1,000 people, almost three-quarters of whom are women. Not a single kindergarten has been built for the plant in recent years and the operating one, for 200 children, accommodates 300. Said ministry is resolving particularly poorly problems of improving working and living conditions at the canning industry enterprises in the oblast.

The solution of social problems in the countryside has been substantially accelerated of late. After the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum the share of investments in the implementation of the social program in the countryside has been increased substantially. We have local possibilities as well. In particular, the measures approved at a session of the party obkom bureau call for building more than 1 million square meters of housing in the countryside over a 5-year period, thanks to which available housing will practically double in the countryside. The plan is being successfully

implemented. In the first 4 years more than 950,000 square meters of housing were built in the villages or 35 percent (as compared to 28 in the 10th Five-Year Plan) of the total number of residential buildings completed in the oblast.

However, raising the countryside to the urban level in terms of the quality of life cannot be accomplished exclusively by building housing, even most contemporary housing. A considerably larger number of houses of culture and health care institutions must be built in the countryside much more rapidly. School material facilities must be improved as well.

That is why it is so important to resolve, once and for all, some basic problems of the organization of rural construction. Together with the RSFSR Ministry of Rural Construction and the Russian Kolkhoz Construction Association, the party obkom formulated and adopted a program for the development of rural construction organizations and their production facilities and the creation of rural construction combines. However, no more than the initial steps have been taken. As in the past, the gap between the possibilities of construction workers and the needs of the customers is not narrowing but is even continuing to widen. The situation is particularly bad regarding construction quality and the architectural expressiveness of sociocultural projects. We are still suffering from an acute shortage of sanitation and other equipment, for which reason completed houses frequently remain uninhabitable. We have organized the manufacturing of heating systems and other equipment for houses built by the people themselves. However, it is hardly efficient from the economic viewpoint of organizing the production of such facilities in the individual oblasts, from a water tap to a gas hot plate. The overall construction planning program should call for the development of stocks of sanitation and electrical engineering equipment, cables and finishing materials, taking into consideration the increased share of housing and sociocultural projects in the overall volume of construction and installation work. We believe that the procedure under which construction materials are being allocated per million of planned volume of construction and installation projects is obviously obsolete.

The fast growth of public housing in the countryside aggravates servicing problems. Housing repairs and the operation of engineering networks and installations are frequently primitive and amateurish. Yet, for a number of years the RSFSR Ministry of Agriculture has considered but failed to resolve the problem of developing communal services in the villages, with their specialists, equipment and material stocks.

Several years ago, the creation of medical physiotherapy preventive establishments was undertaken in livestock farms and complexes: 27 of them were built and equipped in the 10th Five-Year Plan and another 127 in the 11th. Concern for the people is yielding results. However, in addition to the specific and understandable equipment difficulties, another difficulty arises. The provisional regulation on physical therapy establishments at a livestock farm, approved by the republic ministries of agriculture and health care, stipulates the appointment of a full-time secondary medical worker, whose salary is paid by the health-care bodies only if he handles 15,000 treatments annually. The prophylactic establishments at livestock farms allow

for 1,500-2,000 treatments, for which reason the medical institutions are not assigning regular personnel. The decision of such a simple and obvious problem is being mired in red tape. Meanwhile, matters in animal husbandry, justifiably described as an assault front, are suffering.

Road construction has been developing in the oblast at a fast pace in recent years. Today virtually all farms are connected with the rayon centers and railroad stations with paved roads. However, more than 80 percent of intrafarm roads are dirt roads which, understandably, results in production losses and inefficient utilization of transportation facilities and adversely affects the retaining of cadres in the countryside. The decision was made, therefore, to formulate for each five-year plan a specific program for increasing the volume and improving the quality of road construction, including that of intrafarm roads, as well as of railroad spurs to sugar refineries and beet reception centers. This five-year plan 2,100 kilometers of asphalted roads will be laid. The extensive scope of construction of intrafarm roads inevitably raises the question of improving their maintenance. Yet, kolkhozes and sovkhozes have neither the necessary equipment nor specialist cadres for this purpose. Clearly, it would be proper for the servicing of the road network to be assumed by the organizations of the Ministry of Highways.

A problem which is difficult to resolve through local efforts is the seasonal nature of agricultural work. It is particularly grave among rural women. Most women working in kolkhozes and sovkhozes have simply nothing to do for months on end. What is troubling in this case is not only the production but the social aspect of the matter: young women leave the villages, followed by young men, who go to the cities to seek happiness.

In some oblast farms initiative-minded chairmen have opened small auxiliary enterprises, most of which are engaged in the manufacturing of simple clothing. As a result, girls and young women remain in the villages, so that the young men as well do not have to leave their homes. In the Kolkhoz imeni Kalinin, Rakityanskiy Rayon, for example, starting with the autumn, no week can pass without the celebration of one or two marriages.

The trouble, however, is that with local initiative it is virtually impossible to organize anything other than clothing shops. Even those are not easy to organize: finding the necessary equipment and materials, finding a market, etc., are no easy matters.

Developing auxiliary production facilities aimed mainly at the use of female labor is such an important and necessary matter that in that same Rakityanskiy Rayon the kolkhoz managers go to the entire trouble to set up shops and workshops, although the farms show no profit whatsoever from such activities, for the profits go to the respective industrial enterprises. The problem described in the press as a "bride for the mechanizer" does not affect Belgorod alone. Amazingly, however, the managers of many enterprises in the light and other industrial sectors and their republic and central departments, while complaining of manpower shortages, are quite unwilling to use the seasonal labor reserves in the countryside. Yet even work done at home would be effective in a number of sectors, not to mention the opening of shops or

workshops which would provide 50 or even 100 jobs in a big village. Why, the question is, should a girl sit behind a sewing machine in the city and live in a hostel if she could do the same work in her own native village under better housing conditions? Obviously, the time has come to organize in the villages on a planned and centralized basis production facilities involving low material-intensiveness and simple technologies, which could absorb the existing seasonal manpower surplus.

Our society is at the beginning of the developed socialist stage, which is the natural result of the intensive and creative activities of the party and the people. The results of this labor and the plans for the country's socioeconomic development for the 12th Five-Year Plan and on a longer-range basis will be comprehensively discussed at the 27th CPSU Congress.

We believe that in social construction and the practical implementation of plans for upgrading the living standard of working people, we must concentrate our attention on eliminating departmental barriers and achieving the total balancing of the plans, both horizontally--on the territorial and regional levels--as well as vertically, along the lines which link the soviets of people's deputies with superior administrations. This approach is both logical and legitimate. It is based on the conclusion which was drawn at the 26th CPSU Congress on intensifying the interconnection between the country's economic and social progress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17

## OUR KNOWLEDGE, STRENGTH AND WEAPON

### LOYALTY TO PRINCIPLE AND FLEXIBILITY OF TACTICS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85) pp 47-58

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences Ye. Bugayev, on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of the publication of V. I. Lenin's work "Two Tactics of the Social Democrats in the Democratic Revolution"]

[Text] This work by Lenin, which came out toward the end of July 1905<sup>1</sup> in Geneva and was published the same year in Russia by the Bolshevik Central Committee and the Moscow Committee, has been reprinted (between 1917 and 1985) 232 times in 64 different languages in our country and 103 times abroad in the languages of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Europe. It remains the handbook of all true revolutionaries in all countries. It arms the fighters for overthrowing the power of monopoly capital and the builders of a new classless society with a methodology for revolutionary action. This is the "secret" of its comprehensive elements.

The title of the work reflects the fact that the outbreak of the first Russian revolution found the RSDWP divided. The party's opportunistic wing had given merely formal acceptance of its program, rejecting its organizational principles and revolutionary policy. Under the conditions of the already initiated revolution, Lenin and the bolsheviks were forced to waste a great deal of effort to rebuild a truly revolutionary party with a single leading center.

Despite the counteraction of opportunists and thanks to the gigantic efforts made by Lenin and his fellow workers, VPERED, the bolshevik newspaper, began publication on 22 December 1904. In a half-year span (18 issues) it published more than 60 articles and notes by Lenin. The 3rd Party Congress was prepared and held. Twenty-four voting delegates and 14 delegates with advisory vote represented the overwhelming majority of RSDWP committees and organizations, which were particularly active in the largest industrial centers. The mensheviks refused to work with them and convened their own congress, which was attended by representatives of no more than eight organizations, which bashfully described their congress as a conference.

Both the congress and the menshevik conference dealt with essentially similar problems: the nature of the developing revolution, its motive forces, and the tasks of the party in the revolution. As was to be expected, the resolutions

passed at the 3rd RSDWP Congress and the menshevik conference on all problems were entirely opposite, with the exception of the acknowledgement of the bourgeois nature of the revolution, to which a different meaning was invested and from which mutually exclusive conclusions were drawn. "...The intraparty struggle ended in a split," Lenin pointed out. "Today there is only the struggle of one party against another..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 11, p 145).<sup>2</sup>

"Thoughts and Notes on the Resolutions of the 3rd RSDWP Congress and the Conference of the Social Democrats Who Have Broken Away" was the modest subtitle which Lenin gave to this outstanding work of creative Marxism. Indeed, the book contains a profound comparative study of the resolutions. However, this was merely the reason and means of substantiating the aspect of a truly revolutionary party and its behavior in the growing revolution. The book displayed most brilliantly Lenin's masterly use of the Marxist method applied in studying phenomena in social life, which "consists above all of taking into consideration the objective content of the historical process at a specific time and under specific circumstances, in order to understand most of all the dynamics of the specific class which is the mainspring of any possible progress under these specific circumstances" (vol 26, pp 139-140).

The revolution condenses the period of development. In the course of it the correlation and deployment of struggling forces may change quickly and unexpectedly. Under such circumstances, proper and consistent party tactical slogans are of tremendous importance in leading the masses. This truth is never obsolete, any more than is the concept that the formulation of such slogans when time does not wait--events could bog down and push a movement on the side--requires the greatest possible concentration of knowledge, willpower and energy, so that the formulated tactic could serve in principle the revolutionary struggle not only today and not only in a specific place.

The work was precisely that type of cluster of theoretical knowledge, energy and the amazing ability of Lenin's mind to provide an instant assessment of events and draw from them far-reaching political conclusions. Lenin was never bothered by the circumstance that his conclusions sometimes clashed with the general views, for they were the development of the fundamental ideas of Marxism under the new conditions and the flexible and able application of its basic principles under specific circumstances.

One can only be amazed at the fact that in some 2 months after the 3rd Congress, the preparation for which took such great effort, Lenin was able to write a work which remains relevant to this day. The explanation for this is Lenin's unflagging revolutionary purposefulness, in addition to his brilliance. He lived for the revolution, he sensed even the slightest symptoms of its ripening. He studied manifestations of revolutionary feelings and actions not only in the thick of labor collectives but in all classes and strata. He reflected, he compared class forces within the country, he considered their interrelationships and assessed the way events should and could develop and the nature of their probable consequences. In his articles in the newspaper VPERED, the draft resolutions for the 3rd Party Congress and his addresses at the congress on basic problems of the revolution, such as armed uprising, the participation of the social democrats in the provisional

revolutionary government, the attitude toward the peasant movement and the party bylaws (in the 3rd Congress Lenin was the author of some 140 speeches, motions, supplements and amendments), he formulated and substantiated the party's tactics in the revolution, i.e., its political behavior toward the other parties and the nonproletarian classes and strata in a rapidly developing revolutionary situation.

Starting with 11 January 1905, each issue of VPERED carried articles or series of articles containing not only reactions to various events but also their analysis and consequent recommendations. As early as 12 January, in the article "Start of the Revolution in Russia" Lenin emphasized that the armed people alone can be the true bulwark of their own freedom. He called upon workers and peasants to create revolutionary committees everywhere, in factories, city districts and villages. This was already a platform on the basis of which "any and all revolutionaries" could and should rally: the immediate arming of the workers and all working people and the training and organization of revolutionary forces needed for the destruction of governmental authorities and institutions. Lenin immediately cautioned that "the proletarian must always follow its own way...remembering its great end objectives" (vol 9, pp 203-204).

Therefore, the appearance of "Two Tactics..." was not merely a brilliant inspiration but the result of intensive time-packed work, a model implementation of Lenin's revolutionary duty. In the seven articles published under the general title "Revolutionary Days," in issue No 4 of VPERED he wrote of the difficulty in keeping up with events "because of our accursed distance." He nevertheless believed that "...we must try to keep up with them, to sum up, to draw conclusions, to draw from the experience of contemporary history lessons which will come in handy tomorrow, elsewhere, wherever today "the people are still silent," and where in the immediate future a revolutionary fire will break out in one form or another. We must constantly act as publicists: we must write the history of our time and try to write it in such a way that our description would be as helpful as possible to the immediate participants in the movement and to the proletarian heroes where the action is taking place. We must write in such a way as to contribute to the broadening of the movement and to the conscious choice of means, ways and methods of struggle which could yield the greatest and most durable results with the least effort" (ibid., p 208).

It is precisely this study of real events rather than abstract theorizing that was the base of Lenin's annihilating criticism of the opportunistic tactics of the mensheviks and the substantiation of a truly revolutionary tactic which has been repeatedly tested through historical experience since that time and the basic concepts of which have proved their viability under all possible conditions of the global liberation struggle, requiring merely partial corrections necessitated by the national-historical features of one country or another.

The study of today's problems and not only in the specific period of the revolution but the entire period of the socialist reorganization of society is impossible without checking the present against the past and correlating it with the future. It is extremely difficult to struggle for the final

objectives of the working class and to reach intermediary albeit necessary targets without the study of works such as "Two Tactics...", not to mention the situation in countries where vestiges of feudalism have been preserved, where reactionary dictatorial Pinochet-like regimes rule the country, and even in "most democratic-seeming" capitalist countries, where the revolutionaries face tasks of a democratic and socialist nature. Although such tasks have come exceptionally close to each other in the developed capitalist countries, they have not blended. "Those who wish to achieve socialism by following a road other than political democratism," Lenin wrote, "would inevitably reach conclusions which are economically and politically stupid and reactionary" (vol 11, p 16). While struggling against the tailist position held by the right wing of the social democrats in Russia and the West, Lenin cautioned against attempts to erect a Chinese wall between the democratic and the socialist revolution. To separate them by anything other than the degree of preparedness of the proletariat and the level of its unification with the other toiling strata, "is the greatest possible distortion of Marxism, its debasement and its replacement with liberalism" (vol 37, p 312).

Revolutionaries and revolutionary parties unwilling to understand this quite frequently apply the method of trial and error, which inevitably leaves bruises which could be avoided with the use of tactics based on firm scientific foundations.

Lenin immediately singled out two basic problems which, to one extent or another, he discussed throughout the book. While acknowledging the bourgeois nature of the developing revolution (acknowledged by everyone other than the SR and the like) and assuming that the revolution would teach both the party and the masses, Lenin sharply raised the question of the role of the party as the conscious and organized vanguard of the working class, a question which did not merely apply to whether or not the party would be able to learn something from the revolution. This would have been a passive, a non-Bolshevik position. "Shall we be able," Lenin asked, "to make proper use of our social democratic theory and our links with the proletariat, the only consistently revolutionary class, to leave a proletarian mark on the revolution, so that the revolution could bring about a true and decisive victory in fact rather than in words, and to paralyze the instability, halfway nature and treacherousness of the democratic bourgeoisie?" (vol 11, p 4).

Under the prevailing historical conditions, Lenin drew the basic conclusion that the proletariat alone, headed by a revolutionary party, could be the main motive force, the hegemon of the revolution, should the revolution, reacting to objective conditions, be unable to go beyond bourgeois limits. "The outcome of the revolution," Lenin claimed, "depends on whether or not the working class will play the role of accomplice of the bourgeoisie, an accomplice powerful by virtue of its pressure on autocracy yet helpless politically, or else the role of the leader of a people's revolution" (ibid., p 5).

The successful solution of the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia--the overthrow of tsarism first of all--would have had great historical consequences. "...The significance of this victory," Lenin prophetically wrote, "would be tremendous in terms of future developments in Russia and the

rest of the world. No one could enhance to such a degree the revolutionary energy of the global proletariat. No one could shorten to such an extent the path leading to its full victory as would a decisive victory of the initiated revolution in Russia" (ibid., p 45).

The mensheviks had a different understanding of the deployment of class forces in the country. They ignored the peasantry, i.e., 85 percent of the population. They did not formulate an autonomous assignment for the proletariat, considering that since the revolution was bourgeois the bourgeoisie was its leader. The proletariat, they claimed, was interested in overthrowing autocracy. Therefore, it was the ally of the bourgeoisie. Since it was unable directly to head a socialist coup d'etat, even with an outbreak of armed rebellion against autocracy, it should not unnecessarily frighten the bourgeoisie which could abandon the revolution and leave the proletariat without an ally. The victory of the revolution, the mensheviks claimed, would give power to the bourgeoisie perhaps not immediately but as a result of a lengthy haggling with tsarism. It would be unseemly for social democrats to join a bourgeois government. They could assume the role of "extreme opposition" in future representative institutions and wait for the working class to become the majority of the people, gain parliamentary majority, become cultured and learn from the bourgeoisie how to administer the state.... The mensheviks thought of the bourgeois revolution in general, mandatorily looking at the West yet fearing revolutions of the 1789-1793 types and of the Paris Commune, and considering entirely acceptable bourgeois revolutions such as the one in 1841 in Germany.

Meanwhile, the breakdown of class forces under the conditions of the global liberation struggle had changed radically. Lenin was the first person in the world to notice this. "Unquestionably, we have entered a new epoch," he wrote. "A period of political upheavals and revolutions has started" (ibid., p 18). This epoch, which Lenin was subsequently comprehensively to describe as the epoch of imperialism, demanded ways and means of struggle different from those of the period of calm which had followed the Paris Commune.

Lenin considered inadmissible for a revolutionary party to wait for "others to begin," as was the case with the opportunists. He firmly supported the revolutionary initiative of the proletariat wherever a revolutionary situation developed. "The time is past," he wrote, "when nations and countries could live isolated from each other" (vol 12, p 34). Taking the new conditions into consideration and the increased class maturity of the Russian proletariat, compared with that of Western Europe of 1789-1793 and 1848, the existence of its own political party and of the possibility of rallying the entire peasantry and, at a certain stage, even the rural bourgeoisie, Lenin developed a new theory of the bourgeois-democratic and socialist revolution. It was new in the sense that, proceeding from basic and essential Marxist foundations, it reflected the new deployment of class forces. "...It is only the people, i.e., the proletariat and the peasantry, taking into consideration the basic, the large forces, and the breakdown between the rural and urban petite bourgeoisie (who is also 'the people') standing between the two that is the power which can win a 'decisive victory over tsarism'," Lenin claimed (vol 11, p 44). The revolution in Russia was precisely the first people's revolution of the epoch of imperialism.

Pointing out that the tactical slogans of the mensheviks coincided with the slogans of the Cadets--the party of the liberal bourgeoisie--and were similar to the slogans of the monarchic bourgeoisie, whereas the slogans of the bolsheviks were similar to the slogans of the democratic-revolutionary and the republican bourgeoisie, which had still not developed as a big popular party in Russia (see *ibid.*, p 33), Lenin pointed out the existence of elements of such a party. More than anywhere else, he saw them in the peasantry. It was precisely within the proletariat and the peasantry awakened by it, rather than within the bourgeoisie that Lenin saw the motive forces of said revolution. What should the attitude of the revolutionary party in a bourgeois-democratic revolution be toward the peasantry and the petite bourgeoisie as a whole? On behalf of the bolsheviks Lenin said: "We intend to lead (should the Great Russian Revolution be successful) not only the proletariat, co-organized with the social democratic party, but also the petite bourgeoisie who can march alongside us" (*ibid.*, p 34). By involving into the revolution the masses which accounted for the huge majority of the population, "this would become a revolution in which the peasant and proletarian elements will predominate" (*ibid.*, p 35), i.e., this would be a people's revolution, whose leader, unlike the situation in bourgeois revolutions of the past, will be not the bourgeoisie but the proletariat.

Lenin considered the mensheviks' inability to understand the features of the specific bourgeois revolution as being precisely a peasant revolution the base for the essential erroneousness and unsuitability of their entire tactical line. Furthermore, in his "Report on the 1905 Revolution," he emphasized another one of its features: "...In terms of its social content, it was bourgeois-democratic; in terms of the means of struggle, however, it was proletarian--not only in the sense that the proletariat was the leading force, the vanguard of the movement, but also that it was a specifically proletarian means of struggle, the strike, which was the principal means of moving the masses and the most typical phenomenon in the wavelike growth of decisive events" (vol 30, p 311).

The Russian bourgeoisie, which felt the power of the proletariat, was cowardly. It selfishly tried to retain as many features of the old system it found suitable, including the tsar. It favored reforms. The working class favored a revolutionary way, "for the reformist way is a way of delays, procrastinations and painfully slow withering away of the rotting parts of the people's body. It is the proletariat and the peasantry who suffer most of all and above all from their decay" (vol 11, p 38).

In Lenin's expression, the working class in Russia suffered less from capitalism than from its inadequate development and the vestiges of serfdom. "That is why the bourgeois revolution is advantageous to the proletariat to the highest extent..., in a certain sense a bourgeois revolution is more to the advantage of the proletariat than to the bourgeoisie" (*ibid.*, pp 37-38).

It did not follow from this that the party of the working class could form alliances and set up blocs with the bourgeois parties. The third congress deemed local and temporary combat agreements admissible and desirable only with the SR, as a party representing the left wing of the petit bourgeois

democrats, under RSDWP Central Committee control at that. This meant, however, that without entering into alliances and agreements, the proletariat could support bourgeois actions which could promote social progress and were beneficial to the working people.

This concept stems from the basic principles of the Marxist theory of the tactics followed by proletarian parties toward bourgeois parties. In his letter to Gerson Trier, dated 18 December 1889, Engels wrote: "You essentially reject firmly any, even a short-term joint action with other parties. I am a revolutionary to a sufficient extent not to reject absolutely any possible means under circumstances in which this would be more advantageous or the least harmful.... I am in favor of it, however, only if it directly benefits us or benefits the historical development of the country on the path to economic and political revolution, a benefit which would be unquestionable and worth working for; and all of this providing that the proletarian class nature of the party is not questioned. To me this is a mandatory prerequisite. You will find a presentation of this policy drawn up as early as 1847 in the "Communist Manifesto." We followed it in 1848, in the International, and everywhere else" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 37, pp 274-275).

Lenin taught the working class not to remove itself from the revolution because its objectives may be bourgeois, and not to grant the bourgeoisie the leadership of the revolution on the same grounds (as was the case of the mensheviks) but "conversely, engage in most energetic participation and wage a most decisive struggle for consistent proletarian democratism and for carrying out the revolution to the end" (vol 11, p 39).

While explaining that it is objectively impossible to "break out" of the bourgeois-democratic framework of the revolution, Lenin called for waging a decisive struggle for comprehensively widening this framework, for defending one's own interests and laying the grounds for future total victory (see *ibid.*, pp 39-40). The question was as follows: either the revolution would end in total victory over tsarism, or else it would not have the power to do so and would end in a deal between tsarism and the bourgeoisie. No third solution was possible and the class interests of the proletariat demanded a dedicated struggle for the first outcome.

Who and to what extent, by virtue of his objective status within the system of social relations in Russia, could support the working class in its struggle for a decisive victory of the revolution? The peasantry, and only the peasantry, Lenin claimed. "There is bourgeois democracy and bourgeois democracy," he wrote. He demanded that a distinction be made among the bourgeois monarchist landowner, who publicly supported the universal right to vote while secretly making a deal with tsarism, on the basis of a lame constitution, the peasant who, arms in hand, was marching against the landowners, and officials and who called for "expelling the tsar" without, however, forgetting that the peasant is "also a bourgeois democrat" (see *ibid.*, p 40).

Even before the 3rd Congress, Lenin submitted for discussion by the party a supplement to Article 4 of the program, as follows: "(The RSDWP demands above

all)...'4. The establishment of revolutionary peasant committees to eliminate all vestiges of serfdom and for the democratic reorganization of all general rural relations and the adoption of revolutionary measures to improve the situation of the peasantry, including the expropriation of the land from the landowners. The social democrats will support the peasantry in all of its revolutionary-democratic undertakings, defending the independent interests and independent organization of the rural proletariat" (vol 9, p 358).

This supplement not only expressed the basic attitude of the party of the working class toward the peasantry but also earmarked practical steps (the creation of peasant committees), the purpose of which was to lead to active life and historical creativity the huge masses which so far had been left ignorant and neglected (see vol 10, p 19).

"In simple terms," Lenin noted subsequently, "the peasant committees are a call for the peasants to deal by themselves immediately and directly with officials and landowners in a most decisive fashion..., and for the people, oppressed by the vestiges of serfdom and a police order, to deal with such vestiges 'in a plebeian fashion,' as Marx used to say" (vol 12, p 363).

The involvement of the peasant mass in the active struggle and granting the peasant committees the functions of local authorities was the only way for the revolution to be like the one of 1789-1793 rather than the one in 1848-1850 (see vol 10, p 19).

Naturally, Lenin considered both the heterogeneous nature of the peasantry and the limits of its revolutionism as a whole. He called for making a distinction between the class alliances during the bourgeois-democratic and the socialist stages of the revolution. "Lack of unity on problems of socialism and in the struggle for socialism does not exclude unity of will on problems of democratism and the struggle for a republic" (vol 11, p 73). Lenin wrote on this subject most thoroughly and clearly as early as 1903, in the pamphlet "To the Rural Poor."

The rural proletariat (the farmhands) and the semiproletariat (the rural poor)--were the only reliable support of the working class in the countryside during all the stages of the revolution.

It was against this type of social background that the revolution had to resolve its main problem--the problem of power. In turn, this raised the questions of the forms and means of struggle for power and the nature and class content of the future regime and its agencies.

The Marxists never absolutized any one of the forms of struggle for power, choosing them in accordance with specific circumstances. It was obvious, however, that the situation in Russia could not avoid an armed uprising. The need to prepare for an armed uprising had been described by Lenin in "What Is To Be Done?" (see vol 6, pp 178-179). At that time priority was given to propagandizing the mandatory nature of such preparations. "Today these slogans have been outstripped by events and the movement has marched forward..." (vol 11, p 60).

Taking into consideration that the general democratic movement had already led to the need for an armed uprising, the 3rd RSDWP Congress considered the preparations for, organization and leadership of the uprising some of the main and urgent problems and instructed all party organizations "to take most energetic measures to arm the proletariat and to formulate a plan for an armed uprising and its direct leadership, creating to this effect, as necessary, special groups consisting of party workers" ("KPSS v Rezolyutsiyakh i Resheniyakh Sezdov, Konferentsiy i Plenumov TsK (1898-1986)" [The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses and Conferences and Central Committee Plenums (1898-1986)]. Ninth edition, vol 1, Moscow, 1983, p 126). Lenin persistently demanded immediate and practical action on preparations for the uprising.

In their resolution, the mensheviks expressed their attitude toward the armed uprising in a "classic" opportunistic spirit. To propagandize the uprising? Yes. The possibility of planned uprising was excluded. This was a typical tactics of opportunists, ready merely to blab about a revolution, a tactic of idleness, of a bystander, which could doom any revolution or vitiate any idea.

Nevertheless, since all social democrats had agreed that autocracy had to be overthrown (even though irreconcilable differences existed on how to accomplish this), a new question arose: What would replace the overthrown government, who would form it and what would be its assignments and the attitude toward it?

For example, the view was expressed that a provisional revolutionary government in Russia would be a government of worker democracy. This was a petty example of adventuristic skipping through unfinished development stages, as was the Trotskyite cry of "No Tsar, But a Worker Government." In a democratic revolution the working class defends not only its own specific interests but the interests of the people, which are consistent with its class objectives at the given stage.

The overthrow of autocracy means a democratic coup d'etat in which, in addition to the bourgeoisie and the working class, which are antagonistic classes, other strata, the peasantry above all, would participate as well. Although supporting a democratic coup, they are still not prepared to support a socialist revolution which leads to a dictatorship of the proletariat. However, if in the course of the armed uprising the working class and the peasantry overthrow the autocratic-landowning stratum, why should they allow a strengthening of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, which the mensheviks considered the norm, take the place of the tsarist-landowning dictatorship? Lenin radically rejected such an interpretation of the "decisive victory of the revolution."

"The decisive victory of the revolution over tsarism' means the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry," he claimed. "Our new ISKRA people cannot avoid this conclusion which was pointed out in VPERED a long time ago. No one else can achieve a decisive victory over tsarism."

"Such a victory would be precisely a dictatorship, i.e., it must inevitably be based on military power, on the armed masses, on an uprising, rather than on some kind of 'legally' or 'peacefully' created institutions. This can only be a dictatorship, for the implementation of the changes, which are urgent and mandatory and necessary to the proletariat and the peasantry, would trigger the desperate resistance of landowners, the big bourgeoisie and tsarism. Such opposition or the repelling of counterrevolutionary attempts are impossible without a dictatorship. Naturally, this would be not a socialist but a democratic dictatorship. It will be unable to affect the foundations of capitalism (without an entire series of intermediary degrees of revolutionary development)" (vol 11, p 44).

This was an entirely new formulation of the question of the nature of the power after the victory of the democratic revolution, which was not aimed at a direct transition to socialism but merely cleared the battlefield for socialist ideals from cluttering historical rubbish. In Lenin's view, the provisional revolutionary government was to be the political organ of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship.

Lenin considered this problem in detail in two articles published in PROLETARIY (21 and 27 May 1905). He crushed the inconsistent halfway views of the menshevik conference, which did not even mention the need for founding a republic, pitting against it the resolution of the 3rd RSDWP Congress. "The resolution of the congress calls a specific class to the struggle, for a clearly defined immediate objective," he wrote. "The resolution of the conference deals with the struggle among different forces. One of the resolutions expresses the mentality of the active struggle; the other, a passive observation; one is imbued with an appeal for live activities, while the other is dead philosophizing" (ibid., pp 26-27). This is not the language of political activists, Lenin concluded, but the language of some kind of archival jury (see ibid., p 28). Indeed, the tactical resolutions passed by the mensheviks looked at the past.

However, as the mensheviks as well assumed, the revolution would develop into an armed uprising (they were even not adverse to have it led by both the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, assuming that it broke out spontaneously), if the result of it would be the creation of a provisional revolutionary government, what attitude should the social democrats adopt toward it?

Lenin's answer was unequivocal. The provisional revolutionary government, he wrote, "is a government of the revolutionary epoch, directly taking over from the overthrown government and relying on the uprising of the people, rather than on any kind of representative institutions stemming from the people. A provisional revolutionary government is an agency of the struggle for the immediate victory of the revolution and the immediate repulsion of counterrevolutionary attempts and not in the least an agency for the implementation of the historical tasks of the bourgeois revolution in general" (ibid., p 30).

The establishment of soviets of workers and, here and there, also soviets of workers and soldiers' (peasant) deputies, the result of the creativity of the people, were the embryo of such a government. Initially informed of the

structure and activities of the soviet, Lenin unreservedly defined them not only as organs of the uprising but of the new system as well. He firmly opposed attempts to turn the soviets into truly social democratic bodies. Conversely, he welcomed the "variety" of their composition. Lenin saw as the force of this organization the fact that "the new system, as the dictatorship of the vast majority, could be and was retained exclusively with the help of the trust of the huge mass, exclusively by the fact that it drew to itself most freely, most extensively and most strongly the entire mass in participating in the regime" (vol 12, pp 318-319). Initially, such a government was the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which was set up in February 1917.

The participation of the social democrats in such a government was considered by Lenin not only possible but, under certain circumstances, strictly necessary for the further development of the revolution, the defense of the separate interests of the proletariat and the most merciless suppression of the counterrevolution. It was to be used to apply pressure from above in the interest of the revolution, relying on the armed people. Since the time of the Paris Commune, the social democrats had lost sight of this possibility and had engaged merely in a defensive struggle against pressure from above. Under the new circumstances, it was necessary to combine pressure from above and from below.

It was precisely the victorious people's uprising and the creation of a provisional revolutionary government that would mark the actual victory of the revolution. The mensheviks' "decision" to set up a constituent assembly would have meant that the revolution was victorious in words only.

"The question of a provisional revolutionary government," Lenin wrote, "is the focal point of the tactical problems of the social democrats at present" (vol 11, p 77).

Proceeding from their basic postulate that if the revolution is bourgeois the bourgeoisie is its hegemon and, therefore, it assumes power, in attacking Lenin from the positions of anarchism and once again looking at the past, the mensheviks considered totally inadmissible for the social democrats to participate in the provisional government and discounted any possible claim to power (the revolution not being socialist!). They suggested that the social democrats play the role of "extreme opposition," so that the proletariat would not dissolve within bourgeois democracy. In their view, the revolution would advance if the government would consist of the liberal and the monarchic bourgeoisie.

They justified their position by citing the fact that all socialists in Europe had condemned A. Millerand, who had become a minister in the reactionary bourgeois cabinet of Waldek-Rousseau in 1899; the French Socialist Party even expelled Millerand from the party after long hesitation (in 1904!). However, participation in a reactionary bourgeois government is one thing and in a government which has come to power on the crest of a mass revolutionary upsurge and relies on the armed nation, another. Participation in such a government is both possible and necessary, unquestionably, alongside

representatives of the peasantry and the other nonproletarian strata and even the democratic bourgeoisie.

In February 1917 the mensheviks had the possibility of reviewing their dogmas, being actually in power in a government created in the course of the armed uprising, in a government of revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants. However, they hastened to surrender it to the counterrevolutionary government of the bourgeoisie and the landowners and to join it, standing up, together with the bourgeoisie, against the workers and the peasants. The Provisional Government, headed by mensheviks and SR, fired at a mass demonstration in July 1917, thus putting an end to the peaceful development of the revolution and definitively joining the camp of the counterrevolution. The same was done by their associates--the German social democrats. Their government, headed by F. Ebert and F. Scheidemann, drowned the 1918-1919 revolution and, later, the Bavarian Social Republic in blood.

However, there were other examples as well: during World War II a powerful antifascist movement, the heart of which were the communist parties, appeared in the countries occupied by fascist Germany. After the liberation, governments born of the upsurge of the mass people's struggle were formed in many of these countries (France, Italy, Belgium, etc.), in which communists participated alongside representatives of the petit and big bourgeoisie. These governments were able to achieve a great deal in consolidating important social and political gains of the working people. Even subsequent reactionary counterattacks, supported by the United States, were unable to void such gains entirely.

However, the question of the expediency of the participation of communists in developed capitalist countries in coalitions with other parties in governments not based on a mass revolutionary upsurge has still not been exhaustively answered by contemporary practical experience. The experience of the communist parties of Finland and France is insufficient in providing a positive assessment of such participation. The problem requires a particular study.

In 1905 the bolsheviks did not call for the creation of a government of the Paris Commune type, despite the high appeal and greatness of this prototype. It was a question not of a dictatorship of the proletariat but of a government of revolutionary-democratic dictatorship by the proletariat and the peasantry, the purpose of which was to implement the minimum program of the RSDWP.

All of this, however, did not mean in the least that Lenin and the bolsheviks shared to any extent the reformist dogmas of a 50 to 100-year-long period, which separates the victory of the bourgeois revolution from a socialist revolution.

On the contrary, they proceeded from the fundamental statements by Marx and Engels, already noted in the "Communist Party Manifesto," of differences in the conditions of the bourgeois revolutions which had taken place in England and France and were taking place in Germany. Taking into consideration the higher level of development of industry and organization of the working class in Germany, compared with the one which prevailed at the time of the preceding

revolutions, they allowed for the possibility that a bourgeois-democratic revolution in Germany could be no more than a prologue to a socialist revolution.

Even more clearly, in the familiar Central Committee address to the Alliance of Communists, Marx and Engels wrote that "while the democratic petit bourgeois would like to put an end to the revolution as soon as possible..., our interests and tasks are to make the revolution continuous until all more or less property-owning classes have been removed from power and until the proletariat has assumed the power of the state..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 7, p 261).

These were the fundamental concepts on which the complete Leninist theory of the growth of the bourgeois democratic revolution into a socialist revolution was based. This theory was a new word in Marxism, for it contemplated not only general concepts but actually existing specific historical conditions in which capitalism as a whole had already completed its progressive role and had become a reactionary force.

Objective conditions (the existence of a relatively highly developed capitalism alongside vestiges of serfdom) as well as subjective ones (existence of a revolutionary proletariat with its own revolutionary party) led to the conclusion which Lenin reached of the possibility and, as part of the party tactics and the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, the necessity of a struggle for the development of the bourgeois-democratic into a socialist revolution.

Two social wars of a different nature: the first against the tsar and the landowners and for a democratic republic, a nationwide war, and the other, against the bourgeoisie, were waged inseparably, not in theory but in the live practice of millions of people; no strict demarcation between them was possible either in terms of time or means of struggle. Priority, however, was given to the nationwide struggle against autocracy. The proletariat had been called upon to lead it. Victory in that war meant not the conversion of the revolution but merely the regrouping of the class forces, some of which turned into active opponents from hesitant fellow travelers, while others assumed a position of hesitation and expectation after having been active participants.

The mensheviks clearly failed to understand that the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry had a past and a future. "Its past," Lenin wrote, "was autocracy, serfdom, monarchy and privileges. In the struggle against this past and against the counterrevolution, the 'unity of will' of the proletariat and the peasantry is possible, for there is unity of interests.

Its future is a struggle against private ownership, the struggle waged by the hired worker against the owner, a struggle for socialism. In this case unity of will is impossible" (vol 11, p 74).

Lenin provided a characterization of the bourgeois-democratic and socialist stages in the revolution, brief and exhaustive in terms of class content, as the two links within a single chain: "The proletariat must take to the end

the democratic coup, drawing to itself the mass of the peasantry in order to suppress the resistance of autocracy and to paralyze the instability of the bourgeoisie. The proletariat must make a socialist coup by drawing to itself the mass of nonproletarian elements in the population, in order to crush the power of resistance of the bourgeoisie and to paralyze the instability of the peasantry and the petite bourgeoisie" (ibid., p 90).

In order that no doubts remain as to the bolshevik tactics in this matter, in September 1905 Lenin wrote that "from a democratic revolution we shall immediately begin to convert and precisely to the extent to which we have the strength, the strength of the conscious and organized proletariat, will begin to convert to a socialist revolution. We support a continuing revolution. We shall not stop halfway" (ibid., p 222).

The accuracy of this Leninist theoretical concept was fully confirmed by subsequent experience. In February 1917, the bolsheviks were guided by Lenin's tactics. It is true that they (the Russian Bureau of the Central Committee, the Petrograd and other committees) "looked over" the end of the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution with the appearance of the actual revolutionary government--the Petrograd Soviet--and somewhat lingered and held on to the tactical slogans of 1905. Once again from this "accursed distance," Lenin was the first to realize this and to give the party a new program for action. This lingering on the part of even tried and tempered bolsheviks was explained with the fact that the revolution had taken place "totally unexpectedly" and that instead of a single power body, by the fault of the mensheviks and the SR, a twin power had developed in the course of which the basic problems of the bourgeois revolution were not being resolved, thus creating the appearance of an unfinished democratic stage. Nevertheless, even under such extremely complex circumstances, the party pursued a revolutionary bolshevik line. As N. Antipov, member of the Petersburg Committee, said about Lenin's April theses, "Lenin's theses are nothing but a clear and precise description of what we are confusedly doing" ("Pervyy Legalnyy Peterburgskiy Komitet Bolshevikov v 1917 g." [The First Legal Petersburg Bolshevik Committee in 1917]). Moscow-Leningrad, 1927, p 87).

It was precisely in "Two Tactics..." that the theoretical foundations for the tactics which led to the victory of the October Revolution were formulated. This revolution was able "among others" also to complete the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution which had remained unresolved and could not be entirely resolved by the bourgeois democratic revolutions without going beyond the framework of the bourgeois system, i.e., without developing into socialist revolutions.

In formulating the tactics of the party of the working class in the revolution, Lenin did not ignore even for a minute problems of strengthening its ideological and organizational unity. The graver the social problems were, the more necessary was the existence of a party which could lead the masses, the working class above all, which was in the center of the contemporary epoch, to their resolution. Lenin firmly condemned all types of opportunism. He opposed any kind of belittling of the party's role in the revolutionary process and spontaneity. "They," Lenin wrote about the mensheviks, "belittle the materialistic understanding of history by ignoring

the effective, leading and guiding role which parties aware of the material conditions of the coup d'etat and leading the progressive classes could and should play in history" (vol 11, p 31).

Naturally, this applies to parties of revolutionary action, which are not limited to the possible forms of struggle which exist only at a given time, but which realize and acknowledge the need for new forms of struggle, based on changes in the social circumstances, unfamiliar to the leaders of that period.

As the leader of the revolutionary reorganization of society, in order to be worthy of its mission, the Marxist-Leninist party must take into consideration even the slightest changes in the deployment of class forces. It must master all forms of struggle, influence all aspects of social life and always be ready rapidly to reorganize its ranks for the solution of the new urgent problems.

This is what we learn from Lenin's brilliant work and the historical experience of the Leninist party. This is demanded by the new tasks which were formulated with such clarity, firmness and most profound faith in their successful implementation, by the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Old style.
2. Subsequent references to V. I. Lenin's complete collected works will indicate volume and page only.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17

## THOUGHTS ON LENIN

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85) pp 59-65

[Article by Aziz Muhammed, first secretary of the Iraqi Communist Party Central Committee]

[Text] On the occasion of the 150th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth, the journal's editors turned to A. Muhammed with the request to describe the role which Lenin and Leninism played in his development as a communist and in the struggle waged by the Iraqi Communist Party for social progress, peace and socialism. Following is his article.

When a communist writes about Vladimir Ilich Lenin it is as though he weighs and carefully analyzes his own life with the help of a most sensitive scale, for Lenin's life and every single day in it are a high model for communists.

### Beginning of the Way

World War II was on. At that time I was not even 18, and for the first time I was discovering the revolutionary ideals. Although officially Iraq had proclaimed its affiliation with the coalition of countries fighting fascism, the authorities had continued to ban any kind of objective publication which would speak of the Soviet Union or make any mention of Marxism. To find other truthful sources was no easy matter. At that time, the Iraqi Communist Party (ICP), which had been created in 1934, was still in its organizational stage. It had no possibility of printing and distributing materials which would satisfy the great desire of Iraqi youth to become acquainted with the foundations of scientific socialism and the Soviet Union. All that reached us was scraps of news about the outstanding firmness of the Soviet people in the face of the then strongest possible military machine of Hitlerite Germany and its satellites, the crushing blows which the Red Army was inflicting to it and, finally, the great victory over fascism in May 1945, which brought vivifying winds of freedom to our area as well (it was precisely during that noteworthy year that I became a communist party member). These victories were inseparably related to the Bolshevik Party and Lenin. Despite the scant information, in the atmosphere in which Iraq found itself at that time, the impression that I and my coevals, who strove to fight the oppressors, initially gained about Lenin was one of an almost fabulous hero who could make

miracles. This almost legendary concept was only gradually enriched with the real features until, in the course of time, the living image of the leader of the world proletariat and of all oppressed, and the spokesman for communism, a doctrine which can truly change the world, became crystallized.

Therefore, the image of Vladimir Ilich Lenin, with his human wisdom, titanic struggle and great ideals, did not rise before our eyes in its entire gigantic size immediately. This demanded of us, the young Iraqi communists, great and dedicated efforts and searches, reflecting the tremendous difficulties of the revolutionary struggle in Iraq. The first piece of serious information about Lenin was obtained by us, the young Iraqi communists, from a small booklet written by Yusef Salman Yusef (party pseudonym Fahed), the founder of the Iraqi Communist Party, who subsequently died the death of a martyr for the cause of the freedom of the people. He wrote of the way Lenin had conceived of the party of a new type--the party of the revolution. This was my initial acquaintance with Leninism. I read my first Leninist work later, in 1946, when the Arab translation of the book "Imperialism as the Higher Stage of Capitalism" was published in Baghdad.

At that time Iraq suffered not only from feudalism but, above all, from imperialist oppression and plunder. We, however, the young communists, still lacked at that time a scientific idea of what is imperialism and did not know what gave it the power to rule us and other countries and how imperialist oppression could be rejected. Lenin impressed us by explaining all of this in the precise language of the scientist. He helped us truly to identify the enemy we were fighting. From the pages of this book I saw the live image of Lenin--the brilliant scientists and great revolutionary who based his revolutionary conclusions on the profound study and painstaking analysis of a tremendous amount of facts and phenomena. It was thus that we mastered what matters to a proletarian revolutionary: in order to struggle successfully against one's class enemy one must know and understand him well.

#### Hammering Out the Ideological Weapon...

Soon afterwards, the rulers mounted a broad terrorist campaign against the Iraqi communists. The leadership and the main party cadres were sent to jail in the most remote desert areas. I was among them. This was a difficult period in party life. In 1949, in conspiracy with the imperialists, the authorities executed a number of ICP leaders headed by Comrade Fahed. They resorted to draconian steps to defeat the party organizations, instill fear and panic in communist ranks and all patriotic forces and undermine our party from within. It became clear that the imperialists and the reactionary powers in Baghdad had reached the conclusion that it was precisely an offensive mounted against the communist party which would help them clear the way for the creation of an aggressive anti-Soviet military bloc in the Middle East, historically known as the Baghdad Pact. Generally speaking, they were close to the truth, for no more than a year before these bloody events the Iraqi people had developed a powerful movement against signing a new agreement with England, which would have tied Iraq to imperialism even closer. The communists were marching at the head of the masses which had risen.

We quickly realized that under the developing conditions preserving the party, recovering from the losses and replenishing the valuable revolutionary experience which had been irretrievably lost with the execution of the ICP leadership, were our main and urgent tasks. That is why we decided to dedicate that part of our lives which was to be spent in the middle of the desert to intensive ideological and moral training for the revolution. Naturally, we still had no clear plan for action, for the harsh conditions of the jail and the most difficult situation of the party and the entire country prevented us from drawing up such a necessary plan quickly. However, we badly needed a clear program for future work.

Where to begin? We sought Lenin's aid and advice. At that time, through the efforts of the colonizers and the local reaction, the Arab countries were doing everything possible to hinder the dissemination of Marxist literature. In this respect we had no real choice, no more than had our comrades on the outside, who were forced to import clandestinely such literature from abroad. Nevertheless, we were able to find and collect Lenin's landmark works and to smuggle them into the jail. Some of the works we obtained from the outside were the English translations of "What Is To Be Done?", "Two Tactics of the Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution" and "The 'Leftist' Children's Disease in Communism." It was precisely in these works that we began to seek answers to our pressing problems. Occasionally, it even seemed to us that Lenin's works had been written especially for us, Iraqi communists, for so precisely and clearly did Lenin's genius illuminate the core of the vital problems of our reality and the tasks facing the Iraqi Communist Party.

The party aktiv urgently needed to sharpen the most powerful weapon of the communists--the clear theoretical understanding of what had to be done to recreate and develop the proletarian party and to strengthen its ties with the working people. Briefly, during those most difficult times the Iraqi communists needed, above all, wise words and advice and mastering the experience of the other fraternal parties. We found all of this in Lenin. The imprisoned comrades who knew English well, translated Lenin's works in our possession. These priceless notebooks were then sent to the free ICP members and were passed from hand to hand as textbooks in the revolutionary struggle.

It was thus, in jail, that for the first time we became thoroughly familiar with Lenin directly on the basis of his works and clearly mastered what he had in mind by saying that there can be no revolutionary movement without revolutionary theory. Now we realized more clearly what to begin with: based on Marxist-Leninist science, we had to develop our positions on the fundamental problems of the revolutionary struggle in Iraq. We had to provide a principled assessment of what was true and what was false in our debates and discussions on the path of development of the country and the party. We were also pleased to have become directly "acquainted" with Lenin but it was only as time went on that we realized that this was merely part of his tremendous ideological legacy and that, alas, at that time we were still influenced by the vestiges of the romantic revolutionism which had trapped us in our youth.

Because of the difficult circumstances of clandestine work, the treasury of Leninist thinking or, more precisely, even the part which was accessible to us at that time, was available to only a small circle of fighters. As to initial

familiarity with Lenin's ideas by the broad social circles in Iraq, it took place only after the people's revolution of 14 July 1958, in the preparations for which the communists made their major contribution. The revolution gave the Iraqi people a great deal: real political independence, abrogation of the hated Baghdad Pact, agrarian reform, significant improvements in education and social security and the opportunity to work in mass political and trade union organizations. For the first time, the revolution created conditions for the publication of a large number of Lenin's works in the country, which resulted in the widespread dissemination of the Leninist understanding of the laws governing social life, which were firmly rooted in the minds of the progressive forces in the country.

It was since then that, on the basis of their own experience, the people learned how to recognize the direct link between the degree of their own freedom, the progress of the country and the freedom of dissemination of Leninist ideas and works. In periods of victory of the national liberation movement the bookstores were flooded with publications of Leninist works. During periods of defeat of the revolutionary movement, reading Lenin's books was proclaimed a crime. It was thus that the people learned that the word "Lenin" is synonymous with the word "freedom."

### Three Lessons From Lenin

Lenin not only captivated our minds with his powerful scientific logic and exceptional ability to predict the future impeccably, but also won our hearts, the hearts of thousands and thousands of sons of the Iraqi people, with his great moral force as an inflexible fighter for bright ideals.

To us Lenin means revolution. The spirit of revolutionary purposefulness and decisiveness, which cannot be crushed either by terror or persecution, which does not cool off by losses or defeats, this Leninist spirit was what inspired and will inspire us always in the difficult struggle for building a just socialist society.

To be a Leninist means to make Lenin the yardstick of each one of our steps and to be answerable to him for any failure or blunder. In the way that Lenin dedicated his life to the revolution, unhesitatingly we too should dedicate all our forces to the cause of Lenin, the cause of communism. This was the first and most important Leninist lesson mastered by the Iraqi communists. Such was the path of the legendary Comrade Fahed, the founder of our party and its secretary general, who went to the gallows fearlessly on 14 February 1949, hanged by the corrupt rulers in Baghdad. He went to the scaffold with the words "Communism is stronger than death and stronger than the gallows!" This same Leninist lesson was obeyed also by Salam Adil, first secretary of the ICP Central Committee, who was savagely and undescribably tortured for 4 days and 4 nights, until he died on 24 February 1953 at the hands of the executioners among the organizers of the then-counterrevolutionary coup. They were unable to extract a single word out of him. Loyal to the Leninist principles of a steely firmness of revolutionary spirit, the Iraqi communists are always ready to fight to the end and, if necessary, to sacrifice their lives for the cause of the people, wherever this may be: in the mountains, in city streets or in the jails of dictatorial regimes.

The second lesson Lenin taught us was to have boundless faith in the people and the working class and the understanding that the strength of the party rests on the inexhaustible source of the toiling masses. In assessing the results of the party week which was held in Moscow from 20 to 28 September 1919, when the imperialist interventionists and White generals were threatening the very existence of the Russian Soviet Republic, Lenin wrote: "Those who win the war are those who have greater reserves, greater sources of strength and greater support among the people."

"We have all of this more than the Whites, more than the 'universal powerful' Anglo-French imperialism, this giant with feet of clay. We have more of this, for we can draw and we shall continue to draw for a long time, more and more deeply, from the workers and the toiling peasants, from those classes which were oppressed under capitalism and which everywhere accounts for the overwhelming majority of the population. We can draw from this richest reservoir, for it will give us the most sincere, the most tempered leaders trained in the hardships of life, the closest people to the workers and peasants, in building socialism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 39, p 237).

Imperialist and reactionary dictatorial rulers have frequently proclaimed that they have been able to eliminate once and for all the Iraqi Communist Party and that it will no longer be able to return to the arena of the struggle. On each such occasion they did not conceal their premature joy. However, again and again they were forced to realize the futility of their hopes. The only reason for this is that the communist party can neither be destroyed nor "banned." It has long sunk deep roots within the people. The ICP has always stood on the side of the working people loyally and unhesitatingly. It earned the love of the people to whom it dedicated its best sons and daughters so that the party could once again become strong, and raise its head high under the banner of the fierce struggle for a victorious revolution.

Lenin taught us to be active fighters for the cause of peace. He always taught that while dealing with the complex and difficult problems of national life in one's own country, one must not forget the cause of universal significance: the struggle for the prevention of world war, the struggle against the aggressive aspiration of international imperialism for conquest, broadening the realm of its domination and weakening and destroying world socialism--the bulwark of all revolutionary movements on the planet. He emphasized that war and capitalism are twins, whereas socialism means the elimination of exploitation and oppression and fraternity among nations or, in other words, peace.

Lenin farsightedly predicted that on its way to communism mankind will inevitably undergo a historically lengthy traditional epoch in the course of which countries belonging to the two opposite social systems--capitalism and socialism--will be forced to live side by side on the planet. That is why he called for developing between them relations based on the principles of

peaceful coexistence, equality and respect for the sovereignty of all countries, large and small.

Today, when mankind faces the mortal danger of nuclear war, every honest person understands how right Lenin was to issue this appeal and how necessary is the adamant struggle for the prevention of nuclear catastrophe and for rebuffing the plans of American imperialism and its accomplices, who are threatening the doom of human civilization. In order successfully to struggle for a better life for their peoples, the communists must also struggle for the right to life of all mankind and for the preservation and strengthening of peaceful conditions for social progress. Lenin's dialectics of the organic interconnection between the struggle for socialism and against war has been firmly mastered by the Iraqi Communist Party and is its permanent platform for action in the international arena.

These are the three most important lessons drawn by our party in the course of difficult mastery of Leninism and its theoretical, organizational and strategic principles.

#### Lenin and the Historical Destinies of the Peoples of the Orient

The communists in the former colonial and dependent countries respect Lenin for his theoretical discoveries of invaluable importance in the struggle waged by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America against imperialism. Lenin drew attention to the revolutionary nature of the national liberation movements as an important component of the global socialist revolution at a time when others, even greater revolutionaries, were unable properly to assess their tremendous transforming potential. He particularly indicated the important role which the struggle waged by the peoples of colonies and semi-colonies play against imperialism in the world revolutionary process, emphasizing that "the period of awakening of the Orient in the contemporary revolution will be followed by a period of participation of all the peoples of the Orient in resolving the destinies of the entire world, so that they may not be merely a source of enrichment. The peoples of the Orient will awaken to the need for practical activities and for each nation to resolve the problem of the fate of all mankind" (ibid., p 328). That is why he persistently called upon the representatives of the young communist parties and organizations in Oriental countries "to play a great role and blend in this struggle with our own struggle against international imperialism" (ibid.).

With every passing day life confirms the relevance of this Leninist behest. Friendship and cooperation between the peoples of the liberated countries and the socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union is a guarantee that imperialist conspiracies against such peoples will be always firmly rebuffed.

Lenin did not limit himself to indicating the tremendous importance of the revolutionary movement in colonial and dependent countries. He also pointed out the objective conditions which must be taken into consideration by the representatives of the proletariat acting within the national liberation movement. In speaking of the need for organizing national alliances with the progressive yet heterogeneous "bourgeois democracy," he also emphasized that

the communist parties must "not blend with it but absolutely preserve the autonomy of the proletarian movement even in its embryonic form" (op. cit., vol 41, p 167). However, should the necessary conditions be lacking or lost, he deemed participation in such alliances inexpedient. Lenin's criteria in assessing the progressive and revolutionary nature of broad alliances have become our manual for action in all matters pertaining to the national front, ever since the party called for its establishment at the beginning of the 1940s. Through our political practices and the entire experience gained in the struggle we tested the accuracy of Lenin's concepts in terms of the present, for which reason we shall always support each single letter of Lenin's words.

### Unjust Wars and Lenin's Position

Lenin's greatness lies in the fact that he always assumed a principled position on any question, however difficult or, initially, unpopular it may have been. Let us take as an example his approach to the question of the attitude of the revolutionary class and its party to a reactionary and unjust war. The bourgeois groups in power, Lenin pointed out, characterize any position which does not support them in a reactionary war as "national treason." Acting under the slogan of "Defense of the Fatherland," they try to frighten the petite bourgeoisie and fog the awareness of the masses in order to draw them into the camp of the supporters of the war; with the help of this slogan, they call for "class peace," demanding of the proletariat to abandon class battles "in the name of victory." Lenin bequeathed to us not only the need firmly to oppose unjust wars but to continue our revolutionary struggle for democracy, social progress and socialism.

I am mentioning this problem because it is directly related to the position taken by our party concerning the Iraq-Iran war. From the very first day of the war, which was unleashed with the direct encouragement of imperialist circles, the ICP has been against it. It proved how dangerous it was to the cause of national and social liberation and peace in the area and throughout the world, emphasizing that it is only imperialism and the reaction who benefit from it and that it could result in the total adoption by the ruling circles of the warring sides of the policy of imperialism and regional reactions and give the imperialist, the United States above all, a pretext for consolidating their military position in the zone of the Persian Gulf. The ICP pointed out that the war would cause tremendous calamities and destruction for both countries and peoples and demanded its soonest possible end.

When the Iraqi forces penetrated into Iranian territory, the ICP called for their immediate withdrawal. It did not join the chorus of those who called for "victory," explaining that such a "victory" would be nothing more than the triumph of imperialist and reactionary plans. When the Iraqi army was forced to retreat to the border and to assume defensive positions against the armed forces of the Iranian rulers, the Iraqi Communist Party continued to call for an immediate end to the war on a just and democratic bases and for peace without annexations. In the struggle against this war, our policy was not different from the position held by the fraternal Iranian People's Party. This is proletarian internationalism in action. Here as well we act as Vladimir Ilich taught us.

## To Live Like Lenin

When Marxism emphasizes the role of political leaders with experience in heading the revolutionary struggle, it points out that such leaders cannot be true leaders of the working class unless they observe two basic principles: first, always to remember that they are implementing the will of the people and the party, for which reason they are answerable to them; second, always to apply the methods of collective leadership, for there is no greater wisdom than that of the collective. Lenin tirelessly emphasized this. He always condemned emphasizing the merits of an individual leader, however great they may have been, and did not stand for anything which led to the glorification of his personality. A. V. Lunacharskiy recalled how once, in September 1918, Lenin invited a group of leading comrades and told them the following: "I note with great displeasure that people are beginning to praise my person. This is annoying and harmful. All of us know that this is not a question of a personality. Personally, I would find it uncomfortable to forbid such phenomena, for this may sound somewhat...pretentious. However, you must surreptitiously oppose all such things."

people, who recorded in it outstanding pages and have accomplished a great deal for their nations, for all mankind. However, who among them has achieved, who has accomplished for the people the world over as much as Lenin? His exceptional principle-mindedness, outstanding organizational qualities, clear revolutionary thinking, consistent internationalism, iron will, wisdom, faith in victory and modesty and love for the people are what made Lenin a one-of-a-kind leader. Let every true revolutionary be proud of the fact that he is struggling in the ranks of the proletarian army of internationalist communists, created and headed by Lenin. Lenin was the first communist of our revolutionary epoch, a person of high humanism, to whom the suffering of other people and all mankind was also his own personal suffering.

Every communist, every revolutionary and, furthermore, every honest person owes a great deal to Vladimir Ilich Lenin. He can repay this debt best of all by dedicating his life to the cause to which Lenin dedicated all of himself, by concentrating all his forces on strengthening peace and friendship among the peoples and by tirelessly working for the defense of real socialism at the origins of which stood Vladimir Ilich Lenin.

Lenin's cause will win!

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17

## FOR OUR SOVIET MOTHERLAND

### THE PEOPLE'S RESISTANCE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85) pp 66-75

[Article by Lt Gen P. Zhilin, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member and Lenin Prize laureate]

[Text] The victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War, which proved the invincible power of socialism, the moral and political unity of Soviet society and the unbreakable friendship among the peoples of the USSR, has become forever part of the chronicles of the heroic history of our homeland.

The Great Patriotic War was a war fought by the entire nation. In unleashing their aggression against the USSR, the Hitlerite politicians and strategists relied only on the opposition of the army. Yet they were opposed by the entire Soviet people. Our victory was hammered out in three areas: in the armed struggle waged by the Soviet army, as a professionally trained part of the people; in the rear of the country, where, under the leadership of the communist party workers, peasants and intellectuals supplied the front with everything it needed through their dedicated efforts; in the course of the resistance which had developed on temporarily occupied territories, including guerrilla warfare, mass sabotage of enemy economic, political and military activities and the struggle waged by patriotic groups and organizations of the antifascist underground in the cities and other settlements. All of these areas and means of struggle, which were closely interwoven and supplementing each other, are included in the concept of the nationwide nature of the Great Patriotic War. The party's slogan of "Everything for the Front! Everything for Victory!" became a powerful call which rallied the efforts of all the Soviet people in the just war of liberation in defense of their socialist homeland.

### I

The struggle which the Soviet people waged on the territory seized by the enemy was a structural component of the Great Patriotic War. This struggle was uncompromising and fierce from the very start, for it reflected the class confrontation between socialism and the most reactionary strike force of imperialism--Hitlerite fascism--the objective of which was to destroy the first socialist state in the world and to establish its world domination.

The hostile objectives of the fascists concerning the peoples of the USSR were, first of all, to abolish the socialist social system, to uproot the ideas of Marxism-Leninism from the minds of the Soviet people by all available means and to disarm them spiritually. Proceeding from their racist man-hating fascist theory, they intended to divide the peoples of the Soviet Union, to push into Western Siberia more than 30 million people, to Germanize as many as 14 million and to destroy the rest.

The economic objectives of the occupation forces were as openly predatory. They were to exhaust Soviet material resources and to use the public and private property of the Soviet people for the needs of the "Third Reich." This criminal policy, formulated as directives, orders and instructions, had the power of "state law" and was zealously implemented by the Hitlerite army, the special punitive organs and the occupation machinery.

It would be impossible to list all crimes committed by the Hitlerites on the occupied territory of our country. The "new order" was introduced ubiquitously: a regime of total plunder and bloody mass terror. Grossly violating the norms of international law, the fascist killed several million Soviet citizens on the occupied territory of the USSR. Millions were sent to concentration camps. About 5 million of our compatriots were forcibly exiled to work in fascist Germany.

Not only the leaders of fascist Germany and its various organizations but the Wehrmacht as well were responsible for these crimes. Nazism, the monopolies and militarism acted in unity.

The Hitlerites backed their bloody repressions with unbridled demagoguery, provocation and lies. They hoped, using their tremendous propaganda apparatus, to corrupt the Soviet people politically and morally and to accustom them to slavish obedience, nationalism and a private ownership mentality.

However, the fascists erred. Millions of Soviet patriotic citizens, raised under the Soviet system in a spirit of loyalty to communist ideals and ready to fight for their implementation to their last drop of blood, rose to the struggle.

In recent years, repeating after the beaten fascist generals, the bourgeois ideologues have proclaimed partisan activities illegal and the methods of struggle used by the partisans unworthy of civilized people. They fear the ever growing struggle waged by the peoples against imperialism and reactionary regimes and for their social and national liberation. They fear finding themselves cast in the dump of history.

The struggle waged by the Soviet people on occupied territory was truly national. It was a manifestation of the profound interest of the working people in achieving total victory over the enemy and enjoyed the absolute support of the entire Soviet people. It was the most important structural component of the country's single military camp. The Soviet people waged the war on the enemy both at the front and in the occupied territories with all

available means, uncompromisingly, for destruction. This was the legitimate and sacred right of the people of a socialist country subject to aggression. For the first time in history, the common objectives of socialist ideology, unity of political and economic interests and the task of building and defending the new system united the actions of the broadest possible popular masses, giving them a clear political orientation and becoming a decisive factor for victory.

The nationwide nature of the struggle waged by the people behind enemy lines was clearly manifested in the social and national composition of its participants. At the beginning of 1944, workers accounted for more than 30 percent of all Soviet partisans; kolkhoz members accounted for about 41 percent and employees for more than 29 percent. Almost 10 percent of the partisans were women. The entire united family of peoples of the USSR rose in defense of the Soviet state. In the partisan detachments in the Ukraine alone members of 62 nationalities in our country fought the fascist occupation forces shoulder to shoulder.

The just national war waged by the Soviet people against fascism inspired the patriots of other countries to fight. Poles, Slovaks, Germans and Frenchmen, who were unwilling to cooperate with the occupation forces, took the side of partisans and clandestine workers. More than 1,200 foreigners-antifascists fought in the ranks of the Belorussian partisans alone. Jan Nalepka, commander of a detachment consisting of former Slovak military servicemen, fought in the Ukrainian partisan formation commanded by A. N. Saburov. The German antifascist Fritz Schmenkel, displayed exceptional courage in the struggle against the Hitlerites in the ranks of the Russian partisans. The land of the soviets deeply appreciated the military exploits of such outstanding people, awarding to Jan Nalepka and Fritz Schmenkel the title of Hero of the Soviet Union. "A movement is national," V. I. Lenin wrote, "if it expresses the objective needs of the entire country.... A movement is national, when it is supported by the sympathy of the tremendous majority of the population" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works, vol 22, p 283). The experience of the Great Patriotic War proved that the nationwide and mass nature of the struggle waged behind enemy lines was the result of the basic advantages over capitalism, internally inherent in socialism, something which, the final account, was profoundly legitimate.

The legitimacy of the struggle waged by the Soviet people in the territory occupied by the enemy also stemmed from the simple and clear comparison between the Soviet social and state system and the "New Order" which the fascists were trying to establish. The atrocities committed by them inspired even the most peaceful people to take up arms. However, the desire to seek revenge from the aggressors for the suffering they had caused the Soviet people was merely an additional factor in the development of the liberation struggle. Its main reasons were much deeper. They rested within the people themselves, raised by the communist party for nearly a quarter of a century in a spirit of Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism and, in Lenin's words, generating powerful economic and political reasons (see op. cit., vol 14, p 7).

One of the factors which decisively influenced the scope and effectiveness of the nationwide struggle behind enemy lines, naturally, was the victories won by the Soviet armed forces over the German-fascist hordes in the battles for Moscow and Stalingrad and in other large-scale operations. They inspired the fighting people, instilled new strength in the ranks of the partisans and clandestine workers and strengthened their confidence in the inevitable defeat of the fascist aggressor.

The initiatives of the people, who had great revolutionary and combat traditions, led to the creation of a great variety of forms of resistance, confirming the variety of ways and means of participation by the Soviet people in the war. Thousands of party members remained behind enemy lines. Guided by the party's programmatic stipulations, formulated in most important documents, such as the 29 June 1941 USSR Sovnarkom and VKP(b) Central Committee directive and the 18 July 1941 VKP(b) Central Committee decree "On Organizing the Struggle in the Rear of the German Forces," they did a tremendous amount of organizational and political work among the occupied population, raised the multimillion-strong masses to the sacred struggle against the aggressors and gave it a historically unparalleled strength and organization.

The partisan movement--the open-armed struggle--was the most controllable and efficient form of the nationwide struggle behind enemy lines.

A form of armed struggle, such as partisan warfare, was already familiar to the history of our country. It had been used as early as the beginning of the 17th century in the war against the Polish and Swedish interventionists, in the 1812 patriotic war and during the 1918-1920 civil war and military intervention. However, the partisan movement assumed a particularly wide scope during the Great Patriotic War. Partisans operated everywhere: in the mountains of the Caucasus and the Carpathians, in the steppes of the Ukraine and Kalmykiya, in the forests of Karelia, Bryansk and Belorussia, in the in the Crimean catacombs, in the Don flats and in the polar tundra. The total number of participants in the partisan movement in the Great Patriotic War exceeded 1.1 million people. It was the most widespread in Belorussia, the Ukraine, Moldavia, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and in the krays and areas of the RSFSR occupied by the Hitlerites.

## II

In guiding the organizational structure of the partisan formations, the party committees followed Lenin's instructions to the effect that the combat forces of the people require a simple organization with maximal flexibility and mobility (see op. cit., vol 13, p 322).

However, the practical implementation of the most efficient methods for the organization of the guerrilla movement was no easy matter, and experience in covert and flexible struggle came gradually. At the start of the war a great deal here was spontaneous. However, soon afterwards the detachment became the basic combat organizational unit. It consisted of combat groups, platoons, squads or companies. Their number fluctuated from several dozen to several hundred men. A large number of small, highly maneuverable partisan

detachments, operating within a vast territory, proved invulnerable to the enemy, for he was unable to make efficient use of heavy weaponry and combat equipment against them.

Directing the dispersed partisan detachments was no simple matter. Their actions had to be coordinated, and as early as the end of 1941 a new form of organization of partisan forces--formations--was developed under different names, such as brigades, divisions and corps. Their size ranged from several hundred to several thousand men.

Usually, the detachments within the formations were based at great distances from each other and carried out their assignments both independently and through combined efforts, under joint command. This considerably enhanced the combat possibilities of partisan formations and made the systematic and operative control of their work possible. Throughout the war more than 6,000 partisan detachments operated behind enemy lines, many of which were part of large formations. Thus, during the enemy occupation of Belorussia, 1,255 partisan detachments were organized; 997 detachments were part of 213 brigades.

Let us point out clearly and unequivocally that the people who joined the partisan detachments were not mobilized, as some bourgeois historians claim today, but joined voluntarily, answering the call of their hearts and their feeling of duty to the homeland. In frequent cases the detachments included husbands and wives, fathers and children and entire families.

The partisan movement operated on the basis of strict army regulations. All partisans swore an oath of allegiance. The detachments had strong party and Komsomol organizations which cemented the ranks of the partisans. The partisan formations were headed by commanders and commissars who included many secretaries of party and Komsomol committees. In their work they relied on the staffs as management bodies and, since 1943, officer and general ranks were instituted in the partisan formations.

Unarmed partisan reserves were set up in cities and settlements under partisan control. During the war they numbered more than 1.5 million people. Under the guidance of experienced instructors, the reservists were trained in guerrilla tactics. They guarded the settlements recaptured by the partisans from the Hitlerites, engaged in reconnaissance and participated in sabotage actions. If necessary, they joined the combat units.

Some of the military specialists--the command and political personnel, radio men, scouts and saboteurs were trained in special schools behind Soviet lines. During the war some 30,000 such people were trained. The Soviet rear supplied the partisans with weapons, ammunition, mines and explosives. All of this turned the partisan movement into a major strategic force which could provide substantial aid to the Soviet army in its struggle at the front against the German-fascist forces.

During the different stages of the war the activities of the partisans were based on the special party and Soviet government decrees and the orders of the supreme commander in chief. Particularly important was J. V. Stalin's 3 July

1941 speech and the 5 September 1942 order of the People's Commissar for Defense "On the Tasks of the Partisan Movement," which called for improving the interaction between partisans and the Red Army and earmarked the basic trends of partisan activities: disrupting the work of the enemy's transportation system and troop control, destroying manpower, material facilities and weaponry, and engaging in reconnaissance.

Supreme Command Headquarters provided the overall strategic leadership of the partisan armed struggle. The direct leadership of the combat activities of all partisans was assigned to the Central Staff of the Partisan Movement (TsShPD) at headquarters, under the command of Lt Gen P. K. Ponomarenko, CP(b) of Belorussia Central Committee first secretary. The headquarters established contact with the partisan formations, directed and coordinated their activities, summed up and disseminated experience in partisan warfare, trained cadres, supplied the partisans with weapons, ammunition and medicines and organized their interaction with the Soviet forces. The TsShPD resolved these problems under the direct leadership of the VKP(b) Central Committee and general headquarters and, from September to November 1942, of Marshal of the Soviet Union K. Ye. Voroshilov, VKP(b) Central Committee Politburo member, in close contact with the general staff which controlled the party bodies in republics, krays and oblasts, and the military councils of fronts and armies, with the help of the republic and oblast (front) partisan movement staffs under his command from the operative viewpoint. They were headed by secretaries or members of the central committees of communist parties of republics, and VKP(b) kraykoms and obkoms.

In planning its operations, the Soviet command always took into consideration the partisan formations operating behind enemy lines. Like the regular forces, they were issued specific combat assignments. Through their actions the partisans substantially contributed to the success of the various operations.

The partisans caused the greatest harm to the enemy by striking at his communications, the railroads in particular. For the first time in the history of war they were able to carry out a number of large operations which, in terms of results, were of operative-strategic significance. One of them was the famous "Railroad Track War," which took place from 3 August to 15 September 1943. Based on a single plan formulated by the central staff of the partisan movement under the Supreme Command Headquarters, virtually all partisan formations undertook the destruction of railroad tracks.

To the enemy, the results of the "Railroad Track War" were overwhelming. In analyzing the situation in the rear, at the peak of the "Railroad Track War," in his 31 August report, the commander of the rear of the German Armies Center wrote that this was the first time in which an operation of unparalleled scope had taken place to sabotage transportation through the systematic and sudden destruction of railroad communications. In a single month the number of cases of sabotage increased by a factor of 30. By 15 September the partisans had destroyed about 215,000 tracks, or the equivalent of 1,342 kilometers of a single-track railroad. In some directions traffic was delayed between 3 and 15 days and along the main railroad lines of Mogilev-Krichev, Polotsk-Dvinsk and Mogilev-Zhlobin, the railroads remain idle

during the entire month of August of 1943. At the same time rolling stock and other enemy targets were destroyed. For example, during the "Railroad Track War" the Belorussian partisans blew up 836 trains, including three armored trains, wrecked 690 steam locomotive engines, destroyed 184 railroad bridges and 556 bridges on unpaved and paved roads. It was only a flexible and well-organized command system that could ensure a strike of such power over such a vast territory (about 1,000 kilometers along the front and 750 kilometers in depth) within predetermined time span when, subsequent to their defeat in the battle for Kursk, the Hitlerites were engaged in the intensive regrouping of their forces.

The political work of the party members on occupied territory and the combat activeness of the partisans, relying on the help of the population, contributed to recapturing entire areas from the enemy, which were held by the partisans for substantial periods of time. Such areas appeared as early as the winter of 1941. By the summer of 1943, one-sixth of this territory (more than 200,000 square kilometers) behind the lines of the German-fascist troops was already under the control of Soviets partisans. The enemy was able to keep his garrisons only in large settlements and along basic communication lines. In the partisan-held Bryansk, Smolensk, Kursk, Leningrad and Kalinin oblasts and in Belorussia about 4 million people lived under Soviet law and traditions and worked for victory. Soviet authorities operated in the partisan-held areas kolkhozes, local industry enterprises and schools. Thus, in part of the Orel (today Bryansk) oblast, occupied by the Hitlerites, the mobilization of draftees was carried out and 15,000 of them were taken across the front line for Red Army service. The population of the partisan area in Leningrad Oblast collected 2,375 poods of grain and gruel, 750 poods of fat or a total of more than 3,500 poods of food products and, under the protection of the partisans, hauled this freight into besieged Leningrad on 233 carts .

This was the rear of the partisan army. Warehouses, airfields and landing strips for use by aircraft transporting freight from the "big land" were located on the territory held by the partisans; there were hospitals to treat the wounded and the sick, cadres of scouts, saboteurs and other specialists were trained at so-called "forest courses." It was here that partisan reserves were set up, training for further campaigns, and reinforcements were added to the active units and formations.

Partisan reconnaissance activities were of great importance to the Red Army command. They were able to gather exceptionally important information. For example, partisan reconnaissance helped the Soviet command to find out about preparations for the summer (1943) offensive by German-fascist forces in the area of the Kursk Salient, based on the plan for Operation Citadel, identify the place of Hitler's field headquarters in the Vinnitsa area and warn on time the Soviet government that the Hitlerites were planning an attempt on the lives of the heads of the allied powers during the Teheran conference.

Raids deep within enemy lines aimed at broadening the scale of the patriotic struggle waged by the Soviet people and disorganizing the enemy rear played a major role. In the course of such raids, political work was conducted among the population, the local partisans were supplied with weapons and communications facilities, important enemy military and economic targets were

destroyed and new forces became involved in the armed struggle. In the summer of 1943, carrying out an assignment issued by the strategic command, a formation commanded by S. A. Kovpak fought its way across 13 Belorussian and Ukrainian oblasts, reaching the Hungarian border and hit the Drogobych oil fields. In the course of the raid the Kovpak forces destroyed enemy manpower, blew up train echelons and bridges, and told the population the truth about the victories of the Red Army. Detachments and formations commanded by V. A. Andreyev, I. N. Banov, P. P. Vershigor, A. V. German, I. A. Grigorev, S. V. Grishin, F. F. Kapusta, Ya. I. Melnik, Ya. A. Mukhin, M. I. Naumov, N. A. Prokopyuk, A. V. Romanov, A. N. Saburov, V. P. Samson, A. F. Fedorov, A. K. Flegontov, M. I. Shukayev and others became particularly famous for their daring raids.

During the war the partisans destroyed, captured or wounded more than 1 million fascists and their accomplices. They destroyed more than 20,000 enemy echelons, blew up 58 armored trains, destroyed more than 10,000 steam locomotive engines, blew up 12,000 bridges, 1,600 of which were railroad bridges, and destroyed 65,000 motor vehicles and 1,100 aircraft.

The Hitlerite command was forced to use as much as 10 percent of its regular forces (in addition to guards and police) in the fight against the partisans. The skillful and decisive partisan actions instilled in the fascists fear of the unavoidable retribution and reduced the combat readiness and striking power of the enemy armed forces. The German General Guderian wrote that "as the war became protracted and the battles on the front became increasingly stubborn, guerrilla warfare became a real scourge, strongly affecting the morale of front troops."

### III

The defeating by the population of the military, political and economic measures taken by the occupation authorities was the most widespread form of popular struggle against the Hitlerite aggressors, involving the participation of millions of people. This struggle was waged by all available means. At the risk of their own life and that of their families, for any violation of the orders of the occupation authorities was punished by death, the Soviet people avoided both work and mobilization. According to the East Economic Command 22 May 1943 report to Land Forces Headquarters, about 1.6 million able-bodied people had avoided mobilization and work assignments. In one of his 1943 reports, the director of economics and finance of the "Estonian Self-Administration," pointed out that as many as 50 percent of the workers in Tallin systematically failed to show up for work and that anti-German feelings among them were increasing. At the beginning of 1943 only 5 percent of the peasants assigned to cutting wood in Avinurmeskiy Volost (Estonia) were showing up to work.

Workers, peasants and intellectuals wrecked equipment in mines, plants and factories, destroyed various types of property, raw material and foodstuffs, and idled at work. As a result, many enterprises in the Donbass, Dnepropetrovsk, Krivoy Rog, Odessa, Riga, Kaunas, Minsk, Smolensk, Bryansk, Orel and other cities and industrial areas remained idle. In the Ukraine, for example, the Hitlerites were able to operate no more than 0.02 percent of the

prewar number of enterprises. In the Donbass, as a result of sabotage and subversion, throughout the occupation maximal coal extraction did not exceed 7 percent of the prewar volume. All of this forced the occupation forces to meet their own needs for coal by shipping to Donbass coal extracted in Upper Silesia. In the areas of the USSR they had "conquered," the Hitlerites were able to attain slightly more than one-sixth of the planned norm for timber, about 28 percent of the planned amount of grain and an insignificant quantity of metal and fuel. As a result of partisan activities a minimum of 120 million tons of plundered property could not be shipped out. All of this clearly reflects the scale at which the plundering activities of the occupation forces were wrecked. Despite fierce terror and mass reprisals, the fascists were unable to put to their own service the economy of the occupied areas in the USSR.

The Hitlerites also failed in their effort to involve the population in various profascist parties and associations, with the help of which they hoped to consolidate the "New Order" on occupied Soviet territory, as they had done in countries with a different social system. They found no social support among the Soviet people. The fascists were able to recruit only the riffraff of the White Guard emigres and some turncoats, such as kulaks and other anti-Soviets, criminals and bourgeois nationalists. However, these elements found no support whatsoever among the people and could not take even a single step without being protected by the bayonets of the aggressors. Thus, for example, the dyed-in-the-wool spy anti-Soviet Kaminskiy, the Oberburgmeister of Lokotskiy Okrug, who tried to found a "Russian National Socialist Party" consisting of Russian people, in one of the rayons in Orel Oblast, kept for his protection a battalion of soldiers after the partisans had killed his predecessor, the traitor Voskoboynik. In Belorussia, Soviet patriots routed an "Alliance of Belorussian Youth," which was the embryo of a youth profascist organization. With few exceptions, its leaders, recruited from the vestiges of hostile class elements, were captured by partisans and clandestine workers and eliminated. A similar fate reached other fascist puppets. No psychological diversions were able to eradicate from the minds of the Soviet people the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and their support of the Soviet socialist system. After the war this was acknowledged also by bourgeois political leaders hardly suspected of being sympathetic to our country. For example, both Eden and Churchill said that only in the Soviet Union had Hitler been unable to create a "fifth column" or find even a single Quisling on temporarily occupied territory.

The territorial underground as well became a very efficient form of struggle against the aggressors. The letter of instructions issued by the Orel VKP(b) obkom to the party committees stipulated, among others, that "in addition to underground party and Komsomol organizations and along with them, mass clandestine antifascist organizations consisting of nonparty patriots are being created. We recommend the creation of youth, women's, worker, peasant and other organizations. As a rule, such organizations are to be headed by party members." Similar instructions were issued by other party committees as well. Their practical implementation significantly broadened the base of the nationwide struggle behind enemy lines.

The structure of the territorial underground may be judged by the following data. The "Clandestine-Subversion Organization imeni K. Ye. Voroshilov," which operated in Kirovograd (Ukrainian SSR) numbered 1,300 people, 84 of whom were party members, 175 members of the Komsomol and 1,041 nonparty members. The nonparty patriots were also in the majority in the clandestine "Committee for Assistance to the Red Army" Organization in Mogilev (Belorussian SSR). The Kiev clandestine workers used 140 safe houses in their work and had 98 active messengers, primarily women. More than 1,000 rifles, 133,000 cartridges, 2,500 hand grenades, 214 pistols and more than 500 kilograms of explosives were sent from Kiev to the partisan detachments. The clandestine workers saved about 8,000 Soviet people from being sent to Germany. They printed more than 1 million antifascist leaflets and distributed among the population more than 173,000 copies of newspapers and a large number of other antifascist publications.

The clandestine workers in Minsk displayed unparalleled courage and resolve. During the occupation they mounted 1,500 acts of subversion. Wilhelm Kube, a favorite of the Fuehrer's, the Hitlerite deputy for Belorussia, arrived in Minsk in August 1941. Terrible crimes began to be committed under his leadership. Entire villages were set on fire together with their population, thousands of civilians and prisoners of war were killed and gallows appeared everywhere. Kube frequently repeated to his accomplices: "The very mention of my name must make every Russian and Belorussian shudder and his mind freeze at the sound of the name 'Wilhelm Kube'." During the night of 21 September 1943, by decision of the TsShPD and the clandestine CP of Belorussian Central Committee, this executioner was put to death at his own residence. Germany declared a mourning period. This thoroughly planned and risky operation was carried out by clandestine worker Yelena Mazanik, with the active participation of N. Drozd, M. Osipova and N. Troyan and with the help of partisans from the Dima Brigade (N. P. Fedorov commander, Kh. A. Khatagov commissar).

The work of the clandestine workers was hard and dangerous. Many of them died the death of martyrs in Gestapo prisons. However, fascist terror did not break the fighters' will to resist. Those who fell were replaced, and the struggle went on. We are familiar with the exploits of the young clandestine organization "Young Avengers" in Obol settlement, Vitebsk Oblast. The Hitlerites were able to locate and detain Z. M. Portnova, a young partisan. During her interrogation by the Gestapo, she grabbed from the table the pistol of the fascist executioner and killed two Hitlerites, but died as well.

The immortal exploits of clandestine organizations, such as "The Young Guards" in Krasnodon, "Partisan Spark" in Odessa Oblast, the Lyudinovskaya Clandestine Komsomol Group in Orel Oblast, and clandestine workers in Minsk, Kiev, Mogilev, Odessa, Vitebsk, the Dnepropetrovsk, Simferopol, Sevastopol, Smolensk, Kaunas, Riga, Petrozavodsk, Pskov, Gomel, Orsha and many other cities and settlements will never be forgotten. All in all, more than 220,000 patriots fought with the territorial underground during the period of struggle against fascism.

Clandestine cells were set up even in the Hitlerite "death camps," where prisoners of war were detained. Their members conducted explanatory work,

kept the prisoners' spirits up and prepared and led uprisings and organized escapes.

A train with prisoners arrived at one of the secret bases on Usetom Island, where the fascists were testing the V-1 and V-2 missiles and the latest aircraft models, in 1944. One of them was Soviet flier M. P. Devyatayev. Soon afterwards, a group of prisoners of war made a daring escape under his leadership, crossing the front line in an enemy bomber they had captured. The airplane landed in the lines of the 61st army. The Soviet soldiers who had run up to the airplane were overwhelmed. Ten thin and exhausted people, looking like skeletons in their striped clothing, wearing wooden shoes, covered with blood and dirt were crying, repeating the single word "Brothers, brothers." They were lifted up and carried like children to the unit, for each one of them weighed less than 40 kilograms.

During the war, operating on temporarily occupied Soviet territory, at different periods the clandestine CP of the Ukraine Central Committee and the clandestine CP of Belorussian Central Committee, 90 clandestine obkoms, oblast party centers, okruzhkoms and interraykom and interrayon party centers, 620 gorkoms, rayon party centers, rayon party groups, uyezd committees and volost party committees and hundreds of party organizations were active. The Komsomol underground dedicatedly fought under their leadership. Based on the instructions of the communist party and the Soviet government, the party clandestine organizations provided ideological-political and organizational leadership in all forms of struggle waged by the people behind enemy lines. Based on Lenin's concept that the partisan movement "must be consistent with the main means of struggle" (op. cit., vol 14, p 9), the VKP(b) Central Committee demanded of the party organizations to organize the work in such a way that the struggle in the enemy rear provide direct, extensive and heroic support to the Red Army fighting German fascism at the front.

The local leading party workers studied the situation, gave practical assistance and summed up the experience in the activities of partisans and clandestine workers. The party committees operating on nonoccupied territory did a great deal of fruitful work in guiding the clandestine and partisan movements. The following dealt with problems of organizing the struggle behind enemy lines within the central committees of communist parties of union republics: Belorussia: M. V. Zimyanin, P. Z. Kalinin, V. N. Malin and P. K. Ponomarenko; the Ukraine: D. S. Korotchenko, and N. S. Khrushchev; Latvia: Ya. E. Kalnberzin; Lithuania: A. Ye. Snehkus; and Estonia: N. G. Karotamm. In the kraykoms and obkoms such work was carried out by A. A. Zhdanov (Leningrad), I. P. Boytsov (Kalinin), P. I. Seleznev (Krasnodar), A. P. Matveyev (Orel), D. M. Popov (Smolensk), M. A. Suslov (Stavropol) and others.

The people's struggle, which developed during the Great Patriotic War behind enemy lines, combined nationwide tasks of defending the homeland from the German-fascist aggressors with international tasks of the liberation of other enslaved peoples from the Hitlerite yoke.

The Soviet people actively participated in the antifascist struggle of the European nations. As early as 1944, some of the most combat-tempered detachments and formations shifted combat operations beyond our homeland and

actively participated in the struggle waged by the patriotic forces in Southeastern and Central Europe. The Soviet Union supplied them with weapons, ammunitions and various types of equipment; it trained for them cadres of organizers of the clandestine and partisan movements. More than 40,000 Soviet citizens fought in the resistance movement in France, Italy, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Greece and other countries. These were basically prisoners of war who had escaped from fascist death camps. In all detachments and in clandestine work they fought the enemy with dedication and proved themselves true internationalists. M. Guseyn-Zade in Yugoslavia, F. A. Poletayev in Italy and V. V. Porik in France immortalized their names and became national heroes of these countries.

The nationwide struggle behind enemy lines was an important structural component of the Great Patriotic War. It developed into a historically unparalleled social movement of millions of people fighting in defense of the freedom and independence of the socialist homeland. The courageous actions of the Soviet people against the fascist aggressors behind their lines were a real force which actively helped the Red Army. Relying on the broad and firm social foundation of victorious socialism, the struggle waged by the Soviet people was aimed at defending its gains and was supported by all population strata in the country. Never before in the history of mankind had there been such a war in which the interests of the people, the state and the ruling party had blended to such an extent as in the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union. Thousands of participants in the partisan movement and the clandestine struggle were awarded orders and metals for heroism and bravery; 249 of them were awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union; S. A. Kovpak and A. F. Fedorov were awarded this high title twice.

The nationwide struggle which developed behind the lines of the German-fascist aggressors was one of the important factors in the universal-historical victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War. It proved to the entire world the unity and invincibility of the Soviet people and their boundless loyalty to their socialist fatherland.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17

## BATTLEFRONT MEDICAL PERSONNEL

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85) pp 76-85

[Article by Article by Col Gen of the Medical Service, USSR Academy of Medical Sciences Academician Ye. Smirnov, Hero of Socialist Labor]

[Text] World history is unfamiliar with any trials more severe than those which befell our people in the Great Patriotic War. Tremendous courage and truly gigantic efforts were demanded of every Soviet person, at the front or in the rear, to cope with these trials, to withstand the pressure of a strong and treacherous enemy and to defeat him.

It would be difficult to overestimate the tremendous contribution which Soviet medical personnel made to the Great Victory. Infinitely loyal to the homeland and the lofty ideals of humanism, like all our people and their valorous armed forces, from the very first day of the piratical attack mounted by Hitlerite Germany, they took up the defense of the fatherland. Sparing no effort, they fought for saving the most precious possession of man--his life and his health.

The war, in the course of which two opposite social systems clashed--the first socialist state in history, which embodied the best expectations and hopes of progressive mankind, and fascist Germany, the strike force of international reaction, which brought mankind death, suffering and destruction--was distinguished by its uncompromising nature. On the Soviet-German front the struggle was waged to the death and was accompanied by unparalleled human losses.

The merit of the Soviet medical service is that at the cost of incredible efforts of physicians, secondary and junior medical personnel and thanks to their professional skill, hundreds of thousands of our troops were saved from death. During the war more than 72 percent of the wounded and 90.6 percent of sick soldiers and officers were returned to the ranks from the hospitals. No military medicine of any other country has ever been able to achieve such a success, equal in terms of importance and size to winning major strategic battles.

War has always been accompanied by irreplaceable and replaceable (medical) losses. Their uneven appearance at different times in military units, large

units and formations has been and remains one of the characteristic features of combat medical losses. This led the great Russian surgeon N. I. Pirogov, an active participant in the defense of Sevastopol in 1854-1855, to describe war as a "trauma epidemic."

Another characteristic feature of combat casualties has been their sharp increase in the 20th century, during the world wars. The reason is obvious: the development of production forces. As early as 1878, F. Engels wrote that "nothing depends more on economic conditions than the army and navy. Armaments, structure, organization, tactics and strategy depend above all on the level of production and means of communication reached at the given moment" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 20, p 171).

This Marxist concept was clearly manifested in the two world wars. The first broke out when the warring parties still had no tanks and the number of airplanes was small. World War II began when military technology and aviation had reached a level of development such that extent of their maneuverability, mobility and firepower, had radically changed the nature of combat operations. Whereas in World War I static defense and army-level operations predominated, during the second war static defense became the exception against the background of maneuvering front-line and strategic operations. This led to a sharp increase in the number of people killed, wounded or concussed. As a result, the health service which used to take care of combat casualties, now became one of the main sources of reinforcement of the active army.

In the wars which were fought in Europe between 1805 and 1914, the total number of people who were killed or died from their wounds or diseases is estimated at some 1.5 million. In slightly over 4 years in World War I, 9.5 million died and more than 20 million were wounded. World War II took the lives of 50 to 55 million people. No information exists to this day concerning the number of wounded or concussed, although it is huge.

As a structural component of the country's health care, military health care is also an inseparable part of the army. Its organization must be consistent with that of the armed forces, the land forces above all, which account for the absolute majority of combat losses. In the tsarist army an infantry division included a first-aid detachment and two field mobile hospitals of 210 beds each. The all-army force had no medical institutions.

Because of the irregular nature of combat casualties at different times and the improper system of subordination of divisional field mobile hospitals, the majority of combat casualties could not receive prompt and skilled medical aid. As a result, the mortality and disability rates among the wounded, concussed and sick was high, while the percentage of people returned to the ranks was extremely low. That is why, essentially, the medical service of the tsarist army was not a source of reinforcement of the army in the field, although it could have been.

A new type of health care, based on the nature of the socialist system, began to be developed with the victory of the Great October in our country. However, the military-medical leadership of the new Worker and Peasant Red Army, essentially retained for a number of years the previous system of

organization of the medical service. This is understandable, for in order to win a war one must rely on military science. That is why V. I. Lenin deemed it necessary to make use initially of the officers and generals of the tsarist army. This affected the military medical service as well. From way back divisions had had mobile field hospitals. Naturally, both medical personnel and commanders objected to their removal. This situation remained unchanged for a number of years. When the results of the battles fought on the Khalkhin-Gol River in Mongolia and during the military conflict with Finland, were summed up, the leadership of the Military Medical Administration of the RKKA [Worker and Peasant Red Army] deemed it necessary to submit for discussion at a conference which was held in April 1940 the changes which, in its view, should be made in the mobilization plan for the organizational structure of the medical service. This was dictated by the desire to make it consistent with the flexible nature of combat operations, a fact which was confirmed with particular clarity when fascist Germany attacked Poland.

A number of suggestions were discussed on how to perfect the medical service and, in particular, on replacing physicians with feldshers in battalions under regimental and divisional command, withdrawing from the divisions and assigning to the medical services of armies and fronts the mobile field hospitals, developing in the rear areas of armies and fronts special hospitals for the light casualties, based on polyclinical instead of in-hospital treatment, organizing the institution of chief specialists in the center and at the fronts, army specialists in the armies and inspector-specialists in the evacuation centers of the fronts and the combined-army forces and in some local evacuation centers, with a view to attaining a higher scientific and medical standard of management of medical institutions by physicians. Another problem which was discussed was that of combining reinforced groups as a single reinforced medical company, consisting of surgeons and nurses specializing in various fields, with corresponding mobile systems for surgical instruments and medicines. These groups were to be assigned to the mobile field hospitals under army-level jurisdiction in the course of combat operations.

In discussing the army in the field and its reserve formations, we must not underestimate hygiene and medical-anti-epidemiological support of combat operations, for otherwise epidemics are inevitable, epidemic typhus, relapsing fever and typhoid fever in particular. In themselves, epidemics are not the inevitable companions of war. Occasionally, they are the result of the ignorance of individual officials concerning problems of general and, specifically, military hygiene and epidemiology. That is what makes competence, persistence and initiative on the part of the leaders of the corresponding bodies and the availability of organizational and material possibilities of taking prompt mass preventive measures so important. It is no accident that at the April 1940 conference the crucial problem of the need to let the military medical service take over bathing and laundry washing was raised: in the course of combat operations washing for the sake of cleanliness and for the prevention of epidemics are one and the same.

The treacherous attack launched by fascist Germany on the Soviet Union was done under conditions which put our army at a disadvantage. The military units, large units and formations attacked by Hitlerite military units joined

the battle unaware of the number of tank, motorized and aviation groups of enemy forces and the directions of the main strikes. Under the existing circumstances, the only correct decision available to the country's higher political and military leadership was to undertake the creation of a large active army; the forces of the first echelon and the large units and formations were to convert to a strategic defense according to the mobilization plan, wearing down the enemy and slowing down the rate of advance within the country of his tank, motorized and aviation armadas; war industry enterprises were to be dismantled and evacuated along with their workers and engineering and technical personnel, design bureaus, scientific research institutes and VUZs out of the areas of possible occupation, to the Urals, Western Siberia, Kazakhstan and Central Asia. This also pertained to garrison and evacuation hospitals with their personnel and their wounded and sick soldiers and officers.

During the battle for Smolensk, the Hitlerite military command realized for the first time that the reliance on the "blitzkrieg," which had justified itself in enslaving the Western European countries, was beginning to malfunction on Soviet soil. The rate of advance of the Hitlerite forces dropped sharply, above all toward Moscow, where they were soon forced to convert to defense.

The combat operations of our troops were of a stubborn, a fiercely defensive nature and entailed heavy combat casualties. While providing medical support for the combat operations and organizing medical establishments, the Military Medical Administration kept daily count of incoming wounded and sick and, accordingly, directed military medical trains to the fronts and individual armies to evacuate casualties.

The inadequate military training of many of those who headed the medical service of large units and formations and the clinical experience of the leading personnel of treating physicians, who worked under the conditions of the active army was revealed the very first year. This prevented them from knowledgeably managing many of the medical establishments essentially staffed by nonspecialized general practitioners. On 25 November 1942 the State Defense Committee passed a decree on the establishment of three departments at the Military Medical Academy imeni S. M. Kirov: command medical, treatment-prophylactic and for training army physicians. The number of surgical, therapy and infectious mobile field hospitals, hospitals for the treatment of light casualties as well as motorized medical companies and medical aviation squadrons and aviation regiments increased. By March 1944 there were more than 3,400 hospitals with more than 1.5 million beds.

The mobile field hospitals, which had been removed from the infantry divisions before the war, the organization of hospitals for the treatment of light casualties and the field therapy hospitals, which were set up toward the end of 1942, enabled the military medical service successfully to provide graded treatment of battlefield casualties, from the army-level rear area to the rear area of the country. It was precisely these measures which made it possible to move mobile hospitals, to prevent the overcrowding of some and the idling of others and to return to the ranks millions of healed wounded and sick soldiers. Toward the end of the second year of the war, the absolute majority

of soldiers and officers in the active army had been frequently hospitalized for wounds or illnesses. Let us emphasize that already by that time 85 of each 100 healed patients were returned to the lines from army and front zone hospitals.

The counteroffensive mounted by our troops at Moscow and the subsequent general winter offensive indicated that epidemic typhus was raging in the areas liberated from fascist occupation. The real threat of an epidemic in the army arose. The struggle against epidemics among the population was assumed by the Military Medical Service. A GKO [State Defense Committee], decree which called for the establishment of a number of medical-anti-epidemiological, bathing and bathing-disinfection establishments, was passed in March 1942.

Between 1942 and 1944 the anti-epidemiological service investigated 32,650 settlements. More than 10,000 sick people were sent to mobile field infectious-disease hospitals and 1.4 million people received medical treatment.

During the war, the medical-epidemiological service continued to gather strength. By July 1943 it already 322 field laundry detachments, 12 field mechanized laundries, 22 bath-laundry disinfection and 69 bath-disinfection trains, 162 mobile field bath detachments and 103 washing-disinfection companies.

It was precisely thanks to the purposeful and systematic activities of this service which, both during and after the war had remained in the background, that no single case of recurrent typhoid fever, which frequently occurs along with typhus, was registered in the active army.

The sick accounted for 34 percent of casualties in the active army. The remaining 66 percent consisted of wounded, and concussion and burn cases. No more than 9 percent of the sick suffered from epidemic diseases, including 2.7 percent from epidemic typhus. Furthermore, only 25 percent of cases of epidemic typhus were in the active army; the remaining 75 percent were among garrisoned troops. As a result of epidemics control in the troops and the treatment of all infectious cases in army and front zones, without evacuating them to the rear, the active army was not a source of spreading of epidemic diseases in the country, as had been the case in all previous wars, including World War I and the civil war. This was one of the most important achievements of the Soviet Military Medical Service.

The VKP(b) Central Committee, the State Defense Committee and the USSR Sovnarkom showed constant concern for providing medical support to the combat operations of the troops, and the treatment of wounded and sick soldiers and officers. Political departments at the front line, and at triage and some local evacuation centers were set up in August 1941. This contributed to the more specific and purposeful leadership of party-political work in hospitals. Such work was carried out not only with hospital personnel but the wounded and sick as well.

In accordance with Central Committee instructions, by 11 August 1941 resolution the Main Political Administration of the RKKA had formulated the main trends and features of similar work in medical institutions. Prime attention was paid to enhancing the responsibility of party members for carrying out their official and party duty and strengthening their influence on the personnel of medical units and establishments with a view to ensuring high-quality treatment and care for the wounded and sick troops and for displaying a concerned and sensitive attitude toward them. All of this contributed to their quickest possible return to the ranks.

Unfortunately, however, it frequently happened that the casualties withdrew within themselves and lost faith in their own strength and in medicine. This occurred mainly as a result of the loss of upper or lower extremities and, particularly, in cases of injuries to the mouth. In such cases, proper and careful treatment was insufficient. Warm words said at the proper time, which could distract the people from their depressing thoughts, became vitally necessary. A good mood is the best assistant in treatment. That is why, during the war the medical personnel had to master basic psychology. According to psychologists, emotions always include an element of a personal, an emotional perception of a given situation. It was particularly urgent for the medical workers, the nurses above all, to realize this in wartime, for it was precisely the nurses who were mostly in touch with the patients and who, through their dedicated work, made a substantial contribution to saving hundreds of thousands of people and returning them to life, work and their families.

A diorama is one of the exhibits at the Military Medical Museum of the USSR Ministry of Defense in Leningrad. It shows one aspect of the front-line life of Mobile Surgical Field Hospital No 689 during the battle for Stalingrad. An enemy bomb dropped on the dugout where the surgical ward was located. Many people were killed, wounded or suffered from concussion. Immediately, Military Physician 2nd Rank D. A. Krivonos and his assistant, Military Physician 3rd Rank O. N. Panchenko, began to organize a second surgical ward under an old abandoned fishing barge. Despite uninterrupted artillery shelling, one surgery followed another.

The best qualities of Soviet military medical personnel and their truly heroic efforts to save the lives of Red Army troops can be seen, as though in a focus in the activities of the 689th Mobile Field Hospital during the battle for Stalingrad. The hospital went "underground" in Akhtuby, on the left bank of the Volga. It was set up in deep shelters. The enemy was confident that the fall of Stalingrad was imminent. Airplanes were bombing the left bank as well, where targets of military importance were located. The fascist Wehrmacht included medical establishments among them.

Following is a description of the then-prevailing situation, given by V. I. Chuykov, commander of the 62nd Army, based on the daily communiques and reports of the army medical service: "13 September 1942. Yesterday and today the evacuation of the wounded was hindered in particular by the excessive activities of enemy aviation.... 30 September. Repeated efforts by armored launches to reach the shore on the night of 28 September failed. During the night Mobile Field Hospital No 689 was the target of strong mortar fire; there

were casualties. At the same time, in the same area the 112th Medical Battalion suffered severe losses from direct bomb hits on the dressing station. Casualties are being assessed. Our work in the area of operations of the 62nd Army is accompanied by daily losses of medical personnel...."

The medical service on the armed forces and army levels worked not only under the fire of mortars and artillery but enemy submachine gunners as well. Under such circumstances, one cannot speak of individual cases of heroism, daring and courage. Mass heroism and mass courage shown by medical personnel, particularly in the 62nd Army, were displayed at Stalingrad. The most difficult part of the work of the army medical service, Chuykov goes on to point out, was the evacuation of the wounded across the Volga. Many troops and commanders of the 62nd Army remember Mariya Maksimovna Vilyamidova, a physician with Batyuk's division. She was physician on duty in charge of the ferrying point on the right bank of the Volga for more than 100 days. She treated thousands of wounds under fire and shelling. Mariya Maksimovna was frequently seen on Mamayev Kurgan, where she went to help the wounded in her division. Vilyamidova was awarded the orders of the Fatherland Front 2nd Class and the Red Star for her courage and daring.

The commander of the 62nd Army had many warm words to say in his memoirs for the medical personnel. He proudly writes about military physicians and nurses, their fearlessness, firmness, courage and daring. They displayed all of these qualities in the struggle for saving the lives of soldiers and officers suffering from wounds and concussions in the course of the stubborn blood-shedding battles. For example, Chuykov praises Military Physician 2nd Rank Serdyuk and his heroic behavior and firm leadership in rescuing boats on fire, in transporting wounded to be loaded on the armored launches of the Volga Military Flotilla.

High professional skill and dedication which demanded total efforts were the characteristic of the Soviet surgeons who practiced the main medical profession in the Great Patriotic War. Before the war, however, many of them had never even held a scalpel. In one year--from July 1941 to July 1942--more than 43,000 physicians were drafted in the active army, many of whom had no more than 4 years of training. The absolute majority of them worked essentially as surgeons in medical battalions and mobile field hospitals. The war turned out to be a school for the accelerated training of specialists, surgeons in particular.

One of the reasons which led to the creation of an institution of chief specialists was precisely the shortage of specialist physicians and the need to train them in practical work, as well as the importance of the equal distribution of experienced surgeons among medical battalions and army and front-level hospitals. Particular attention was paid to the appointment of chief hospital surgeons, about whom many articles and books have been written.

I would like to mention here three of them, who played and continue to play an important role in the development of Soviet medical science. Their brief biographical sketches conceal true military exploits in saving the life and health of thousands of people.

M. I. Kuzin, today a member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, is head of the chair of surgery at the First Moscow Order of Lenin Medical Institute imeni I. M. Sechernov, and director of the Institute of Surgery imeni A. V. Vishnevskiy. He graduated from the Military Medical Academy imeni S. M. Kirov in 1940 and was assigned to the active army at the outbreak of the Great Patriotic War. He worked as commander of the surgery-dressing station squad of the medical battalion of an infantry division. He displayed inordinate ability as a surgeon and organizer and was appointed head surgeon of the mobile field hospital. After completing an advance course he became head of the neurosurgical ward of the evacuation hospital under front jurisdiction. He fought on the Northwestern, Second Baltic and Transbaykal fronts. He is the bearer of a number of combat orders for heroic labor in providing skilled and specialized surgical aid to wounded soldiers and officers in offensive operations.

N. M. Amosov, today Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences member, is corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, director of the Kiev Scientific Research Cardiovascular Surgery Institute and head of the biocybernetics department, Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Cybernetics. Throughout the war he was head surgeon of the mobile field hospital on the Western, Bryansk, and First, Second and Third Belorussian Fronts and the First Far Eastern Front. His military exploit in treating wounded soldiers and officers has been noted with a number of combat orders.

V. I. Struchkov, today USSR Academy of Medical Sciences member, is head of the chair of general surgery at the First Moscow Order of Lenin Medical Institute imeni I. M. Sechenov. He was called to the active army at the outbreak of the Great Patriotic War and appointed head surgeon in a medical battalion. As a trained surgeon with organizational ability, he was soon appointed army surgeon in which position he completed his military service. He is the bearer of high government awards for dedicated work during the war.

These surgeons, as well as hundreds of their comrades, showed good theoretical knowledge and splendid organizational talent under most difficult combat conditions and gained tremendous practical experience which they immediately shared with their colleagues. Under field conditions, the training of physicians and medical personnel had to be carried out both by showing and telling. Under the conditions of offensive operations, which went on for weeks on end and, frequently, months, skill was needed to organize the work of physicians and nurses, particularly in surgery, involving intensive work but also requiring mandatory daily rest. Impeccable discipline and efficient organization of the work, particularly in triage, and cool-headedness and proper organization of surgical teams were a prerequisite for the efficient activities of hospitals.

The chief specialists were in charge of performing scientific-organizational and methodical duties. They included the most outstanding representatives of domestic medicine, such as N. N. Burdenko, chief surgeon of the Red Army, his deputies S. S. Girgolav, V. N. Shamov and V. S. Levit and chief surgeon Yu. Dzhanelidze. Nor can we fail to mention the names of the chief surgeons of the various fronts, such as P. A. Kupriyanov, M. N. Akhutin, N. N. Yelanskiy, S. I. Banaytis, V. I. Popov, A. A. Vishnevskiy, A. I. Arutyunov,

I. A. Krivorotov and I. N. Ishchenko, as well as the chief specialists in the individual medical branches, outstanding experts and excellent organizers M. S. Vovsi, P. I. Yegorov, V. Kh. Vasilenko, B. V. Ilinskiy and E. M. Gelshteyn (therapy), L. A. Orbeli, N. N. Anichkov, A. N. Chistovich, M. F. Glazunov, A. V. Smolyannikov, N. A. Krayevskiy and A. P. Avtsyn (physiology and pathological anatomy), S. N. Davidenkov and S. V. Golman (neuropathology), N. N. Timofeyev (psychiatry), G. G. Kulikovskiy (ear, nose and throat pathology), F. G. Krotkov (military hygiene), T. Ye. Boldyrev, T. T. Pozyvaya, K. F. Akinfiyev, I. F. Akimikhin and I. I. Yelkin (epidemiology and bathing and laundry) and others. Honor and glory to their exploits!

Unquestionably, the medical personnel who, under combat conditions, risking their lives every minute, hastened to the help of wounded troops, deserve the most profound gratitude for their military work. A tremendous number of war veterans and members of their families recall to this day with warmth and gratitude company medics and medical instructors. Crawling from one wounded to another on the battlefield, they gave first aid, the most valuable and, frequently, the most decisive, to the wounded. It is no accident that the highest mortality rate during the war was among medical personnel of this category, even exceeding that of the infantry.

The medics who evacuated the wounded from the battlefield were in less danger. However, their work was even harder and more exhausting. As the first envoys of the thousands-strong army of medical personnel, who fought for the life and recovery of the combat and work capability of the wounded and the sick, with their very appearance the medics instilled in the heavy casualties faith in their rescue.

Marshal Chuykov impressively described exploits of medic T. Shmakova who, displaying amazing cunning and skill, was able to help the wounded even under the heaviest machine gun and mortar fire. "How many lives did Tamara Shmakova save!" the army commander exclaims. The Military Council of the 62nd Army presented awards to more than 1,000 women soldiers for heroic exploits. They include member of the medical service M. Ulyanova, who was a member of the fearless and firm garrison which fought in the great "Home of Pavlov" from the beginning to the end of the battles; V. Bakhomova, who evacuated from the battlefield more than 100 wounded; N. Koltsova, who was awarded two orders of the Red Banner for her courage; L. Nesterenko, who was killed holding a bandage in her hands, alongside a comrade wounded in battle. In concluding his description of the heroism of the medics, Army Commander Chuykov emphasizes that essentially they were in the front end of the struggle against the enemy. Their dedication helped the 62nd Army to carry out its combat assignment. The situation at the other war fronts was the same.

The title Hero of the Soviet Union has been awarded to many company medics, medical instructors, stretcher bearers, and feldshers of battalion medical centers, who accomplished heroic exploits in combat. Let me name a few of them.

During fierce and bloody battles in the area of the Severskiy Donets River, V. Gnarovskaya, medical instructor at the 907th Infantry Regiment, 244th Infantry Division, gave first aid to more than 300 troops and officers. In

the battles for the city of Dolina she evacuated 47 wounded. On 23 September 1943, concentrating a considerable number of tanks on a narrow sector, the enemy mounted a counteroffensive, breached our defense and emerged in the area where the wounded had been gathered. Fighting to save them, Gnarovskaya grabbed a bundle of hand grenades and threw them under a tank. A second enemy tank was stopped with an antitank gun. The wounded were saved but the woman soldier died the death of the brave. She was awarded posthumously the title of Hero of the Soviet Union.

By ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, dated 10 January 1944, medical service Lieutenant Feldsher N. Kopytenkov and, posthumously, Feldsher F. Pushina were awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union. On 6 November 1943 the medical unit of the 520th Infantry Regiment, 167th Infantry Division, in which they served, was deployed in Svyatoshino village, near Kiev. Fierce battles were being fought for the right bank of the Dnepr and there were incoming wounded day and night. Early in the morning enemy aircraft began to bomb Svyatoshino. A bomb fell on the building where there were wounded. A fire broke out. The heavy casualties and the sick were in mortal danger. Kopytenkov and Pushina started to remove the people away from the raging flames. The building crumbled just when Kopytenkov was pulling out the last casualty--his comrade Pushina. Severely hit in the head, her entire body burned, she had already lost consciousness. Despite his severe burns, Kopytenkov recovered. He was severely wounded again in 1944 but, after recovering, he returned to the front.

During the battle for Kursk, Lieutenant A. Zubkov, who was in command of stretcher bearers, gave medical aid to 35 heavy casualties and, regardless of fascist counterattacks, transported them to a sheltered area and then to the regimental medical center. In the course of the Soviet army offensive on Rylsk, Zubkov skillfully organized the rescue of the wounded and their evacuation across the Seym River. He personally evacuated from the battlefield and transported to the far shore 28 heavy casualties. Although wounded himself, he remained in the ranks. In the battles for the Dnepr, under enemy fire Zubkov was among the first to reach the right bank. In the battles for retaining the bridgehead, for 5 days and nights, he provided medical aid to casualties and defended them against the pressing Hitlerites. Rafts were assembled to evacuate the wounded to the left bank and some 200 casualties were evacuated in several crossings. A. Zubkov was awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union for his inventiveness, courage and daring shown in pulling heavy casualties from the battlefield and evacuating them. An enemy bullet put an end to the hero's life in March 1945, in the battle for the liberation of Poland.

Z. Mareseva, medical instructor with the 214th Infantry Regiment, 73rd Infantry Division, received her baptism of fire at the walls of Stalingrad. In August 1943, in the battles for crossing the Severskiy Donetsk River, she pulled out and evacuated to the other bank 67 wounded soldiers and officers. An enemy mine blew up not far from the boat during one of the trips. Guards Senior Sergeant Mareseva threw herself over the wounded commander and was herself severely wounded and, 3 days later, died in the hospital. Her combat comrades buried Mareseva with military honors in Pyatnitskiy Village, Kursk

Oblast. By ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, dated 22 February 1944, she was posthumously awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union.

The grateful remembrance of this 20-year-old girl and of the thousands of medical workers who had dedicated themselves to the sacred cause of rescuing wounded soldiers is a structural component of the historical memory of the people. Their heroic actions for the sake of saving the life of others will never be forgotten.

The personnel of medical workers in squads and companies, infantry battalions and regiments included a large number of women. The author of this article has frequently had the opportunity to observe their dedicated and heroic toil. Practicality, calm and absence of panic under fire could not fail to instill confidence in the fact that they could surmount all difficulties and not only withstand everything but, alongside their brothers, husbands and fathers, who fought arms in hands at the fronts of the Great Patriotic War, crush the enemy who had encroached on the honor and independence of the Soviet fatherland.

There is a similarity between their accomplishments and L. N. Tolstoy's "Sevastopol Stories." He wrote: "The main, the pleasing conviction which you brought is the conviction of the impossibility...of weakening the strength of the Russian people anywhere. You were able to see this impossibility...in the eyes, speech and manners of what is known as the spirit of the defenders of Sevastopol. What they are doing they are doing so simply, so calmly and forcibly that you are convinced that they can do a hundred times more...that they can do anything. You realize that the feeling which makes them work is neither one of pettiness, vaingloriousness or forgetfulness...but another feeling, a more powerful one.... It is a feeling which rarely comes to the surface, which Russians are shy about but which is found in the depths of everyone's soul--love for the homeland."

The new, Soviet patriotism intensified such feelings, this ability for self-sacrifice, a hundred times; it inspired millions of people to commit exploits in the defense and salvation of the socialist fatherland. It was this that ensured the success of the nationwide struggle against the treacherous and strong enemy and became the foundation of our victory.

Displaying tremendous courage and inflexible will and loyalty to their military and professional duty, the Soviet medical personnel made a significant contribution to the great victory over fascism. They brilliantly proved the advantages of the socialist organization of the medical service. A tremendous number of human lives were saved through their dedicated efforts. The work and exploits of the military medical personnel, like that of all the troops in our valorous armed forces, live and will continue to live in the hearts of grateful defendants and the new generations of Soviet people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17

## UNDER THE BANNER OF INTERNATIONALISM

### ABREAST OF THE TIMES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85) pp 86-97

[Article by Professor B. Leybzon, doctor of historical sciences; written on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the 7th Comintern Congress]

[Text] History has no simple answers to questions. Its answers are the result of the actions and struggles among various social and political forces.

Today, 50 years after the 7th Comintern Congress, which was held in July-August 1935, during a dramatic period in world history, the decisions it made in the interests of the working class and all toiling mankind are accepted as self-evident. Simple and clear, they defined the strategy and tactics of the international communist movement for many years into the future.

However, hiding behind the simplicity which distinguishes real truth, are tremendous mental efforts and political experience, a wise penetration in the complex happenstances of life and a manifestation of the power of Marxist-Leninist analysis and depth of methodology in their entire greatness.

Having withstood the pressure of the revolutionary wave which welled in October 1917, the capitalist world plunged into euphoria. The panic fear of the "abyss" over which Europe was hanging, was replaced by forecasts on the crisis-free development of capitalist society which had allegedly become organized. Rosy assessments were disseminated by statesmen, "theoretically" substantiated by bourgeois and social democratic ideologues. It was suggested to the broad toiling strata that capitalism was on an endless road to prosperity.

No particular concern was shown when the price of stocks began to drop on the New York Stock Exchange on 19 October 1929. However, very soon afterwards it became clear that the history of the capitalist world had never before experienced the type of devastating crisis which prevailed from 1929 to 1933.

The growing successes of the socialist country became particularly impressive against the background of the unparalleled disaster caused by capitalism. In the Soviet Union industrialization was rapidly advancing and age-old backwardness was being eliminated in a truly revolutionary manner.

It was as though history had deliberately organized a confrontation between two worlds and two systems. The period of the world economic crisis coincided with a period of upsurge in the economic and social development of the USSR and its rapid advance. The revolutionizing influence of the achievements of socialism on the entire world was increasing.

The specific situation was such that, given the developing circumstances, not all capitalist countries were interested in war, although not one of them was pursuing a policy of peace. At that time, for example, the United States was not setting itself immediate goals of conquest. A postponement of military conflicts and gaining time to strengthen its positions were consistent with its expansionistic interests. England, which was trying to preserve its colonial hegemony, was not interested in starting a war. France, which was consolidating its positions in Europe after World War I, favored maintaining the status quo.

The ruling circles of these countries agreed on one thing: they would have liked to destroy the socialist country. However, they preferred that this be accomplished by someone else.

The main threat of war stemmed from fascist Germany and militaristic Japan, which were openly calling for war on the Soviet Union and doing everything possible to set up a bloc of reactionary states for the sake of achieving their aggressive purposes.

Therefore, the struggle against the warmongers was not developing into a struggle against imperialism "in general" but demanded the concentration of forces against Germany and Japan. They were the main sources of military danger, threatening above all the Soviet Union and the national independence of many peoples in Europe and Asia.

Although the other imperialist countries were doing a great deal to support and encourage countries eager to plunge into aggression, the fact that imperialism was as yet unable to set up its united front offered certain opportunities and prospects.

In formulating the revolutionary strategy and tactics in the struggle against war, the 7th Congress took into consideration the need to bear in mind the contradictions between imperialist countries. V. I. Lenin's words on the mandatory and most skillful use of "any, albeit the least 'crack' among enemies, any conflict of interest among the bourgeoisies of different countries..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 41, p 55) were loudly sounded in the report submitted by P. Togliatti "On the Tasks of the Communist International in Connection with Imperialist Preparations for a New World War," delivered at the congress. Delegates to the congress recalled that when the Anglo-French coalition offered the Soviet republic a military agreement in May 1918, it had been rejected by the Bolshevik Party Central Committee for considerations not of principle but political expediency, considering that such an agreement would not be useful in the then-prevailing circumstances.

"Without rejecting in the least a military agreement with one imperialist coalition against another," Lenin wrote then, "in cases in which such an agreement, without violating the foundations of the Soviet system, could strengthen the latter's position and block the pressure which an imperialist country may apply on it, at the present time we cannot enter into a military agreement with the Anglo-French coalition" (op. cit., vol 36, p 323).

Naturally, at the time of the proceedings of the 7th Comintern Congress one could hardly predict the precise manner in which the "conflict of interests" would appear in the future in the bourgeois camp. Today, however, after the defeat of fascist Germany by the anti-Hitlerite coalition, which united the socialist state with capitalist states, the prophetic power of Lenin's words becomes particularly clear. During those worrisome years, the Soviet Union was considered by many workers not only a beacon but also a fortress, on the power and reliability of which one could rely. This attitude toward the socialist country was not shared by communists alone. Anyone who was against war looked hopefully at the USSR. Thanks to its consistent policy of peace, the Soviet Union, as the resolution passed at the 7th Comintern Congress stipulated, "had become the center of gravity not only for class-conscious workers but for all working people in the capitalist and colonial countries, who wanted peace."

The ratio of forces between the two systems--socialism and capitalism--became such an influential factor that it was only by taking it into consideration that all phenomena which were taking place in the world could be accurately assessed. This became a most important methodological concept which was reflected in all the documents adopted at the 7th Congress.

Capitalism sought in war the outcome of aggravated contradictions within its system; it sought the solution in redividing the world and destroying the socialist state. "No one can doubt," P. Togliatti said in his report, "that a future war, even if it is a war between two great imperialist powers or a war between a great power and a small country, would inevitably show a tendency to develop and will inevitably turn into a war against the Soviet Union."

The threat of war in the world increased. Strictly speaking, the armed struggle for the division of the world had already begun. The seizure of Manchuria by Japan and its advance in northern China, Italy's attack on Ethiopia and the immediate danger threatening Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland and other Central European countries, confirmed that the time of outbreak of a global conflagration was approaching. The communists predicted the rising threat of war.

The 7th Congress aspired to achieve what Lenin had in mind when he wrote that "our job is to learn how to understand the present" (op. cit., vol 14, p 26). It was necessary to understand the features of the specific situation in the complex interweaving of events, many of which were unexpected. Mere references to "imperialism" could not explain occurrences, for the interests of imperialism itself could change and it is able to resort to a variety of means of self-preservation, aggression and confrontation against the people's masses, depending on circumstances.

We know the way Lenin spoke against abusing the concept of "imperialism," cautioning that "forgetting the characteristic nature of political and strategic correlations and harping opportunely or inopportunely on the memorized word 'imperialism' is no Marxism at all" (op. cit., vol 30, p 102).

The approach taken by the 7th Congress in formulating slogans based on the specific study of a specific situation, is of permanent methodological significance. For the first time in the history of the international communist movement the conclusion was heard that war should not be considered a fatal inevitability, that the struggle for peace is not futile and, given the changed ratio of forces, "even in most difficult times it is not hopeless."

The communists had always been principle-minded supporters of peace. However, it was only the 7th Comintern Congress that raised the slogan of the struggle for peace as being central. The Comintern had not considered doing this earlier possible, for after World War I it was the peace of Versailles that was known as "peace," a peace against which the communist parties were fighting, unwilling to create the impression that albeit, indirectly, they were supporting the system it had established. After the Versailles Treaty had actually collapsed little remained of it, the communist parties gained the possibility of assigning a central role in their activities to the struggle for peace. This struggle was not in the nature of general propaganda only. It was directed above all against the main warmongers and against specific steps taken to prepare the war, against militarism and rearmament, against increased military expenditures, etc.

A rejection of the fatal inevitability of war, which gave confidence and purposefulness to the struggle for peace, did not mean in the least that the inevitability of peace was guaranteed, particularly considering the developing situation. Therefore, the congress paid attention to the problems which could arise should the war nevertheless break out. The task of the communist parties in countries which could become targets of aggression was redefined in an entirely new way. To them such a war assumed the nature of national liberation, although shortly before that it was still believed that the time for such wars in Europe was over. The communist parties in countries in which the prospect of a national liberation war was turning into reality were oriented toward taking daring steps in the struggle for democratization of the armed forces and involving working young people in voluntary organizations offering military training. This was different from the stipulations of the 6th Congress, which had considered such work inadmissible. The circumstances had changed, however, and the communists, displaying flexibility and abandoning yesterday's slogans, were finding new accurate solutions consistent with the times.

This is merely one of numerous examples of the extent to which the communists had mastered the art of taking into consideration the changes in circumstances and accurately assessing the new political situation which demanded a fast and sharp turn in strategy and tactics.

This art remains an invaluable wealth which the current generation of communists try to multiply. Naturally, however, the antiwar policy formulated at the 7th Congress could be used today to a certain extent as it applies to the antiwar struggle. That which the congress stipulated should war break out is today of historical interest only.

A nuclear war, should it break out, would be catastrophic for mankind. Therefore, today it is virtually impossible to separate efforts to prevent a war from efforts during the war itself. All efforts must be focused on the struggle for the salvation of mankind from the threat of destruction. In the 50 years which have passed after the 7th Congress the situation in the world has changed so strikingly that no comparison is possible between the forces which could oppose war then and now. Whereas in the mid-1930s the communist movement had merely approached the conclusion that an outbreak of war is not fatal, today it is imbued with the deep conviction that this greatest threat can be prevented and is doing a great deal as part of the common stream of those who fight for the implementation of this sacred task.

The approaching war was unparalleled in history. It was being unleashed by fascism, which had appeared as the answer of the most reactionary bourgeois circles to the upsurge in the revolutionary movement during the post-October period and as an aspiration to outstrip the development of revolutionary events.

Distinguished by its extreme demagogy, speculating on the needs and hardships of the masses, and using the bitterness of declassed elements, who had had their lives shattered, and of the ruined petite bourgeoisie, fascism quickly established a mass social base. Supported by the monopolies, and profiting from the political near-sightedness and pliancy of some social democratic leaders, fascism rapidly gathered strength. The 7th Congress rated the German-type fascism as the most reactionary of its varieties. Hitler's advent to power meant a dangerous turn in the development not only of Europe but of world history and the increased threat of war. Willi Brandt, the president of the German Social Democratic Party, believes (there is a great deal of truth in it) that the moment the Nazis were allowed to come to power, "in that sense World War II began as early as January 1933."

As G. Dimitrov said in his speech at the 7th Comintern Congress, entitled "The Advent of Fascism and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle for the Unity of the Working Class and Against Fascism," "the advent of fascism to power is not an ordinary change of bourgeois governments but a change of one governmental form of bourgeois class rule--bourgeois democracy--with another form--open terrorist dictatorship."

Fascism displayed savage anticommunism. Its racist and chauvinist ideology justified any crime or pogrom, refined torture and mass murder.

The communists realized on time the threat which fascism presented to mankind. For a number of years, at Comintern congresses and plenums of its Executive Committee, the understanding of the nature of fascism intensified; erroneous views on fascism, which had appeared also within the ranks of the communist movement but which were particularly popular among some social democrats and

the liberal bourgeoisie, were surmounted. It was becoming increasingly clear that one should not confuse the nature of fascism with its social base. The nature of this base did not convert national socialism in the least into a petit bourgeois movement, as some believed. Equally, the name "National-Socialist German Workers Party," which had been adopted by the Hitlerites, had nothing in common either with the labor movement or with socialism. Now that the archives of the German monopolies have become accessible, one can easily see that none other than monopoly capital nurtured fascism and turned it into its own weapon, that fascism was raised as the "fist of the international counterrevolution." Half a century ago, however, this demanded sharp class intuition and clear theoretical thinking to see behind the plastered facade of demagogic phraseology the true nature of fascism as a phenomenon, and to give it an accurate scientific definition which could be used as a manual for action in the struggle against this new dangerous enemy.

The 7th Comintern Congress approved the definition of fascism, which had already been formulated by then (13th IKKI [Communist International Executive Committee] Plenum, November-December 1933), proving that fascism in power means open terrorist dictatorship by the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialistic elements of financial capital. G. Dimitrov emphasized at the congress that the development of fascism and fascist dictatorship itself are assuming different forms in different countries, depending on historical, social and economic conditions, national features and the international status of the individual countries.

A great deal has changed in the world since that congress. A great many new developments have occurred in the history of fascism. In particular, a fascist variety, such as military fascist has appeared in Latin America. A tremendous number of works have been written on fascism, including some by Marxists. However, the definition which was accepted by the mid-1930s remains valid. It has withstood the test of time and, furthermore, today it is used by the communist movement. This does not mean in the least any support for the old formulas but an indication that fascism and the numerous varieties of neofascism appearing in various countries are neither an accidental nor a circumstantial phenomenon. They are a natural process which covers an entire historical period. It was identified by the Marxists at a time when imperialism was feeling much more confident than it does today.

Lenin wrote about the two methods of bourgeois rule. If the ruling class does not feel its power directly threatened, it willingly resorts to democratic methods of government. Should the threat to its rule increase, the bourgeoisie rejects the democratic cover and converts to methods of direct naked violence. That is why, as was clearly stipulated at the congress, fascism is an indication of bourgeois weakness rather than strength. A turn to fascist methods is proof that at that moment and in that country the bourgeoisie is no longer able to rule as it has.

The reviving of neofascist organizations in West Germany, France, England and other countries today is an indicator of the profound crisis experienced by the capitalist political system. The open encouragement of the fascist regimes in Latin America or neofascist organizations in the FRG by the United States proves not only the profoundly reactionary nature of the present

American administration but also its lack of confidence and the desire of the U.S. military-industrial complex to gain the support of fascist and profascist forces abroad.

However, as a means of strengthening bourgeois rule and by trampling on bourgeois democracy, fascism inevitably creates conditions which accelerate its own doom. Although it strikes mainly at the working class and the toiling masses, it cannot stop there but goes on, persecuting the other strata related to bourgeois democracy. It tries to destroy the communist party above all. However, it also deals with the social democrats and the bourgeois parties. This creates grounds on which sociopolitical forces can find a common language, although they may be substantially different from each other yet, in the face of the common enemy, capable of uniting, and subordinating that which divides them to that which brings them together.

The political wisdom of the international communist movement was manifested in the fact that it was able to see these new opportunities and to formulate a theoretically substantiated strategy for progress.

The 7th Congress called for securing the type of extensive unification of the forces of all working people in the struggle against the onslaught of capital and reaction and against fascism and war, never before found in the history of the struggle waged by the working class. In emphasizing the significance of the unification of antifascist forces, in his concluding speech at the congress G. Dimitrov said: "We did not produce this task out of thin air. It was formulated by the very experience of the global labor movement."

The initial experience was that of France. The failure of the attempt made by the fascist organizations in Paris, in February 1934, to seize the power proved the great force of proletarian unity. The routing of the fascist putsch was achieved thanks to the fact that the communist party was able to have the workers take to the streets regardless of their political orientation. The struggle against fascism became the base for the unification of heterogeneous forces. In a number of cities communists and socialists began to act jointly. Yielding to pressure from below, the socialist leadership accepted the proposal of a pact of unity with the communists in the struggle against fascism. In the autumn of 1934 the French communists made public the program for the creation of a popular front.

Although the French experience stood out because of its scope and daring, it was not exclusive. The increasing danger of fascism encouraged the search for means to unify forces which could oppose it. The Spanish Communist Party successfully worked along the same line. The working people in that country not only set a heroic example but proved the full possibility of waging a successful struggle against fascism. A pact of unity of action between communists and socialists was concluded in Italy in August 1934. The lessons from the events of the beginning of 1934 in Austria, where the fascists had gained the upper hand despite the armed resistance of the workers, were an indication of the severe consequences of the refusal by the reformist leadership to engage in decisive antifascist actions. At the same time, however, the Austrian events brought to light the antifascist militant energy of the masses. The need for the unification of forces on an antifascist basis

was being increasingly felt in Greece, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and many other countries. New experience was being acquired. Experience in itself, however, does not mean a great deal. Theoretically interpreted and substantiated, however, it can truly enrich political strategy with a clear political perspective. The courageous struggle waged by G. Dimitrov, who had fallen into fascist hands but who was able to turn the trial against him into the trial of fascism, was of tremendous mobilizing importance. The campaign in his defense assumed unparalleled scope. Mass meetings and demonstrations took place in many countries. The communist parties were able to involve in antifascist actions, in connection with the trial, a great variety of heterogeneous population strata, which gave the struggle the nature of a broad united front. G. Dimitrov's duel with his accusers showed to the entire world the heroic image of an inflexible communist fighter, firmly loyal to his ideals and able to defend them and to prove their great spiritual power. The trial, which ended with Dimitrov's victory, earned the communists the sympathy of many people the world over, including that of noted representatives of the progressive intelligentsia.

On the eve of the 7th Comintern Congress, intensive creative work was under way in the leading organs of the International on the formulation of the new line. It involved the participation of representatives of the VKP(b) and the French, Italian, Spanish and other communist parties with whom G. Dimitrov and other noted personalities of the international communist movement, directly related to the new practice of the struggle against fascism, cooperated closely, a line which was reflected in the congress's documents. The debates which developed confirmed that the new path could be opened only by surmounting a number of concepts which hindered finding scientifically substantiated answers to the questions raised by reality.

The 7th Comintern Congress entered the history of the international communist movement as an important turning point. It formulated and gave the movement a new orientation and imparted to it new strength and confidence in the struggle against fascism and war.

The ideas of a united workers front, formulated during the very first years of the Comintern with Lenin's most direct participation, reached a new level. In the past, a workers front was conceived in terms of the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat. Naturally, this objective inevitably limited the framework of such a unification only forces which were already prepared directly to struggle for worker power and socialism. The threat which fascism presented to the people's masses gave priority to the task of opposing all forms of the fascist onslaught, in defense of the gains and rights of the working people and against the abolishment of bourgeois democratic freedoms. Under the developed circumstances, it was necessary above all to struggle against fascism for the sake of the triumph of the historical objective of the communist parties--socialism. The question was not capitalism or socialism but fascism or democracy. This was the essence of the new strategic orientation of the international communist movement. The communists deemed it their task to struggle for the type of democracy which could take decisive steps against fascism and reaction, establish control over banks and industry and show concern for the interests of the working people. This made possible

a type of unity among popular forces, unparalleled in the history of the liberation movement. The 7th Congress called upon the communist parties to take precisely this way.

The processes which were taking place within the social democratic movement offered favorable prospects. The crisis, the advent of fascism in particular, the danger of which had been underestimated by many reformist leaders, had caused within their party ranks a certain differentiation and the desire to draw lessons from the errors which had been made. As early as 1933, K. Kautsky, the "patriarch" of the social democrats, published the pamphlet "New Programs," in which he acknowledge that critical feelings had become widespread. "A number of social democrats have withdrawn from the policy pursued by our party so far. They believe it to be erroneous and have rejected it. The social democrats must follow an entirely new path... This will inevitably result in the consideration and discussion of our principles and objectives."

Anticomunist prejudices were being rejected in a number of social democratic parties and the desire for cooperation with the communists and for working class unity of action was intensifying.

Such actions offered the possibility of achieving an even broader--antifascist, popular--unity.

The problems of the antifascist popular front were formulated by the congress profoundly and comprehensively, starting with the type of forces which should be included in the front and its tasks, and ending with a specific program for popular front governments and the possibility such a program offered as a transitional form to socialist changes.

The congress drafted a political line for the entire international communist movement. It summed up the experience acquired by all the parties and cautioned that the basic course which had been adopted should be pursued in accordance with the characteristics of the individual countries and the features of the changing situation. The experience of the popular front in France triggered tremendous interest in all communist parties and had a positive influence on their activities. However, efforts directly to duplicate this experience in other countries had not yielded the results achieved by the French communists. The congress's resolution on the accountability report on the activities of the IKKI spoke of the need for the "communist parties to make use both of their own experience and the experience of the global communist movement while avoiding any mechanical application of the experience of one country in another or replacing a specific Marxist analysis with stereotypes or general formulas.

The problems of the creation and development of a united anti-imperialist front in the colonies and semicolonies had their unique features. The broadest possible masses had to become involved by the communists in the national liberation movement, against cruel enslavement and for expelling the imperialists and acquiring national independence. The congress directed the communist parties toward active participation in mass anti-imperialist

movements, acting jointly with the other real forces, including the national reformists, on the basis of a specific anti-imperialist platform.

The new ideas formulated at the 7th Congress had a tremendous impact on the entire subsequent history of the international communist movement. The communists were guided by the congress's ideas before and during World War II in organizing the antifascist resistance and creating national and patriotic fronts. These ideas helped to find proper solutions during the period of people's democratic and socialist revolutions in Central and Eastern Europe and Asia. In the course of many postwar years the concepts formulated at the 7th Congress inspired the communists to engage in practical activities. They were a source of confidence in the efforts to find proper solutions. The methodological significance of the congress's theoretical ideas remains relevant to this day. However, the changes which are taking place in the world necessitate the finding of answers dictated by them. The threat of nuclear destruction affects not individual population strata but all mankind. It is on the common base of the struggle for its salvation that even most heterogeneous forces, which radically differ in their views on other problems, could establish unity of action. That is why a number of communist parties consider it their task steadily to expand mutual understanding and contacts with anyone who can make a contribution to safeguarding peace. The imperative of the time is such that the scope of such unity must be superior to the one indicated by the 7th Congress. The communists do not set their class position as a preliminary condition for joint action. They favor equal and loyal cooperation, giving preference in relations with other forces to features capable of uniting them.

In his concluding speech at the congress, G. Dimitrov referred to Marx, who said that "we must consider things as they are, i.e., we must defend revolutionary interests in a way consistent with changed circumstances" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 31, p 438). He emphasized that "this is the essence of the matter and this we must never forget."

In the mid-1930s the number of communist parties playing an increasingly noticeable role in the political life of the peoples of their countries and in the active solution of their vital problems grew. However, the transformation of the communist parties into a national force was hindered by the national nihilism which was quite widespread within the movement. It was believed that an interest in national features could harm their international nature. The 7th Comintern Congress most extensively proved the need for combining the national with the international. We, "communists," G. Dimitrov said in his speech, "are the irreconcilable principled opponents of bourgeois nationalism in all its varieties. However, we are not supporters of national nihilism...."

Referring to Lenin's famous article "On the National Pride of the Great Russians," which he wrote in 1914, Dimitrov recalled the way he himself, following Lenin's approach to the national factor at the Leipzig trial, had defended the national honor of the Bulgarian people, answering the Hitlerite efforts to depict the Bulgarians as barbarians: "I am proud to be the son of the heroic Bulgarian working class."

The struggle waged by the working class against the exploiters is also a struggle for the free and happy future of the nation: "A socialist revolution will mean the salvation of the nation and will open for it the way to a higher upsurge."

The duty of the communist parties to be well familiar with all important problems of the country's present and future and to consider themselves the heirs, the keepers of the entire progressive past of their peoples, able to defend this past from distortions and from efforts to adapt the history to the needs of the reactions, stems from the development of the communist parties as a national force.

Naturally, an interest in national problems is related to an understanding of the features of one's own country and its traditions and the search for forms of struggle and specific ways for the solution of common international problems.

This alone should influence the aspect of the communist parties and refute the slander that they are a foreign intrusion in the life of the nation, and to bring together the various population strata.

In the developing circumstances, the problem of the ties between the parties and the masses was comprehensively developed at the congress, starting with the fact that the party should be able to act independently, with initiative and flexibility, depending on the situation, to learn how to work in trade unions and mass organizations and to master the art of speaking with the people in a simple and clear language. The very type of the party workers, consistent with the demands of the time, was described at the congress, above all, as a type of revolutionary familiar with the needs and feelings of the masses, able to formulate specific suggestions and engage in practical activities for their implementation.

In order to promote the independence of the parties and their initiatives, the congress made it incumbent upon the Comintern Executive Committee to concentrate its activities on the formulation of the political and tactical concepts of the global labor movement and to avoid (as a rule) "direct intervention in the internal organizational affairs of the communist parties." The need for this was enhanced also by the fact that the approaching war could break the customary relations among communist parties which should be prepared to act isolated from the fraternal parties in other countries. The machinery of the IKKI was correspondingly restructured.

Subsequently, P. Togliatti and M. Thorez were to emphasize that this decision was based on considerations similar to those which had guided the Comintern in 1943 its decision to dissolve itself, thus granting the increased and strengthened communist parties total autonomy in managing their own affairs. The congress laid the beginning of the development of new forms of relations among communist parties, which would be more consistent with changing objective circumstances and the level of maturity reached by the communist movement. It was precisely then that the seeds were planted from which grew the present system of cooperation among fraternal parties.

Let us note in this connection that in debates on the meaning of internationalism, which is the most profound foundation for the communist movement, efforts are made to put against it firmly established principles, such as respect for the autonomy and equality of all parties, nonintervention in reciprocal domestic affairs, the strict independence of the parties and their complete autonomy in formulating their policies. Such contraposition is far-fetched. The contemporary view on proletarian internationalism organically includes these norms and principles as well, as reflected in the documents of the international communist movement.

It is entirely clear that the existence of a center of the international communist movement belongs to the past. With all due respect for this past, and giving the Comintern its proper due in the establishment of the revolutionary forces of our time, no Marxist-Leninist would suggest its restoration in any form.

Furthermore, as we know, the Comintern itself pursued a consistent and purposeful line of strengthening the independence of the communist parties, above all through strengthening their ties with the masses.

Sectarianism was dealt a crushing blow in the course of the proceedings of the 7th Congress. As described by G. Dimitrov, sectarianism was self-seeking, doctrinarily limited, alienated from the real life of the masses, operating on the basis of stereotypes and deeming the study of the lessons of life unnecessary.

The conditions in which the communist movement developed after the decline of the revolutionary upsurge largely explain the reasons for the popularization of sectarianism. Constant persecutions and endless provocations naturally forced the parties to become increasingly clandestine and be cautious in establishing relations. Those parties which acted legally were surrounded by misunderstanding and hostility and preferred to work among their supporters, which was easier than trying to attract on their side and to convince those who disagreed with them.

The objective and subjective reasons for sectarianism may explain its appearance without providing any justification whatsoever for the harm it brings. The exposure of sectarianism at the congress was both sharp and specific. The assessment of the social democratic movement as being "social fascism," according to which all social democrats were considered counterrevolutionaries, which had spread throughout the communist movement, was particularly criticized. Such a definition reflected the profound indignation at the fact that in a number of European countries, in Germany in particular, the treachery and cruelty of some social democratic leaders had thrown the labor movement back. Politically, however, it was harmful. It hindered the development of left-wing forces and supporters of unity within the social democratic movement and the policy of a united workers front. Also condemned was the concept of "class against class." Having appeared as a reaction to the policy of class cooperation pursued by the reformists, it too reflected the just indignation of the revolutionary workers. However, it did not contribute to the development of contacts with the nonproletarian toiling

strata and essentially worked against the broadening of class and political alliances.

The political strategy formulated at the 7th Congress could not be successfully implemented without the elimination of such and similar assessments (as, for example, that "the trade unions are a school of capitalism," that "the left-wing social democrats are more dangerous than the right," etc.).

In concentrating its strikes on left-wing dogmatism which, at that time, was the most current danger, the congress proved that it is as totally impossible to struggle against the extreme left by making concessions to right-wing opportunism as to surmount right-wing opportunism by sliding to the left. The representatives of a number of parties (England, Norway, Switzerland and others) acknowledged in their statements at the congress that their sectarian errors were caused by their fear of right-wing deviationism.

Meanwhile, the congress clearly realized that expanding the relations of communist parties and creating a broad antifascist front could increase the danger of right-wing opportunism. Successes in broadening the mass base were not to be achieved at the cost of losing one's own character or making ideological concessions.

Historical experience proves that in frequent cases the spreading of right-wing opportunism becomes a kind of price of dogmatic errors and of delaying the formulation of an accurate Marxist-Leninist line on imminent problems of the political struggle.

In exposing the harm and danger of left-wing sectarianism, the 7th Congress cautioned against having such a struggle lead to the development of right-wing opportunistic trends. "We want," G. Dimitrov said in concluding his speech, "comprehensively to intensify the struggle against all specific manifestations of right-wing opportunism, bearing in mind that the danger from that side will grow precisely as we pursue our mass policy and struggle."

An important lesson to be drawn in the struggle against all deviations from Marxism-Leninism, taught by the 7th Congress to the international communist movement, is the fact that the successful elimination of such deviations is possible only by developing and enriching revolutionary theory.

Dogmatic and obsolete concepts were not simply rejected and condemned by the congress. They were countered by a comprehensively thought-out concept which was a new contribution to the development of Marxist-Leninist theory. This concept was distinguished by its integrity and consistency and was the result of the theoretical interpretation of the changes which were taking place in the world and the enrichment of the experience gained by the international communist movement.

Contemporaneity presents the communists with many new difficult problems, the answers to which cannot be found ready-made even in the greatest possible Marxist-Leninist wealth accumulated by the communist movement. A daring and original development of many imminent problems is necessary. In this respect,

the contribution made by the 7th Congress to revolutionary science remains an unsurpassable model of combining loyalty to achievements with decisiveness in asserting the new without any concessions to dogmatism or right-wing opportunism.

The historical greatness of the 7th Congress is not only that it formulated a policy consistent with the needs of the period. It reinterpreted the entire previous experience of the international communist movement and saw in it that which had been underestimated or distorted (such as, for example, the slogan of a worker and a worker-peasant government) but which, actually, contained important elements for the future. The political contribution made by the 7th Congress loses none of its value even when its specific content turns out to be exhausted as a result of radical changes in the circumstances.

It would be pertinent to recall Goethe's wise words: historical flair is the feeling of a person who is so highly educated that in assessing contemporary achievements and qualities he also takes the past into consideration."

The resolutions of the 7th Comintern Congress remain alive today as well, living a new life, not in the least as memory but as part of the firm foundation of the new political line consistent with contemporary problems.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17

## VICTORY OVER FASCISM AND THE ARAB PEOPLES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85) pp 98-103

[Article by A. Vavilov]

[Text] "Let the national liberation struggle waged by the Arab peoples against imperialism, Zionism, fascism and aggression, and for peace, democracy and social progress broaden!" It was under this slogan that a scientific-political symposium on the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism was held in Damascus, the capital of the Syrian Arab Republic. It was sponsored by the editors of the journal AL-NAHJ, published by the Center for Socialist Studies in Arab Countries. It was attended by 28 delegations from communist and worker parties of Arab countries, Greece and Cyprus, the ruling Syrian Party of Arab Socialist Renaissance (Baath), the PLO, other detachments of the Arab national liberation movement and representatives of a number of socialist countries, including the Soviet Union.

The purpose of the Damascus meeting, as it was clearly defined by Yu. Feisal, Syrian Communist Party Central Committee deputy secretary general, was to show the inseparable link between the Great Victory won 40 years ago, current problems and the struggle waged against the forces of imperialism and reaction for the sake of peace and social progress, on the one hand, and the peaceable policy of the Soviet Union, on the other.

The participants in the meeting unanimously noted the decisive contribution of the Soviet Union and its heroic peoples to the victory over Hitlerite Germany and the tremendous significance of the great liberation mission of the Soviet army in the postwar destinies of the entire world.

The victory over fascism won by the Soviet people, the symposium noted, was the most important event of the 20th century next to the Great October Socialist Revolution. Many are those in the imperialist camp who would like to consider this victory only as the finale of even the greatest of wars. In reality, this victory is of tremendous and incomparably greater significance to all nations. It became a decisive landmark in the revolutionary and national liberation movements. It marked an important stage in the world revolutionary process as a whole. It was precisely then that the contemporary world socialist system was born. A new system of relations of fraternal

cooperation and mutual aid appeared as a counterbalance to the virtually indivisible system of domination and subordination in the realm of international relations. This victory marked not only the end of German fascism and Japanese militarism but also a major defeat of imperialism in general. Not only were peoples which had directly suffered from the aggressor freed from fascist slavery but the entire web of colonial relations and ties was torn. One of the most important results was the national independence attained by many nations.

The Soviet representatives who addressed the symposium, described in detail the unprecedented heroism of the Soviet people during the war and substantiated their claims that the main burden of the struggle against fascism fell on the Soviet Union. Hitler threw against the Soviet Union a force which appeared unbeatable. The Red Army was forced to counter the treacherous attack of a totally mobilized and combat-trained enemy army. The first period was bitter for the Soviet people. The Red Army was forced to retreat and there were those abroad who already assumed that the Soviet Union was on the verge of defeat. The opposite was proved by all subsequent events. In the initial period time was needed to strengthen the army, relocate industry and reorganize the national economy on a military footing, something which was brilliantly accomplished by the planned socialist economy. The initial victories were won as early as the end of 1941. Whereas the defeat of the German fascist forces at Moscow was the beginning of the end of Hitlerite Germany, Stalingrad marked a decisive turn in the course of World War II. This was the accomplishment of socialism, for no other social system could have endured such trials.

Why did the Soviet people win? Above all because they defended the gains of their revolution, they defended their own worker-peasant state, their system, their national dignity and their future. The moral and political spirit of the Soviet people was striking. Everyone was confident of victory. This confidence was the "secret Soviet weapon" which no reconnaissance could detect. The main weapons were the readiness of the people for exploit and their inner mobilization.

The Soviet Union lost 20 million people in the war and about one-third of the national wealth which had taken ages to create during the existence of the Russian state. The Soviet people know the price of peace, for which reason they are its consistent and active defenders. The most important right for which the Soviet Union is struggling is the right of man to life. The appeal "People, Be Vigilant!" is today more topical than ever before.

The results and lessons of the battle with fascism retain their viability and relevance to this day, noted A. Ahmar, Baath secretary general. The victory over fascism is a source of inspiration for the Arab national liberation movement in unifying its efforts for the sake of defeating imperialist and Zionist plans and reactionary intrigues and for the sake of guaranteeing the security, stability and durability of peace throughout the area and the entire world.

In discussing the results of World War II, A. Dirham, head of the Baath delegation at the seminar and member of its regional leadership, particularly

singled out their importance to the destinies of the Syrian people, who remember the Great Victory and honor the exploits which the peoples of the Soviet Union committed in order to achieve it.

The situation in the world has changed. Today not only the power of the land of the soviets, as was the case before the war, but the entire socialist community is standing on guard in protecting freedom and progress. This power, which is growing with every passing year, is effectively restraining imperialist and reactionary forces which are acting against peace and are trying to impose their domination and dictate on the peoples.

The historical victory of the Soviet Union in World War II is of permanent significance, F. Kerim, editor in chief of the journal AL-NAHJ said. The great transformations in the life of all mankind over the past decades are closely related to the defeat of the fascist military machine and to peace. The crushing of Hitlerite Germany lifted the threat of slavery and the fascist yoke threatening the people on earth. At the present time, however, the particularly dangerous legacy of the ideas of fascism and, occasionally, profascist political trends, which are openly manifested, still remain in the capitalist world.

The exploit of the peoples of the USSR is continuing to this day, embodied in their firm struggle against the threat of outbreak of a new war and in repelling the attempts of imperialism against peace the world over and the freedom of the peoples.

M. Kamel, member of the Egyptian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo, provided a detailed analysis of fascism and its origins. He pointed out the indivisible link between fascism and the monopoly bourgeoisie. The main purpose of fascism is to suppress the world revolutionary movement and all progressive and democratic forces. It is precisely for this reason that it tries to abolish parliamentary, democratic and bourgeois freedoms through terrorism.

For as long as imperialism exists, so does the possibility of the rebirth of fascism. We must take into consideration that fascism does not remain static. To a certain extent it adapts itself to historical conditions and the national characteristics of the individual countries. Indeed, new models of fascism appeared in postwar history, above all in Latin America. Yet, modern fascism has still not been studied adequately. Such studies must be made wherever it exists and of each one of its manifestations. This will enable us to select proper methods, tactics and strategy for the fight against it.

The participants in the symposium noted in their speeches the significant contribution made by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, including the Arab peoples, to the struggle against fascism. Millions of their best sons fought in the war against fascism and Nazism. In that struggle the interests of the peoples of said continents coincided with the interests and the struggle waged by the Soviet people and do to this day.

Great attention was paid to emphasizing the tremendous importance of the experience of the communist and worker parties and democratic movements in the

Arab countries in their struggle against fascism and in support of the Soviet people and the peoples of Europe and the entire world who fought for the sake of victory over Hitlerite Germany and its Axis allies in the name of peace, freedom and progress.

The final declaration, which was unanimously adopted by the participants, expresses profound gratitude to the Soviet people, who displayed unparalleled heroism and courage and who suffered tremendous casualties and losses in order to save mankind from enslavement and fascist domination. In our days, the declaration notes, as was the case 40 years ago, the Soviet Union is the bulwark of peace and security on the planet and in the vanguard of the struggle waged by the peoples for a peaceful and happy future. Today mankind has no task more important than that of safeguarding peace and fighting aggressive and hegemonistic imperialist policy.

The authors of the declaration call for the creation of the broadest possible universal antiwar front which should include anyone who wants the protection of mankind from the threat of elimination, regardless of ideological, political or religious differences.

A characteristic feature of the symposium's proceedings in Damascus was the close connection between the detailed study of the historical results of World War II and the consideration of the basic problems of the contemporary international situation.

The advent to power of the Reagan Administration in the United States means the domination of the most conservative wing of the monopoly bourgeoisie. The forces of the extreme reaction are trying to dictate their will on the global community. The American right would like to deprive socialism of the opportunity to display its inordinately extensive potential and advantages to the fullest extent. Lenin himself had noted this aspiration of the enemies of the revolution. Today they are unable to destroy the socialist system, for which reason they are trying to exhaust it with armament expenditures and to hinder the implementation of its humanistic development plans. They are doing everything possible to hinder the progress of mankind and gradually to wean the people from the idea of having a better future. They would like to deprive of a future those who are struggling for national and social liberation.

Capitalism is trying to heal its chronic ailments with the arms race. The development and manufacturing of ever new types of weapons are a kind of economic stimulation for maintaining high-level capitalist development. The point is that the arms race and the creation of increasingly refined systems of killing equipment created new needs. Such needs are false. No direct consumers of military output may be found among the simple people. However, such equipment has a customer: the ruling class, which thus can maintain the pace of economic growth. Such matters, which may seem clear, must be repeated again and again so that every person may become aware of them.

The delirious idea of global domination was buried 40 years ago. Today, however, it is being revived under different hypostases. Some governments are

ready to proclaim any part on earth a "zone of national interests," and to cover the planet with a network of military bases and strong points.

Preparations for war, as was pointed out at the seminar, are accompanied not only by an arms race but also by the indoctrination of public opinion. The people are being literally stupefied with the help of two worn-out propaganda cliches: the myth of the "Soviet military threat" and empty and totally groundless accusations that socialism is "violating human rights."

Does the threat of war stem from the USSR? No, it does not. What comes from the USSR is security. Our ideal is disarmament and the Soviet people are loyal to this Leninist behest, the CPSU delegation stated. This is confirmed by all foreign policy steps taken by the Soviet state after World War II.

It would be difficult merely to enumerate all suggestions formulated by the Soviet Union aimed at reducing and stopping the arms race. Mankind would greatly benefit, for example, had the proposal submitted by the Soviet Union as early as 1946 on banning nuclear weapons been accepted! What a tremendous amount of money could have been used for the peaceful development of backward countries. However, big capital invested such funds in the production of means of human destruction.

The greatest of lies on the Soviet military threat serves to conceal the steps taken by the United States and its allies towards increasing armaments.

What guarantees the fact that the victory won 40 years ago will not be lost to the Soviet people and the other peoples of the world? The balance of military power. The objective of the present American administration is to destroy this balance and achieve superiority. The Soviet Union will never allow the violation of this parity, as the United States has tried to do by deploying first-strike weapons in Western Europe.

Recent events have exposed even more fully the Pentagon's subversive plans. The so-called presidential strategic defense initiative, known as the "Star Wars" program, proves that the U.S. ruling circles now wish to disturb the military-strategic balance in space, clumsily justifying such a dangerous "initiative" by claiming that it allegedly involves no more than scientific research.

In his speech, Baath Deputy Secretary General A. Ahmar rated highly the peaceful policy pursued by the Soviet Union, which was confirmed and further developed at the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The peoples on earth, he emphasized, support the peace initiatives and constructive course charted by the CPSU.

The 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism, noted S. Saleh, member of the Yemen Socialist Party Central Committee Politburo, assumes profound historical significance under contemporary international conditions, when the struggle is intensifying between the forces of freedom, democracy, socialism and peace, on the one hand, and international imperialism, reaction, Zionism, and racism, on the other. Global imperialism was the perpetrator of two world

wars. Today as well, imperialism is a source of tension and wars and a threat to international security and peace.

Under such circumstances, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are in the vanguard of the struggle for the preservation and consolidation of peace. The members of the socialist system bear the main burden of opposing aggressive imperialist policy.

The Soviet peace program and the numerous peaceful initiatives of the USSR, the representative of the Yemen Socialist Party stated, are consistent with the interests of all mankind in its struggle for peace and of the national liberation, democratic and peace-loving forces. These forces have extensive opportunities for involving various social classes and strata and religious trends in the common struggle against the threat of war. An awareness by the broad masses of the danger of the outbreak of a world nuclear war and the importance of strengthening peace the world over is increasing throughout the world. In the final account, this will lead to the growth and spreading of the antiwar movement.

Those who think that nuclear war would not affect them and that they would be able to survive it are mistaken, S. Saleh said. An atom bomb makes no difference between believers and nonbelievers, Muslims and Christians or Jews, workers and capitalists, or big and large nations and ethnic groups. The result of a nuclear war would be the destruction of a human civilization which took many centuries to create.

Under these circumstances, the struggle waged by the progressive forces on earth for peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems, strengthening the United Nations and its bodies, and intensifying the role of the nonaligned movement and all regional and international organizations which favor peace becomes particularly important. We must decisively oppose attempts to equate the peaceable policy of the Soviet Union with the aggressive course of the United States. These attempts, the speaker stressed, are aimed at hindering the development of friendship and cooperation between the peoples and the Soviet Union in their joint struggle for peace.

We, the representative of the Yemen Socialist Party said, turn to all national liberation, democratic and peace-loving forces with the appeal to intensify their struggle for peace throughout the world and to make it the linchpin of all of our activities for the sake of social progress. We believe that the cause of peace and democracy will prevail.

M. Kamel, Egyptian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member, sharply condemned the efforts of some U.S. and Western European statesmen to distort historical facts and to desecrate the memory of those who fell in the battle against fascism, including Americans. The United States, he said, supports reactionary fascist dictatorships in various parts of the world, exerts gross pressure on independent countries, interferes in their domestic affairs and tries to suppress the national liberation struggle of the peoples.

F. Kerim, editor in chief of the journal AL-NAHJ, drew a parallel between the fascist plans for committing aggression against small countries with a view to

blackmailing neighboring states and the creation of bridgeheads for subsequent territorial gains, under the slogan of acquiring "Lebensraum for the Third Reich" and the aggressive plans and threats of the United States directed against small countries, near or far, which Washington has proclaimed areas of its "vital interests."

As though continuing this parallel, D. Naame, Syrian Communist Party Politburo member, spoke of the danger of the outbreak of local wars and the threat of their growth into a global armed conflict. This danger, he emphasized, is a real fact today. A negative or passive stance adopted by some states and individual political circles concerning the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, the speaker noted, essentially means an encouragement of the aggressive forces of our time and greatly reminds us of the prewar line pursued by the Western governments--their policy of concessions to and connivance with Nazism.

A number of other statements made at the symposium promoted the idea of the historical lessons gained in the struggle against fascism and the relevance of its experience.

A. Mahmud, member of the leading committee of the Bahrain National Liberation Front, emphasized the continuity in the policy of fascism and contemporary imperialism, which created the military NATO bloc under U.S. leadership and a number of other aggressive military blocs in the most important strategic parts of the world. Contemporary imperialism, the speaker noted, in order to conceal its courtse has borrowed from fascism the same worn-out slogans such as "resisting communist danger" and others.

H. Fahmi, the representative of the National Progressive (Left-Wing) Party of Egypt, highly rated the efforts of the Soviet Union for the preservation of peace the world over and for defeating all efforts at attaining military superiority to which Washington and its allies aspire. He pointed out that the peoples of the world and the progressive public are vigilant concerning the imperialist threat of imposing a nuclear war. Through joint efforts they can force the U.S. administration to listen to the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union. A guarantee for this is the increased influence of the peace-loving forces on the planet and the broadening of their activities in the capitalist countries, including the United States.

The tasks facing the Arab anti-imperialist and national liberation movements were extensively discussed at the symposium.

In considering the current situation in the Middle East, A. Ahmar, Baath deputy secretary general, said that the United States, which is formulating plans for establishing its rule and aiding and supporting Tel Aviv's aggressive aspirations, is the main culprit for the explosive situation.

This conclusion was unanimously supported by the participants in the symposium. The course of escalating the aggression, pursued by the imperialist circles, the United States above all, as the final declaration noted, has had a direct influence on the situation in Middle Eastern

countries. The Middle East has become one of the most dangerous hotbeds of tension, threatening universal peace. F. Kerim, editor in chief of the journal AL-NAHJ, made a profound analysis of Middle Eastern imperialist policies. The increased aggressiveness of imperialism, he said, has been reflected in the American-Israeli aggression against Lebanon, the increased threats addressed at Syria, the fanning of the war between Iraq and Iran, the intensification of "strategic cooperation" with Israel, the expansion of the "rapid deployment force" and the supply of arms to reactionary countries in the area. Together with Israel, the United States is trying to subordinate the Arab world to its hegemony and to use it as a bridgehead for a military confrontation with the USSR and the other members of the socialist countries and the national liberation movements.

The increased military presence of imperialism in the area is manifested, in particular, in the increased number of navy vessels in the coastal areas and naval bases on the Arab shores. This threat is increased as a result of open military intervention, as was the case in Lebanon, and aerial and naval reconnaissance in the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean and the Sinai Peninsula and the presence of nuclear missiles aboard navy vessels. The imperialist circles headed by the United States are trying to expand their military presence in the area further and to increase arms deliveries to reactionary regimes, using the Iraq-Iran war for this purpose.

They are continuing their efforts to convert the military, political, economic and cultural structures of a number of Arab countries into part of the imperialist military-political structure.

Along with these efforts, currently imperialism and the reactionary forces are persistently trying to impose upon the Arab world, the Arab states and the liberation movements a policy of surrender in the spirit of the Camp David deal and the Reagan plan. This applies, above all, to the Amman Accord, the implementation of which is taking place with the help of Egypt's active participation, and participation in or support of a number of reactionary regimes. This includes efforts to coordinate and, so to say, to ensure the cooperation of Arab reactionary regimes in organizing closer interaction among the members of different blocs and groups. Similar action, aimed at drawing as many Arab countries as possible away from the ranks of participants in the confrontation with imperialism and forcing them to take the path of capitulationist deals, are being undertaken toward the North African countries as well. All possible means are put to use to prevent the success of united anti-imperialist actions by the Arab peoples; conspiracies against the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen are being organized and steps are being taken to isolate Syria, promote civil war and clashes among communities in Lebanon and encourage the economic and political destruction of that country. Efforts are being made to turn the PLO away from its anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist course.

The participants in the symposium emphasized in their speeches that one of the main trends in the aggressive strategy of U.S. imperialism is exerting pressure on the Arab countries to weaken the ties of alliance and cooperation among them and between them and the USSR and the other socialist countries. At the same time, efforts are being made to increase the military and

financial dependence of the Arab countries on the West. In an effort to impose its will, U.S. imperialism is drawing the Arab world into its global strategy, urging on reactionary regimes to pursue an even more drastic course of suppression of progressive forces and violation of the democratic freedoms and rights of the people. It is thus that imperialism is trying to lower the tension of the liberation struggle and to remove obstacles on the way to establishing its hegemony over this part of the world.

The firm position of the Soviet Union, a position of adamant struggle for peace and for strengthening its defense power, stands against these intrigues of U.S. imperialism and its Israeli ally. The Arab countries see in this position a powerful support in opposing aggression and the policy of hegemonism and naked force.

The experience in the struggle gained by the Arab liberation forces indicates the existence of a real possibility of opposing aggression and the threat of the use of weapons and political pressure on the part of imperialism and its Israeli partner.

The conviction that in the face of intensified Israeli aggression, the policy of hegemonism pursued by imperialism in the Arab world, the increased threat of war and the efforts to strengthen the positions of Arab reaction the progressive forces, parties and movements in the Arab world must initiate joint efforts on the basis of a coordinated program within the framework of a battlefield, capable of making use of all available opportunities to implement the policy of a close alliance between friendly Arab countries and the USSR for the sake of freedom and democracy in the Arab world and the salvation of the Arab peoples and the peoples the world over from the threat of a destructive nuclear war was voiced with absolute clarity at the symposium.

The CPSU delegation proclaimed the solidarity of the Soviet communists and all Soviet people with the struggle waged by the Arab patriots against the subversive plans of imperialism, Zionism and reaction. It noted that the Arab peoples have a great anti-imperialist potential.

In order to make use of this potential even more completely and extensively, the participants in the symposium decided to set up a committee to coordinate the actions of Arab anti-imperialist forces, consisting of representatives of Baath, the Yemen Socialist Party, the Democratic Patriotic Front of Lebanon, the National Progressive (Left Wing) Party of Egypt, the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the National Front for the Liberation of Palestine and a number of other patriotic parties and organizations in the Arab countries.

The committee will consider current problems of anti-imperialist struggle in the Middle East, make suggestions on its energizing and maintain contacts with the other detachments of the Arab national liberation movement in the Middle East and North Africa, in an effort to make a substantial contribution to the consolidation of the Arab nations in the face of U.S. and Israeli interventionist policy and the development of relations of friendship and solidarity with the peoples of the socialist community. The symposium highly rated the firm anti-imperialist position of the Syrian leadership headed by

President Assad, which is rejecting capitulationist deals with the Israeli aggressors and their patrons and favors the total liberation of the occupied Arab lands and the meeting of the national expectations of the Arab people of Palestine.

The delegates expressed their support of the suggestions made by the Soviet Union on a Middle Eastern settlement, which would open a real path to peace in this explosive part of the planet. The Arab participants in the symposium voiced the deep gratitude of their peoples to the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries for their aid and assistance in the struggle against imperialism, Zionism and reaction and for national and social liberation.

In conclusion, special resolutions were passed in support of the struggle waged by the Lebanese patriots and the Arab people of Palestine. The participants in the meeting expressed their solidarity with the government and people of Nicaragua, who are defending the freedom and independence of the country in the face of Washington's naked armed intervention.

The symposium in Damascus far exceeded the framework of Syrian sociopolitical life. Its results proved the unity of views shared by a wide circle of participants in the anti-imperialist movement in the Middle East and North Africa on basic problems of our time and their growing aspiration to coordinate their activities in the struggle against imperialist policy of expansion and neocolonial diktat and for the free and independent development of the Arab peoples.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17

## REALITIES OF THE CONTEMPORARY EPOCH

### PEACE AND SECURITY FOR EUROPE

AU211151 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85)  
pp 104-114

[Article by A. Chernyshev]

[Text] Ten years have passed since 1 August 1975, when the leaders of states and governments of 35 participant countries of the CSCE signed the Final Act in Helsinki. This historic document represents a charter of European peace and security and a long-term program of cooperation among the states and peoples of the continent.

The all-European conference consolidated the political results of World War II and of the postwar development. This fact alone places the conference in the ranks of the most important events of contemporary international life. The Final Act was expected to become, figuratively speaking, the reference point of a new chronology of the relations between states with different social systems and dissimilar political systems. New opportunities opened up on the European continent for accomplishing the main task of our period, the task of consolidating security and the foundations of general peace.

The implementation of all provisions of the Final Act continues to provide a good basis for building international relations on the principles of good-neighborliness and mutual benefits and conducting Europe's affairs in the interests of peace and the well-being of its peoples. This is what guides the USSR in its activities in the European and world arenas. "We," M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, emphasizes, "value the successes in relaxation of international tension...and are ready to participate in continuation of the process of arranging peaceful and mutual beneficial cooperation between states on the principles of equality, mutual respect, and noninterference in internal affairs."

#### I

The prominent contribution of European peoples to mankind's material and spiritual culture and the formation and consolidation of its noble humanist ideals and traditions is known. However, it is also an incontestable fact that over the millenia Europe has been the arena of bloody and destructive wars. In this century alone it has been swept by the storms of two

devastating and history's bloodiest world wars. About 100 million Europeans have died on the continent's battlefields since the time of the Iliad and ancient Rome. This is the tragic balance of Europe's history. It provides a warning and makes it incumbent upon us to reflect on the past in the name of the future.

In many respects, this explains why the European peoples--and not only they--have fastened, and continue to fasten, to the results of the all-European conference and implementation of the Helsinki Final Act expectations and hopes that perhaps no other international action has engendered in them in the entire postwar period following the adoption by the Allies of the anti-Hitler coalition--the USSR, the United States, and Great Britain--of the decisions concerning the postwar settlement. The faith of peoples in the creative and constructive potential of the Helsinki agreements has been preserved to this day.

The 10-year period since the Helsinki meeting has even more graphically illuminated the entire justice of the Helsinki Final Act's statements on the "interests of states in the efforts aimed at reducing military antagonism and promoting disarmament" and the Final Act's statements pointing out the "need to take effective measures in these areas." Since the Helsinki meeting, Europeans' political thinking has been enriched by an understanding of the fact that all problems of arms reduction and disarmament, which represent the quintessence of the preservation of general peace, most directly concern each of the participant states of the all-European conference regardless of its size, geographical position, and social system and independent of whether it possesses nuclear weapons or not, whether it belongs to this or that military-political group or not, and whether it is nonaligned or neutral.

The principles of relations between states that were adopted by agreement in Helsinki are as topical today as they were 20 years ago. And these principles are: sovereign equality, nonuse of force or the threat of force, the inviolability of borders, the territorial integrity of states, peaceful settlement of disputes, noninterference in internal affairs, respect for human rights and basic freedoms, respect for equal rights and the right of peoples to decide their fate, cooperation between states, and conscientious fulfillment of obligations under international law.

An especially important aspect of these principles, which had laid down a long-term basis for ensuring security and the development of peaceful cooperation between European states, is their inherent universal character. This fact presupposes the possibility for applying these principles also in the interest of maintaining stability and peace in other regions of the world, taking into account, of course, the specific political and other realities existing there.

The peoples of Europe understood the Helsinki conference not simply as a forum at which the principles of peaceful coexistence were formally confirmed by states as living principles but also as a landmark in world politics, a landmark representing the point from which these principles should form the very basis of everyday practice in international relations. The USSR, and other socialist countries, too, appraise the results of the conference from

this same viewpoint. It is no exaggeration to say that a persistent struggle for implementation of the principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act is the main orientation of their European policy.

The energetic efforts of these states over many years have predetermined to a considerable extent the beginning and subsequent development of the process of detente in the 1970s. A general turn for the better in East-West relations began to show during that period. It was possible to take tangible steps aimed at reducing the danger of nuclear war. Of extraordinary importance in this respect was the accord achieved between the USSR and the United States on the questions of restraining the arms race while steadfastly observing the principle of parity and equal security. The ties in the spheres of economy and trade, science and technology, culture, information, education, human contacts and so forth assumed an important place in the relations between Eastern and Western states. The widening and deepening of these ties contributed to the strengthening of mutual trust between states and peoples. Thus, in that period good political, legal and moral-psychological foundations were built for cooperation between states of the two systems in new historical conditions, including cooperation in such a sensitive issue as the security of the sides.

All this provided eloquent evidence of the fact that countries with different social systems can fruitfully solve even the most complicated problems if they really strive to overcome the barriers that hinder their mutual understanding and if they are guided by goodwill and the interests of ensuring stable peace.

The benefits of detente for all are indisputable. And, knowing the advantages of detente, the peoples of Europe value its results. At the same time, it is an indisputable fact that these results could have been considerably more substantial if Western countries had shown a responsible attitude toward the successes of detente and if the Western participant countries of the all-European conference and, first and foremost, the United States, had adopted the same honest and open approach toward fulfillment of the Helsinki Accords as the USSR and other countries of socialism. The process of strengthening security and cooperation in Europe would have then progressively and steadily developed and the substance of detente would have become fuller and deeper.

The very sharp struggle that has developed around the Final Act and its implementation during the entire 10-year period since the all-European conference has clearly reflected the clash between the two main courses in contemporary world politics.

On the one hand, it is the course that is consistently defended by the USSR and the countries of the socialist community and which is aimed at strengthening and deepening the relaxation of tension and, consequently, at strictly and fully observing and implementing the provisions of the Helsinki document. On the other hand, it is the course aimed at undermining and curtailing the process of detente, the course that is apparent in attempts at one-sided interpretations of the Final Act's provisions and at arbitrarily snatching out its individual provisions in order to appropriate for oneself the right to interfere in the internal affairs of other states. The ruling circles of the United States and some of its NATO block allies have placed the

stake in this course. Militarist aspirations have gained the upper hand in their politics and they show a growing and extremely dangerous inclination to adopt adventuristic methods and ways in international affairs.

The fact that the process of detente came to a standstill by the beginning of the 1980s was a direct consequence of this course. The spirit of trust was seriously weakened. The threat of nuclear war once again began to grow. And could it have been otherwise in the situation when Washington began to feverishly whip up the arms race in order to gain military superiority and when the aggressive circles of imperialism decided to once again plunge Europe into the vicious circle of confrontation-arms race-confrontation.

The situation in Europe became especially difficult as a result of the fact that, at the beginning of 1984, the United States began to place its first-strike nuclear missiles in the territories of several NATO countries--that is, the FRG, Great Britain, and Italy. The Reagan administration as well as the governments of the states that agreed to make their territory available for the deployment of these missiles have thereby assumed the heavy responsibility for pulling Europe into a new spiral of the arms race that involves extraordinary risks.

The harsh reality is that the installation of Pershing and cruise missiles on European soil by no means strengthens--as the NATO circles try to claim--the security of the countries whose ruling circles have started to turn them into launching pads for American missiles. The interests of European security as a whole are also seriously harmed, not mentioning the fact that the psychosis of shameless militarism is being exported to Europe together with the missiles.

Is it permissible in our era of nuclear missiles to forget that the approach to the questions of security on the European continent must be especially well weighed and adjusted on the most precise scale of wisdom and prudence? For it is precisely in Europe where two most powerful military groups of states are directly confronting one another. It is precisely in Europe where the most serious danger exists that some spark of a conflict may provoke an all-annihilating nuclear conflagration.

It is also impossible to overlook the fact that a tendency to question the realities resulting from the postwar settlement and development in Europe is once again becoming apparent here and there in the West. This tendency is most frankly apparent in the revanchist demands made by certain FRG circles for a "return to the 1937 borders" or in the calls for building some kind of a "future Europe" where, if you please, there should be no room for the states of the socialist system and where the GDR should cease to exist as a sovereign state. It must be said that even the figures occupying official positions in Bonn let themselves go now and then into expatiations about the "open German question," about the "right of all Germans to self-determination under conditions of freedom," and so forth, expatiations that show nothing else but intentions to undermine the existing territorial and political structure in Europe. These calls and talks can only be assessed as contrary to the letter and spirit of the Moscow agreement between the USSR and the FRG as well as the agreements between the Polish People's Republic, the CSSR, and GDR, on the one hand, and the FRG, on the other. We recall that these agreements are based on

the principles of inviolability of European borders, nonuse of force in solving disputes and noninterference in internal affairs. No matter under what pretexts they may be made, all attempts at shattering the territorial and political realities in Europe are directly aimed against European peace, which it has been possible to consolidate in many respects as a result of the correspondence of these realities to the requirements of historical justice and the needs of the continent's development according to the conditions existing there of states with opposite social systems.

The opponents of detente and, first and foremost, those in Washington have also come down on inter-European economic cooperation by trying to pull the West European countries onto the track of their obstructionist policy, which flouts the universally recognized norms of international economic exchange, and by striving to implant in international economic relations such impermissible methods as trade, credit, technological blockades and all kinds of embargoes and "sanctions."

The period since the all-European conference has convincingly confirmed not only the depravity but the hopelessness of the course of the United States and the countries that follow its policy lead, the course of gross violations of the principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act. This depravity and hopelessness were already graphically demonstrated by the meeting of representatives of the participant countries of that conference held in Belgrade from October 1977 to March 1978. The NATO countries headed by the United States tried to conduct work at the meeting in a way that would divert the attention of its participants from discussions on the urgent problems of security and cooperation in Europe and strove to legalize their "right" to interfere in the internal affairs of the socialist states under the invented pretext of "protection of human rights" in those states.

However, the "test of strength" arranged by the West brought its initiators neither laurels nor any real results. The final document of the Belgrade meeting was oriented toward continuing the all-European process initiated in Helsinki.

The attacks on the USSR and other countries of the socialist community because of their alleged "violations of human rights" are a well-worn hobbyhorse of anti-Soviets and anticommunists. Presenting themselves as the "champions" of these rights, they mendaciously claim that, they say, in Helsinki the West agreed to recognize the social status quo in European states in exchange for some kind of "concessions" by Eastern countries on the "humanitarian" issues. The slanderous fabrications on this account are just one of the means of "psychological war" the imperialist forces are using against the countries of socialism. The USSR has resolutely rebuffed and will continue to resolutely rebuff these and other similar fabrications.

The Great October Revolution was carried out in the name of the freedom of peoples and for genuine human rights, including first and foremost the rights of working people. Our country was the first in the world to affirm in its territory the real equality of people and really guaranteed, and not just proclaimed, human and civil rights. It is perfectly natural that any slanders of their way of life and social system provoke a feeling of legitimate

indignation among the Soviet people. They reject unsolicited lectures on how they should conduct their affairs and what systems they should set up in their own house. Neither the UN Charter nor the Final Act or any other recognized international document, based on invariable respect for the sovereign rights of peoples, do or can grant anyone authority to assume the role of some kind of judge in these questions. All the more, it does not and cannot grant such authority to those who have so far considered it unnecessary to ratify a majority of international legal acts on the question of human rights, acts that were accepted by the United Nations in the development of the statutory positions of that organization.

It is appropriate to point out that those who systematically violate civil and political rights and freedoms subsist on the anti-Soviet slanders. All this is taking place in the United States and other Western countries. That is where we witness the suppression of "differing political views," discrimination against national minorities, infringement of women's rights and limitations of freedom of the press. All these are inseparable attributes of the American reality and of the so-called "American way of life" which, by the way, Washington is trying to impose by hook or by crook on other countries and peoples. And what but deprivation of rights and the lowering of human dignity is shown by these figures: there are nearly 10 million unemployed people in the United States alone, and about 35 million Americans live below the poverty line according to the official data?

Or, let us consider the position of youth in the West. With its entire mentality capitalism maims and cripples the souls of young people by inculcating them with the cult of crude force and educating them in the spirit of militarism. Young men and women are the first to become victims of unemployment, drug addiction, and criminality. Persecution and repression are the share of those who reject bourgeois morals and laws. The advocates of peace and fighters against the danger of nuclear war are subjected to persecution. And this is not a matter of some individual cases but a matter of everyday occurrence in the notorious "free world."

How can all this be combined with the demagoguery of the latter-day "caretakers" of human rights, including their statements of "devotion" to the principles and provisions of the Final Act?

Socialism as a social system demonstrates most visibly its advantages over capitalism by social and national equality, systematic advancement of the economy, and care for the individual and his comprehensive development, all of which creates a solid foundation for the constant enrichment of the socialist way of life and for perfecting the socialist democracy that guarantees in practice the broadest human rights and freedoms and the access of the individual to the highest levels of knowledge and cultural values. These are our cardinal achievements. And the world of capital, unable to extricate itself from deep economic crises and grave sociopolitical shocks, has nothing to show in contrast to these achievements.

In the international arena the USSR advocates broad cooperation in the task of strict observance of fundamental rights of the individual and of civil and political rights and freedoms proclaimed by the UN Charter and the General

Declaration of Human Rights. It is universally known that it was with the active participation of the USSR and other socialist countries that the United Nations adopted the pact on civil and political freedoms and the pact on economic, social and cultural rights. The countries of socialism are making weighty contributions to the task of practical implementation of these important international documents.

Those who threaten our moral, social and civil values and who, in their hatred for socialism, deliberately aim to increase tension in the world have been met and will be met with due counteractions. And, on the contrary, those who are ready to cooperate with our country in corresponding issues on a truly humane and honest basis will find our country a responsive partner.

### III

The all-European process has traversed a great and, at the same time, difficult road from Helsinki to our time. Sometimes it might have seemed that the policy of Washington and some other capitals of NATO countries created insuperable barriers to the development of this process. And yet, in the final analysis, quite a few difficulties have been successfully overcome.

The conclusion of the meeting of representatives of the CSCE participant states in Madrid in September 1983, following their meeting in Belgrade, with the adoption of a balanced and substantive final document solidly based on the principles and provisions of the Final Act, represented a noticeable achievement of that course in international affairs that is aimed at dialogue and mutual understanding and at solving problems through negotiations. The understanding of the fact that any attempts to deviate from the road laid out in Helsinki would lead to the blind alley of confrontations gained the upper hand at that forum.

The Madrid meeting confirmed that the reserves of the policy of detente have not been exhausted by far and that it is necessary to continue to adhere to the chosen course. And this is only possible in strict observance of all principles by which the participant countries bound themselves to be guided in their mutual relations after adoption of the Helsinki Final Act. Understandably, what is also needed is the political will to preserve and continue the process of detente and develop peaceful relations and good-neighbor cooperation in Europe among states with different social systems. The USSR and other countries of the socialist community show this will and it is embodied in the constructive steps and proposals these countries are making in European and international affairs. This fully applies to the position of the socialist countries at the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe that began its work in Stockholm in January last year according to the decisions of the Madrid meeting. The initiatives of the countries of socialism at that conference, which are in accord with the Helsinki Final Act, provide a good basis for achieving mutually acceptable agreements at it.

As is known, 10 years ago in Helsinki all of the 35 participant states of the all-European conference recognized the mutually complementary nature of the political and military aspects of European security as well as the

indissoluble link between European and global security. This formulation of the question is completely justified because the state of affairs in Europe has served and continues to serve as the barometer of political weather in the world.

The proposal made by the socialist countries in Stockholm to conclude a treaty on mutual nonuse of military force and maintaining the relations of peace between the participant states of the all-European conference is backed by historical experience and life itself. The basic provisions of this treaty have been submitted for consideration in Stockholm. Its pivotal proposition is the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear or conventional weapons and, consequently, not to use military force in general.

The proposal is primarily focused on eliminating the threat of a nuclear catastrophe and thereby on protecting the basic human right, the right to life. No state, either nuclear or nonnuclear, can be uninterested in achieving such an agreement. And this is especially true in Europe, where the level of nuclear confrontation is especially high.

What is involved in this connection is not some kind of a purely declarative confirmation of the principle of nonuse of force but a cardinal measure to strengthen confidence and security, a measure of a binding type. What is proposed is not a matter of simply restating this principle in the same form as outlined in the UN Charter and the Helsinki Final Act, but a matter of further developing and consolidating it as envisaged by the mandate of the Stockholm conference and the Helsinki Final Act itself that directly binds its signatory states to implement the principle of nonuse of force "by all means and in all forms," including, naturally, also the form of agreement. In other words, this principle must become the law and norm of international relations.

The Soviet Union strives to find solutions at the Stockholm conference that will judiciously combine large-scale political steps to strengthen European security, and concrete measures in the military sphere that would promote the growth of mutual trust. Our country assesses at their true value the confidence-building measures that have already been implemented in conformity with the Final Act. They have proven their usefulness. We are ready to move further in this direction.

The confidence-building measures in the military sphere, proposed by the socialist countries in Stockholm, are more significant in their nature and broader in their scope than the measures adopted earlier on the basis of the Helsinki Act. Among these measures are further limitation of the scale of military exercises, advance notification on large air and naval exercises held in Europe and the adjacent sea and ocean areas and airspace, and others. But unfortunately, at present the Stockholm conference is at a standstill because of the NATO countries' unconstructive position. The analysis of the document on confidence and security measures recently presented by these countries at the conference shows that this document disregards the legitimate interests of socialist countries and fails to take into account the reasonable observations presented by neutral and nonaligned countries. However, no matter how complicated the problems discussed in Stockholm may be, success can be

achieved also here if the fact is kept in mind that only trust in politics can lead to trust in the military sphere.

The question on reduction of armed forces and arms in Central Europe discussed at the Vienna talks is directly related to the question of ensuring European security.

At these talks the USSR, together with other socialist countries, has made the proposals that make it possible to overcome the artificial barriers built by the Western participants in the talks and to find a mutually acceptable solution for the problem under consideration.

The Soviet-American negotiations that opened in Geneva have elicited great interest and satisfaction in Europe and the entire world. The subject of these negotiations is the complex of questions concerning space and nuclear weapons, including both strategic and medium-range weapons, and the goals of the negotiations are prevention of the arms race in space and its end on earth, the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons, and the strengthening of strategic stability. It is obvious that the subject and goals of these negotiations is directly connected with the tasks of strengthening security on the European continent.

As is known, the negotiations between the USSR and United States in Geneva are moving with difficulty because of the position of the American administration, which shows no readiness to help make progress toward accords. Success at the negotiations can only be achieved if the principle of parity and equal security and the accords on the final goal of the negotiations and on interconnected solutions of the problems under consideration are respected. The USSR, for its part, is firmly disposed to search for and find solutions to the problems discussed at the negotiations, solutions that would be acceptable to both sides. In order to facilitate the progress of negotiations, the USSR has proposed to cease for the duration of the negotiations all activities in creating the space-based strike weapons and to freeze the existing arsenals of nuclear missiles with the aim of moving on to a deep reduction of the strategic and medium-range weapons. The USSR's decisions to unilaterally proclaim a moratorium on deployment of the Soviet medium-range missiles and to stop other countermeasures in Europe has been made for the same purpose. Both the former and latter initiatives of our country have been assessed at their true worth by the world public, and even by many American and West European politicians. If Washington and the capitals of other NATO states adopted a more serious and thoughtful approach toward the Soviet initiatives, if they gave an adequate response to this gesture of good will, and particularly if they showed restraint on the question of deployment of American missiles in Western Europe, more favorable conditions would be created thereby for the Geneva negotiations and a healthier political atmosphere would be established around them.

The USSR proceeds from the fact that it is especially important to erect a reliable barrier against the militarization of outer space under the conditions of which the achievement of any accords on the question of limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons would be unthinkable because the militarization of outer space would become the catalyst of an uncontrolled

arms race in all areas and would lead to its new and even more dangerous spiral and a sharp weakening of strategic stability in the world.

The so-called Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) advanced by the Reagan administration is the source of the new threat to general peace. Washington also strives to pull its NATO allies into implementation of its aggressive plan for waging "star wars." However, even the leading circles of these countries show a guarded attitude toward such a dangerous venture. The comments of the English newspaper SUNDAY TIMES are characteristic in this connection. It noted recently that nearly all West European governments are skeptical about Reagan's SDI, fearing that it will be very difficult to stop the "star wars" express train once it is set in motion.

Plans for the militarization of outer space nurtured by Washington emphasize the urgent necessity of taking immediate measures in the interests of safeguarding European and international security.

The essence of the problem, expressed in the most concise form, is in maintaining the approximate military-strategic balance between the Warsaw Pact and NATO that has been brought about in Europe and globally. This balance has objectively helped preserve peace in the last few decades. The refusal to consider this reality and the aspiration to military superiority in order to ensure one's dominant position will inevitably lead to accelerating the arms race and increasing the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

The USSR and other Warsaw Pact countries do not seek superiority either on earth or in outer space. They consistently advocate a lowering of the level of military confrontation but will never allow the military-strategic parity to be broken. It goes without saying that this fully applies also to the plans of preparations for "star wars." If these preparations continue, the Warsaw Pact countries will have no other choice but to take countermeasures.

The countries of the socialist community believe that a reliable way of strengthening security in Europe is to completely free the continent from medium-range and tactical weapons and to advance by stages toward what is possible. They declare themselves in favor of creating nuclear-free zones in the Balkans, in the North, and in other regions of Europe and, in particular, they show understanding for the proposals by O. Palme, prime minister of Sweden, for the creation of a zone free of battlefield nuclear weapons. The socialist countries also act in favor of freeing the continent from chemical weapons.

#### IV

The peoples of Europe have lived under conditions of peace for 40 years. This peace is founded on the political and territorial realities resulting from the great victory over fascism and the postwar development. These realities have been confirmed by bilateral treaties between a number of European states and the Helsinki Final Act. The stability of these realities and, consequently, a strict observance of the aforementioned agreements and treaties represent the guarantee for security in Europe.

The experience of cooperation between the states of the anti-Hitler coalition during the war incontestably proves the following: the countries with different social systems that were able to join their efforts in the struggle against the common enemy can also now find mutually acceptable solutions and effectively act in the interests of safeguarding peace. The experience of development of the all-European process in the postwar period also attests to this possibility. In our period both the European and all peoples of the world have one common mortal enemy, the threat of nuclear war. Preventing the catastrophe of war is the most urgent task of all mankind. Europe, a continent that is small on a general scale but densely populated, and a continent where the level of military confrontation is especially high, is vitally interested in this.

A keen and completely understandable perception of the danger inherent in the international situation that has now developed is widespread in West European countries. Quite a few facts show that the West European allies of the United States--who follow the lead of their senior NATO partner, compelled to do so by their subordination to the so-called Atlantic solidarity--understand the seriousness of the consequences, including the consequences for themselves, that may result from Washington's current militarist course, and that this understanding is breaking its way into politics. They show, some more so and some less, an interest in ensuring that whatever positive gains were made in the relations among European states during the years of detente will not be lost.

Of course, Europe can and must make a constructive contribution to the cause of consolidation of international peace. This is only possible along the road of preserving and multiplying the positive results of detente between East and West and in combination with the long-term prospects of economic and other mutually advantageous cooperation.

The USSR and other countries of the socialist community will continue to consistently follow the course of development of this cooperation with all interested states. At the same time, they intend to continue to take the necessary measures to further strengthen their technological-economic independent because this is urgently dictated by life itself, considering the attempts of the reactionary imperialist circles to undermine the economic development of some fraternal states. This was most clearly stated once more at the 40th CEMA session in Warsaw.

The task of striving for the development of "firm economic relations" between the USSR and the capitalist countries was raised already by V. I. Lenin, and our party is invariably loyal to this construction. The USSR has established quite developed cooperation with nearly all West European countries. A series of treaties and agreements, covering the most widely varied spheres of relations, links the Eastern and Western countries. Among these treaties and agreements it is necessary to note the long-term economic and scientific-technical cooperation programs concluded between the USSR, on the one hand, and the FRG, France, Italy, Finland, Greece, and some European capitalist countries, on the other. This, too, represents an effective factor of preserving and continuing detente. We are in favor of arranging mutually

beneficial economic relations between CEMA and the EEC. We are also ready to search for a common language with the EEC on concrete international problems.

As a power whose historical fate is indissolubly linked with Europe, the USSR is fully aware of its great responsibility for the continent's present and future and for the security of its peoples. In view of all factors that determine the state of affairs in the European and world arenas, we are firmly convinced that peace in Europe and on our entire planet can be preserved.

The military-political alliance of fraternal countries, the Warsaw Pact, has acted as a reliable bastion of peace for 30 years now. The signing by its members, on 26 April 1985, of the Protocol on Extending the Term of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance of 14 May 1945 for Another 20 Years With Provision for a Subsequent 10-Year Extension was an event of enormous political importance. By making these decisions the USSR and its allies once more took the oath of loyalty to the cause of peace and detente in Europe.

The vitality of the principles incorporated in the Helsinki Final Act is in their profound and organic link not only with the fundamental interests of European peoples but also with the fundamental interests of other peoples. The peace-loving public made a weighty contribution 10 years ago to ensuring the success of the all-European conference. The public of the USSR and other socialist countries played a significant role in this respect by demonstrating their readiness for active cooperation with all peace-loving forces that show real concern for delivering mankind from the threat of nuclear annihilation. The signing of the Helsinki Final Act, in its turn, opened up new opportunities for interventions by broad social circles in the so-called "high politics." The unprecedented rise of the mass antiwar movement in recent years has largely been a consequence of the Helsinki process. It is also the unanimous and sincere desire of the Soviet people to revive this process and consolidate peace and security on the European continent.

This resolute attitude of the Soviet people is expressed, in particular, in the multifaceted beneficial activity of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation that has been formed by a number of social organizations to satisfy the interests of the USSR working people in the problems of European security and to represent them in contacts with the sociopolitical circles of other countries that work for the consolidation of peace in Europe.

The USSR is firmly in favor of reviving the process of detente. In our understanding, what is involved in this connection is not simply a matter of returning to what was achieved in the 1970s. It is necessary to strive and desirable step by step to achieve much more. From our point of view, detente is not simply a political goal; it is a necessary but still only a transitional stage from peace overloaded with weapons to a reliable and all-embracing system of international security.

What has been said particularly applies to Europe, where good-neighbor cooperation between states must become a natural and constant factor in the life of peoples. There are no international problems on the European

continent, or in other regions of the earth, which could not be solved by peaceful means if there is political responsibility and good will.

The political practice of the past 10 years has demonstrated very convincingly that the implementation of the provisions of the Final Act of the all-European conference is a beneficial but not simple process that involves many difficulties. At the same time it has graphically revealed the entire international significance of that document as a manifestation of the political wisdom of all of its participants and of their good will for peace.

The fate of the all-European process and the future of peace in Europe and beyond will depend to a decisive degree on the consideration by all countries of the positive experience gained in the 1970s and on how consistently all principles and provisions of the Final Act will be implemented in practice.

The 10th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act is a good occasion for all CSCE participant states to confirm their loyalty to the "Helsinki spirit."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17-F

## CRITICISM AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

### THE WORKING CLASS AND WORKERS MOVEMENT IN THE LIBERATED COUNTRIES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85) pp 115-119

[Review by A. Madatov, candidate of philosophical sciences, of the following books: (1) "Rabocheye Dvizheniye v Osvobodivshikhsya Stranakh Azii i Severnoy Afriki: Osobennosti i Tendentsii" [The Workers Movement in the Liberated Countries of Asia and North Africa: Characteristics and Trends]. A. S. Kaufman responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1981, 272 pp; (2) "Razvivayushchiyesya Strany: Narastaniye Klassovoy Borby" [The Developing Countries: Growth of the Class Struggle]. B. I. Koval and S. A. Yershov general editors. Progress, Moscow, 1983, 255 pp; (3) "Rabochiy Klass Stran Afriki" [The Working Class of the Countries of Africa]. A reference. M. I. Braginskiy responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 221 pp; (4) "Rabochiy Klass Azii" [The Working Class of Asia]. Reference. A. S. Kaufman responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1985, 228 pp]

[Text] The political role of the working class in the national liberation struggle is growing substantially under contemporary conditions. An upsurge in the labor movement, favoring economic independence and social progress, may be noted in a number of liberated countries. All of these processes determine the relevance of the studies of the status and role of the working class in the countries of Asia and Africa.

In this respect, the recently published collected monographs of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies "The Workers Movement in the Liberated Countries of Asia and North Africa," the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers Movement "The Developing Countries: Growth of the Class Struggle" and the reference books "The Working Class of the Countries of Africa" and "The Working Class of Asia" prepared respectively by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Africa and the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies are of theoretical and practical interest. These works analyze the various aspects of the establishment of a working class and a labor movement in the liberated countries: the social structure of the working class and changes in its structure at the different stages of socioeconomic development, the status of the Afro-Asian proletariat, the characteristics of its struggle for social progress in states with different orientations, the role of the trade unions in defending the economic and political interests of the working people and the significance and nature

of class and political alliances of the proletariat in the liberated countries. These problems are investigated by the authors on the regional and individual country levels, which allows us to gain more profound knowledge about the role of the working class in the various parts in the area of the national liberation movement.

The idea that the working class in the Afro-Asian states as a whole has reached different levels of establishment and development runs throughout the books under review. This process cannot be considered completed. Therefore, it would be erroneous both to underestimate the role of the working class and the relatively high levels reached by the labor movement in a number of countries (such as India, Sri Lanka, Algeria and Nigeria) or to overestimate the real possibilities of the Afro-Asian proletariat regardless of the degree of socioeconomic development and the specifics of the sociopolitical situation of the individual countries. At the same time, one must bear in mind that under the conditions of the intensifying demarcation among class forces and the aggravation of the class struggle in the liberated countries, the young and frequently only recently appeared working class must resolve problems which can be resolved only by a mature working class. That is why the solidarity of the global socialist community with the forces of the national liberation movement and the various trends and forms of influence of the international worker and communist movements on the labor movement in Asian and African countries assumes such great importance in terms of the growth of the class self-awareness of the Afro-Asian proletariat and the upsurge of the labor movement in the liberated countries.

The internal factors which determine the growing role of the working class in the social development of the liberated countries are its quantitative growth and qualitative changes in its structure, manifested in the increased number of factory and plant workers, the greater independence of political actions undertaken by the proletariat, and the energizing of revolutionary trade union organizations in the liberated countries, not only in the struggle for the economic interests of the working people but also in efforts to promote their political education and to increase the influence of Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary democratic parties in a number of liberated countries.

In this connection, it is necessary to take into consideration that the uneven economic and political development of the Afro-Asian states is the reason for the different levels of socioeconomic development reached by the proletariat and the different degrees of its political activeness. Whereas in some countries with a relatively high level of economic development (such as India), a cadre proletariat, including its factory-plant nucleus, has essentially developed and the worker movement has all the proper traditions, in a number of liberated countries the process of the shaping and development of the working class is merely at its very initial stage.

Looking at the book "The Workers Movement in the Liberated Countries of Asia and North Africa," let us note, above all, that this is the first monograph to offer a comprehensive and systematic study of socioeconomic and political problems of the working class in liberated countries. This analysis applies not only to Asia and North Africa, as the title may indicate, but also to Tropical Africa. A new feature in scientific literature here is the

periodization of the labor movement in Afro-Asian countries after World War II, discussed in a separate chapter. Three periods in the postwar development of the labor movement in the liberated countries are singled out:

1. 1945-1956, during which the labor movement in Asia and Africa appeared and strengthened under the influence of external factors such as the victory over fascism in World War II, the establishment of the world socialist system and the initiated process of breakdown of the imperialist colonial system. At the same time, the labor movement in the liberated countries was adversely affected by the cold war, subversive imperialist propaganda directed against the socialist states and the world communist movement and the dogmatic and sectarian errors of individual communist parties in Asian countries, which created certain difficulties for the worker and communist movements in the area;
2. Second half of the 1950s-first half of the 1960s, noted by the collapse of the colonial system, the appearance among the young states of a group of countries with a socialist orientation, the gradual elimination of the former sectorial errors in the worker and communist movements in the liberated countries, and changes in the strategy and tactics of communist and worker parties; during that period the conversion from the national struggle for political independence to a struggle for the choice of a further path of socioeconomic development was completed;
3. The third period began in the second half of the 1960s and is continuing to the present. The contemporary stage in the labor movement in the liberated countries, which developed under the influence of international factors, such as the strengthening of the world socialist system and the intensified struggle for detente, is distinguished by the increased role of the working class in the struggle for choosing a path of socialist orientation.

This periodization is based on substantial facts. However, its main criteria, in our view, require substantial refining, for the authors consider primarily external factors--changes in the deployment of class forces in the international arena. Equally important are internal factors, above all the nature of the main social contradiction during the various stages of the national liberation movement. Furthermore, the periodization of the labor movement in the liberated countries should be considered in closer interconnection with the already established periodization of the national liberation movement and the world revolutionary process as a whole, as described in Soviet literature.

A positive aspect of this work is the thorough study made of social boundaries and the structure of the Afro-Asian proletariat. One of the problems debated in Soviet literature is that of so-called "lower boundaries" of the Afro-Asian proletariat, i.e., the question of the legitimacy of including within the working class hired labor employed at small enterprises and in agriculture. This requires a differentiated approach, taking into consideration the characteristics of hired labor in small enterprises. Whereas in some enterprises of this type, which are part of the small-commodity system, employment is essentially of a family nature, at many others hired labor with its typical forms of capitalist exploitation predominates. In this

connection, in our view the study of the criteria of demarcation between capitalist and precapitalist hired labor at small enterprises should be intensified further. The topical nature of this problem is also determined by the fact that in a number of liberated countries the majority of hired workers work precisely in small enterprises. A great variety of categories are used in Soviet and foreign publications in the classification of this category of working people as belonging to the working class: number, use of mechanical devices value of commodity output, etc. Despite the entire importance of such indicators, the inclusion of hired workers in small enterprises in the working class is legitimate only if "they sell their manpower and are subject to exploitation by the capitalists to whom they bring added value (see "The Workers Movement in the Liberated Countries of Asia and North Africa: Characteristics and Tendencies," p 58). The same applies to hired labor in agriculture.

The heterogeneous nature of the working class in the liberated states is the result of the multiple-stage development of capitalism, i.e., the existence of small capitalist enterprises, manufacturing enterprises and large industrial projects equipped with contemporary production facilities in the liberated countries. All of this determines the heterogeneous professional levels reached by the working class and the different levels of its organization and class self-awareness.

With the help of extensive factual data, the works under review trace the socioeconomic status of the working class in Asian and African countries. The main factors influencing it are neocolonialist exploitation on the part of the leading imperialist countries, the historically established level of socioeconomic development of the individual countries and their economic resources, the nature of foreign economic relations and the different social orientation of the liberated countries. It is only by synthesizing these factors that the current status of the working class can be characterized. As accurately pointed out in "The Developing Countries: Growth of the Class Struggle," "the main thing is the continuing economic dependence of the young countries on developed Western capitalist states and their increased financial indebtedness to the imperialist countries, which paralyzes the development of industry and agriculture" (p 6). The consequences are a slowed-down pace of economic growth, growing inflation, increased mass unemployment and lowered real wages.

By the turn of the 1980s, during the period of the so-called "petroleum boom," two groups of developing countries could be singled out on the basis of economic indicators: petroleum importers and petroleum producers, the latter earning huge amounts of money from their liquid fuel exports. However, under the conditions of dependence on the capitalist world, such a "privileged" situation of the latter not only failed to help them to resolve basic socioeconomic problems related to surmounting neocolonialism and backwardness, but also failed to resolve "grave socioeconomic problems, such as mass unemployment and inflation, a widening gap in income distribution, and the poverty of the toiling masses in these countries" (p 7).

The activities of multinational corporations substantially influence the socioeconomic status of the working class. The consequences of this influence

are by no means one-dimensional. On the one hand, the penetration of multinational corporations, with their advanced technology, in the economy of the developing countries hinders the development of the local national industry and is accompanied by a reduction in manpower (including skilled workers) and increased unemployment. Trained workers are forced to emigrate to other countries in search of jobs (see pp 9-10). On the other hand, while multinational corporation enterprises in the developed capitalist countries usually pay the average sectorial industry wage of the country, most typically in the developing countries the wages and salaries of workers and employees of multinational corporation enterprises are substantially higher than at enterprises owned by state or local private capital (see *ibid.*, "The Workers Movement in the Liberated Countries of Asia and North Africa: Characteristics and Trends," p 92). Thus, in Singapore, approximately one-quarter of all multinational corporation enterprises pay wages exceeding the level of local private enterprises by as much as 30 percent; in 60 percent of multinational corporation enterprises, the differential ranges between 30 and 60 percent (see p 93). There are two reasons for this situation: first, many multinational corporation enterprises operating in the developing countries are distinguished by their particularly high technological complexity and output harmful to the health; secondly, in many multinational corporation branches in the liberated countries wages are artificially inflated with a view to pitting the multinational corporation workers against the other national detachments of the working class. All of this, however, does not exclude the fact that in terms of wage levels and compared with the proletariat of the developed capitalist countries, the proletariat in Afro-Asian countries provides inexpensive manpower. Furthermore, in a number of liberated countries, in the course of time a trend has developed toward a rapprochement between the levels of wages paid multinational corporation workers and workers in enterprises in the private and state sectors. One of the consequences of the worsened economic situation of the working class is the increased migration of manpower, both intranational and intraregional. At the present time some countries have become exporters of manpower while others have attained a relatively high level of immigration.

Another merit of the books under review is the thorough analysis of the various aspects of the trade union movement in Afro-Asian countries. Under circumstances in which in many of the liberated countries there is either no communist party (or else the party is in the process of establishment) or else the party operates in a state of deep clandestinity, in frequent cases the trade unions are the only legal organization of the proletariat in the class struggle. Over the past 15 years an upsurge has been noted in the trade union movement in the liberated countries, revealed not only in the dynamics of strikes but in the combination of strikes with the organization of mass political meetings and demonstrations and the formulation of political in addition to economic demands, aimed against repression, for the liberation of political prisoners, the broadening of democratic freedoms and the pursuit by the authorities of a systematic anti-imperialist policy. This is confirmed by the experience of the trade union movements in Egypt, Nigeria, Sudan, Tunisia and other countries (see "The Developing Countries: Growth of the

Class Struggle," pp 53-69, 193-202, 203-217; "The Working Class of the Countries of Africa," pp 182 and 197).

Despite the increased revolutionary trends in Afro-Asian trade unions, factors such as the ideological and political influence of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the World Christian Confederation of Labor and the American AFL-CIO and the policy of states with a capitalist orientation, aimed at controlling the trade unions and the lack of unity in the trade union movements of the liberated countries exert a substantially negative influence. These factors are considered in the works under review on the basis of extensive factual data. However, the authors have virtually ignored the political role of the Afro-American Labor Center. Yet its activities have become a significant factor in the dissemination and consolidation of reformist trends in the worker and trade union movements in African countries.

The objective logic of the national liberation movement gradually leads to surmounting the so-called depoliticizing of many trade union associations and to strengthening the positions of trade unions in the struggle for progressive development. This is confirmed, for example, by the growing differences among the leaders of many reformist trade unions and the primary trade union organizations. It is indicative that the overwhelming majority of national and regional trade union associations of varying sociopolitical orientation, formulate demands relative to the struggle for peace and against the intensification of the arms race and in the struggle for a new international economic order which, in turn, could contribute to the gradual elimination of the division within the trade union movement of the liberated countries.

The monograph "The Workers Movement in the Liberated Countries of Asia and North Africa: Characteristics and Trends" discusses a wide range of problems related to the creation of a single anti-imperialist front. In particular, the work proves the relevance of the Marxist-Leninist methodological principles of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry to the contemporary labor movement in Afro-Asian countries. The typification of united anti-imperialist fronts involving the communist parties is of great importance in the study of the political alliances forged by the working class as found in the monograph. The work singles out the following types of political fronts: bourgeois democratic, national democratic, revolutionary democratic and people's democratic (see pp 112-113). Naturally, such typification, as is the case with many others, is somewhat arbitrary. Nevertheless, based on specific historical data, it reflects the objective tasks of the Afro-Asian proletariat and its allies in the different stages of the revolutionary liberation struggle. That is why we find it difficult to agree with the author's claim that "it is most expedient to consider the leading sociopolitical force in a given front as the main criterion..." (p 112). Naturally, the nature of the political leadership of the united anti-imperialist front largely determines the consistency of progressive transformations and the prospects of the front's future development. In our view, however, the basic criterion in identifying the types of fronts cited in the monograph is, above all, their objectives and tasks, objectively determined by socioeconomic and political conditions. Whereas in some countries (primarily with reactionary or dictatorial regimes) the immediate

task is the struggle for the democratization of social life and the implementation of progressive reforms, in a large number of countries the democratic forces formulate as their immediate target having a national democratic revolution and establishing a revolutionary democratic system. In countries with a socialist orientation the objective task is the struggle for the intensification of revolutionary and democratic changes and the creation of prerequisites for the growth of the national democratic revolution into a socialist revolution. It is precisely the many-tiered and varying social nature of the general democratic problems facing the various liberated countries that determine the coincidence among the interests of toiling classes, social strata and political parties, united within a single anti-imperialist front.

A relatively separate set of problems pertains to the political role played by the working class in countries with a socialist orientation. This is discussed in a separate chapter in "The Workers Movement in the Liberated Countries of Asia and North Africa: Characteristics and Trends" and in respective articles of the reference works on Africa and Asia under review. We note as a distinguishing feature of the labor movement in this group of countries that the development of the working class takes place under the conditions of a revolutionary democratic system. Until recently, the dominant view in some works by Soviet researchers was that the social nature of the contemporary revolutionary democracy is primarily petit bourgeois. Such an interpretation, as is properly supported by specific factual data, is somewhat one-sided: by no means does it always correspond to the reality of countries with a socialist orientation. To begin with, as a result of a backward socioeconomic structure in the liberated countries and the underdeveloped nature of classes in a bourgeois society, particularly in the countries of Tropical Africa, the petite bourgeoisie is relatively small. The collective monograph published by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economics and International Relations "Razvivayushchiesya Strany: Zakonomernosti, Tendentsii, Perspektivy" [The Developing Countries: Patterns, Trends, Prospects], (Mysl, Moscow, 1974) notes in this connection that "the petite bourgeoisie is a bourgeois social stratum which exists in developing countries only to the extent to which traditional relations have broken down and a capitalist environment has developed, which turned the peasant, artisan and merchant into a petit bourgeois and only to the extent to which the laws of capitalism operate. Insufficient grounds exist to classify all artisans, merchants and other petty owners...as part of the petite bourgeoisie (p 273). The fact that the development of petit bourgeois trends in revolutionary democratic parties and in the state apparatus under the influence of internal as well as external factors outstrips the process of development of the specific petit bourgeois stratum is a different matter. Secondly, the basic criterion in defining the class nature of revolutionary democracy is the nature of the social policy of the socially oriented state, conducted on an anti-imperialist, anticapitalist, antifeudal and antitribalist basis. This policy goes far beyond the range of interests of the petit bourgeois and is based on the coinciding interests of different class and political forces. Therefore, from the viewpoint of its class nature, it would be more accurate to define revolutionary democracy as an ideological-political trend which reflects the coinciding interests of the working class, the peasantry and the urban middle classes and, in a number of countries, the patriotic segment of

the middle bourgeoisie, although such a coincidence is frequently temporary and unstable. In addition to common features inherent in revolutionary democracy as an ideological-political trend, substantial differences may be found in the political leadership of the revolutionary-democratic coalition.

The books under review consider the policy of revolutionary-democratic countries on the labor problem, aimed at drafting progressive labor legislation, enhancing the living standard of the working class and gradually involving workers in the administration of economic and social processes and promoting their ideological upbringing. The role of the trade unions has noticeably increased in countries with a socialist orientation. Under the conditions of a revolutionary-democratic system, "the trade unions promote the strengthening of the state sector. They actively participate in production management and struggle for upgrading labor productivity, strengthening labor discipline and enhancing literacy and worker training" ("The Working Class of the Countries of North Africa," p 12).

One of the important problems related to the development of the labor movement in countries with a socialist orientation is that of the alliance between communists and revolutionary democrats. In this connection, proceeding from specific historical practices in individual countries, the authors of "The Workers Movement in the Liberated Countries of Asia and North Africa: Characteristics and Tendencies" have described the successes and difficulties accompanying the forming of such an alliance. The experience acquired in the development of a number of countries with a socialist orientation proves that any harming of the ideological-political and organizational autonomy of the communist parties not only hinders the establishment of a united anti-imperialist front on the basis of the alliance between communist and revolutionary-democratic parties but also leads to adverse consequences for the entire policy of socialist orientation.

The quantitative and qualitative growth of the proletariat in the Afro-Asian countries gradually contributes to the intensification of its role in the national liberation movement. Despite all difficulties and weaknesses, the labor movement in the liberated countries has achieved substantial successes and its significance will continue to increase. Therefore, the study of the problems of the labor movement in Asian and African countries has become an important scientific trend in the theory of the global revolutionary process. The books under review are a step forward in this direction. Naturally, not all of their content is of equal value. A number of debatable problems have been raised which require further work and substantial refining. As a whole, the works under review are a major theoretical and factual foundation for the further study of the various aspects of the role of the working class in the national liberation movement.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/17

## SHORT BOOK REVIEW

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85) p 120

"Diplomaticheskii Slovar" [Diplomatic Dictionary]. A. A. Gromyko, A. G. Kovalev, P. P. Sevostyanov and S. L. Tikhvinskiy chief editors. In three volumes. Volume 1. Nauka, Moscow, 1984, 422 pages. Reviewed by F. Petrov.

[Text] The CPSU ascribes prime importance to the profound study of the most important trends in the development of international relations and the experience gained by Soviet diplomacy in the course of nearly 70 years of tireless struggle for peace and the security of the peoples. As one of the fundamental works on international problems, this new revised and expanded edition of "Diplomaticheskii Slovar," the first volume of which has been published, will attract the readers' attention.

The period since the publication of the preceding third edition (1971-1973) was a time filled with major and important events. The active foreign policy activities of the CPSU and the Soviet State, aimed at strengthening detente, was marked by socialist diplomatic successes, such as the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the signing of a number of fundamental treaties between the USSR and the other fraternal socialist countries, on the one hand, and the leading Western countries, on the other. The role and significance of the liberated countries in international affairs increased greatly. The nonaligned movement became an important factor in world politics. Multilateral conventions on problems of disarmament and sea, space and other areas of international law were formulated and adopted within the framework of the United Nations and other international organizations. Significant events took place in the area of international economic relations as well.

At the same time, however, the aggressiveness of the reactionary imperialist circles, in the United States above all, increased sharply. They charted a course of aggravation of tension, intensified confrontation and attaining military superiority over the Soviet Union. An extremely dangerous and tense stage appeared in the development of the international situation.

The most important trends and events of international life are reflected in the new edition of the dictionary. Here problems of foreign policy and

diplomacy are considered comprehensively, on the basis of Marxist-Leninist methodology, from their historical, international-legal, national and general theoretical aspects. This applies above all to the scientific determination of the correlation between the concepts of "foreign policy" and "diplomacy," and to describing the interconnection between them.

Naturally, the dictionary concentrates on materials related to Soviet foreign policy and diplomacy and their basic principles and tasks. The main attention is focused on the purposeful activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state in the formulation and implementation of the Peace Program of the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses, the Peace Program for the 1980s and the development of fraternal cooperation among socialist countries. Compared to previous editions, a significantly greater number of articles deal with the national liberation movement and the struggle waged by the developing countries for strengthening their political and economic independence and the reorganization of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis. The dictionary convincingly exposes the aggressive foreign policy of the imperialist countries and provides a critical analysis of the "theoretical" substantiation of its doctrines and concepts.

The new edition contains the necessary referential material on problems of disarmament, international law and international economic relations. The activities of the UN and other international organizations are extensively covered. Nor has the age-old history of diplomacy and international relations been forgotten. Russian diplomacy has been covered much more extensively. Virtually all articles include bibliographies. The section dealing with Soviet, Russian and foreign personalities has been substantially updated.

We cannot fail to point out that the present edition of the dictionary is written in an improved clear and sharp style. Virtually all of its articles have been substantially revised and thoroughly edited. Their content is presented meaningfully and concisely, with argumented conclusions. This has made it possible to increase the number of articles by nearly one third, which makes the dictionary a true encyclopedia of foreign policy, based on the thorough study of an extensive range of sources and documents, including archival ones.

This new edition, which was compiled by a large group of Soviet diplomats, historians, jurists and economists, and which reflects the high standards of development by Soviet science of problems of foreign policy, history of international relations and diplomacy and international law will unquestionably have a broad and grateful readership.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985.

5003

CSO: 1802/17

THE JOURNAL'S MAIL: JANUARY-JUNE 1985

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 11, Jul 85 (signed to press 30 Jul 85) pp 121-128

[Text] During the first half of the year KOMMUNIST received 1,597 pieces of mail, including 308 articles, essays, reviews and notes, 256 responses to publications in the journal, 334 questions, suggestions and wishes addressed to the editors and 699 petitions and complaints.

This year has been saturated with events of great sociopolitical significance. Above all, it is the final year of the 11th Five-Year Plan and the year of preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress. This makes the work of the Soviet people particularly intensive. It concentrates their energy on the successful implementation of state plans and socialist obligations and increases the requirements regarding the activities of party, soviet and economic bodies. A short while ago we solemnly celebrated noteworthy dates, such as the 115th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth and the 40th anniversary of the great victory over fascist Germany. Naturally, all of this has been reflected in the editorial mail, proving once again the strength of the interests and outlook of our readers and the noteworthy ability of workers, kolkhoz members, members of the intelligentsia and labor veterans to concentrate on the main problems of our days and think seriously about resolving topical problems of scientific and technical and social progress.

The study of the articles and letters received by the editors justifies the contention that the resolutions of the April 1985 Central Committee Plenum, the latest CPSU Central Committee decrees and the speeches of Comrade M. S. Gorbachev, its general secretary, on problems of domestic and foreign policy have met with a lively response in the minds and hearts of the Soviet people and are consistent with their hopes and aspirations. The thought of the need to implement persistently, systematically and at a faster pace the type of changes and transformations which would enable us to reach within the shortest possible historical time a new qualitative condition in society, clearly formulated and comprehensively substantiated by the party, imbues the editorial mail as well. The readers thoroughly welcome the formulation of the task of leading our country to the highest standard of social labor productivity and support the fastest possible creation of conditions to this effect, such as the acceleration of scientific and technical progress,

production intensification, changes in economic management methods, planning and management consistent with contemporary economic development methods, identifying and utilizing our organizational-economic and social reserves and upgrading individual responsibility for assignments, particularly among party members and managers on all levels.

Concern is expressed about the still slow implementation of the Food Program and the insufficient satisfaction of demand for industrial goods and services; indignation is voiced at the low quality of many of them and at faults in population medical services. Many claims are voiced concerning the work of cultural institutions and the organization of the rest and recreation of working people, young people in particular. In general, the mail clearly shows that a great deal of work remains to be done in our country in the area of organizing a model socialist way of life.

It is rewarding that the absolute majority of our voluntary correspondents not simply approve or criticize something or other but describe the way they themselves or their labor collectives have joined in resolving the party tasks. They submit many specific proposals dictated by their sincere concern for social affairs.

Hero of Socialist Labor Ye. Vlasov, fitter-assembly worker at the Moskovskiy Elektrolampovyy Zavod Association machine building shop, stipulates quite clearly the following: "As a working person and a communist, I warmly support the resolutions of the April plenum and the energetic steps taken by the party and the government aimed at the immediate application of scientific and technical progress, which is a 'strategic lever of national economic intensification.' My fellow-workers think the same way. We liked very much the lively and intimate talks between M. S. Gorbachev and the people in Leningrad, Dnepropetrovsk and Kiev. A direct and frank conversation and a comradely appeal always trigger sympathy and the desire to answer with accomplishments. We are currently trying to assess our work on the basis of the positions of the state and to increase our individual contributions to the growth of production efficiency and, above all, in upgrading labor productivity. The association's collective has assumed the obligation to achieve considerable savings of material resources over the 5-year period and, to the best of my knowledge, is implementing it successfully."

From the letter of A. Shokul, director of the Azovstal Metallurgical Combine imeni Sergo Ordzhonikidze: "In his speech at the meeting with the collective of the Metallurgical Plant imeni G. I. Petrovskiy in Dnepropetrovsk, M. S. Gorbachev formulated a number of important and specific tasks for the country's metallurgical workers, tasks which are close to and understood by us: The collective of Azovstal has worked under the conditions of the economic experiment since January 1985. It has truly and profoundly realized the need for a collective contract order, the creation of consolidated comprehensive cost-accounting brigades and improvements in the combine's organizational structure. This is what we are working on. A great deal has already been accomplished to improve production and economic activities and to enhance the creative activeness of our engineering services and social institutions. We are implementing measures for the intensification of metallurgical production, such as technical retooling and reconstruction and

modernization of enterprises. All of this is having a beneficial influence on upgrading production efficiency."

The author of this letter discusses in particular the effectiveness of the relations established between the combine and scientific institutions. "The applied innovations accelerate the growth rate of output and enable us to improve production quality. They will have a positive influence on the energizing of the human factor."

CPSU veteran Docent N. Slavkin writes that the broad tasks aimed at the country's socioeconomic development set by the party "can be implemented only by developing high-level discipline in all national economic units," and eliminating negative phenomena which hinder the introduction of proper order. It is from this specific viewpoint that he considers some problems of improving specialist training in VUZs.

CPSU member and armed forces veteran V. Kovalev (Novgorod) emphasizes that the efforts aimed at national economic intensification and radical improvements in social labor productivity should not be reduced merely to various types of economic measures, although naturally they play the main role in this matter. A comprehensive approach should be adopted to the solution of the problem and to ensuring its organizational and ideological support. The task is scientifically to sum up and persistently to apply progressive experience in managing economic activities and raise cadres in the spirit of socialist collectivism and the Leninist work style: true efficiency, a statesmanlike approach and intolerance of shortcomings.

Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Martyanov (Kharkov), who, as he writes, was greatly impressed by M. S. Gorbachev's meeting with heads of industrial associations and enterprises, kolkhozes, sovkhoses and production brigades and specialists and scientists, held in Moscow last April, and the other speeches by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, is particularly interested in the search for and utilization of the most efficient and specific means of "mass involvement of the potential of the working people in production management." This, in his view, would hasten the solution of many topical problems.

He further expresses the conviction that improvements in industrial and agricultural planning could yield substantial results. Planning must mandatorily begin from the bottom, with the participation of the specialists and all working people involved in the production process. New and more efficient quality control methods are also needed. For example, in discussing the need for decisively upgrading the quality of housing construction, the author suggests that the future occupants participate in signing the documents for accepting the premises from the construction workers. In this connection, he considers important that we continue to increase the responsibility of managers and performers, to impose stricter "economic penalties to production collectives which produce substandard and obsolete items and unmarketable consumer goods."

The same thoughts are supported and further developed by engineer B. Zagreyev (Pushkino, Moscow Oblast). He writes: "I am a regular reader of your journal

and am particularly interested in articles on economic subjects. Here is what strikes me: When people speak of perfecting our economic mechanism they usually consider the type of new instruction or decree which will make people work well. The main thing, however, is who, who are the specific people who stand behind such an instruction and whose interests they protect. The economy is a large and complex system. Yet we know that any system works well and stably only if it has feedback. In this case this means the influence of the consumer on the producer." He emphasizes that this refers to the consumer in the broad meaning of the term: "This applies to individuals, organizations and enterprisers which receive goods produced by other enterprises. These are the same people to which I referred earlier....What we need is a permanent economic mechanism of influence by the consumer on the producer!" As to how this can be accomplished, B. Zagreyev expresses the hope that the answer could be provided by competent economists.

Candidates of Technical Sciences Muscovites A. Benderskiy and G. Potemkin write the following: "In order to implement purposeful and planned steps aimed at improving production quality we must master the methods for quality rating. The scientific substantiation of methods for the comprehensive assessment of production quality are still not meeting all requirements. That is why, so far the question of selecting the best production models and organizing their production is resolved in the course of frequently poorly argued discussions. State certification commissions frequently award the state Emblem of Quality to undeserving items. Production prices are set regardless of useful effect. The study of the dynamics of quality on the level of the enterprise, association, economic sector, etc. is hindered." This should no longer be tolerated. The authors justifiably consider that it is time "to analyse profoundly and in detail the entire set of problems relative to quality rating and economic effectiveness based on the utilization of specific goods and the formulation of a coordination plan for scientific research and development of methodical documents."

A number of readers have written on the subject of the advantages of the brigade work method, existing achievements and the reasons which occasionally restrain the process of brigade development and increased labor efficiency.

In discussing the problem of perfecting socialist production relations, reader N. Kushiyevev (Makhachkala) notes that with an individual payment for labor "personal and collective interests did not always coincide, and were not channelled into the single stream of national interests. Furthermore, occasionally they contradicted each-other. Naturally, this could not fail to affect the labor results of the entire collective. The combination of individual with collective (brigade) interests and the interests of the entire enterprise under the conditions of the brigade form of labor organization is the basis for success at the present time."

Candidate of Economic Sciences Ye. Gavrilenko (Tomsk) emphasizes that "the essence of the brigade method, from the viewpoint of the system of socialist production relations, rests not in wages, albeit collective." In his view, the main thing is that "the brigade organization of labor makes the worker the true master of the production process, thereby being the most adequate form of implementation of the basic production relation at the present stage of

developed socialism: the relation of direct social collective work by producers associated on the scale of the entire society as joint masters of the production process." It is on the basis of this viewpoint that the author sums up in his manuscript factual data gathered at Tomsk and Tomsk Oblast enterprises and discusses specific steps to improve brigade work, such as perfecting the labor participation coefficients (KTU), developing the socialist competition "less among brigade members than among brigades" and creating better conditions for the development of rationalizations and inventions.

Many authors of letters, manuscripts and articles discuss the social and moral aspects of the brigade form of labor organization. Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Tkachenko (Zaporozhe) writes: "A sociopsychological study which was made in several enterprises in the city convincingly proved the morally tangible consequences of the application of the brigade method and its strong impact on the development of feelings of comradeship and collectivism. Thus, whereas only 42 percent of those working on the basis of individual orders deem it their duty to help their shop, sector or brigade comrade, this has become the standard behavioral norm of 84 percent of working people in collectives working on the basis of a single order."

On the basis of studies conducted in several UkSSR enterprises, A. Tkachenko draws the conclusion that competition among collectives of related brigades linked through the same technological process must become the main method of interbrigade socialist competition. Such competition is based on contracts concluded among related brigades; the active brigade councils and heads organize the public defense of the contracts. The author considers this an example of the efficient implementation of the USSR Law on Labor Collectives.

O. Prutchikov, senior scientific associate at the Central Scientific Research Automotive Vehicle and Automotive Motor Institute, expresses his satisfaction with the fact that an important role was assigned to broadening the realm of action of cost accounting in our economy, and the extension of the principles of the collective order to associations and enterprises at the June CPSU Central Committee conference on the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. Proceeding from the experience gained on the level of the primary production units--brigades, shops and sectors--the author expresses a number of considerations on the ways of converting entire enterprises to full cost accounting and collective work order. In his view, they should sign respective "state order contracts" with state management bodies for a 5-year term" contracts which should be formulated, discussed and approved with the active participation of the entire labor collective. The conversion of enterprises to full cost accounting and collective contracts is related according to the author to "a considerable broadening of their rights in the area of economic self-management."

In his manuscript "Mechanism of Intensification of Public Production," Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Zhuravlev (Kiev) attempts to find a new indicator for the development of the national economy, which would maximally assist in resolving topical economic and social problems.

The existing summing up indicators of national economic development, he asserts, "are inconsistent with the level of development of production forces," for which reason they "do not stimulate to the fullest extent the accelerated intensification and increased efficiency of the production process." Believing the crux of the problem to be the proper determination of the "specifics of dialectical interaction between live and past labor in the socialist society," "the growth rates of the share of past labor and of the decline of live labor in end production results," the author suggests the introduction of an indicator, such as "working time economy," arguing that it will be most appropriate "in the role of a criterion of social production intensification and efficiency," and that "it is the final generalizing result indicator, which is more responsive to the dynamics of present and past labor compared to the other indices, as well as an indicator which allows the fullest possible utilization of all objective economic laws of socialism in the interest of society and the most efficient combination of the advantages of socialism with technical progress."

A. Zhuravlev is not alone in the search for better methods to assess production intensification. Thus, Doctor of Economic Sciences F. Veselkov (Leningrad) suggests modifications to the indicator for such assessment, one of which is the "indicator of absolute labor economy." Unfortunately, lack of space prevents us from presenting the details of his suggestions and computations which, unquestionably, are noteworthy.

At the April CPSU Central Committee meeting, M. S. Gorbachev pointed out that the tasks of scientific and technical progress demand of us a new approach to our entire foreign economic activities. In reminding us of this, Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Fedorov (Moscow) notes that this formulation of the question demands of economic scientists a more profound development of the entire set of problems of contemporary world economic relations in accordance with the tasks of upgrading the socioeconomic effectiveness of the participation of the USSR in the international division of labor, increasing the contribution of the foreign economic area to the accelerated growth of labor productivity in the national economy and the intensification of the processes of its comprehensive intensification.

"The appearance and noticeable development of new forms of foreign economic relations which exceed the limits of traditional foreign trade (compensation agreements, industrial cooperation, scientific and technical cooperation, etc.) raises new requirements concerning the level of political and economic substantiations of practical recommendations on the utilization of economic laws in the area of international economic contacts, consistent with the nature of socialist society. The task of the scientists is to analyze more profoundly the effect of the law of time savings, which is manifested in the growth of social labor productivity on the basis of the utilization of the advantages of international economic cooperation, and to determine the actual correlation between this law and the law of value," V. Fedorov emphasizes.

The readers are continuing to respond to the journal's publications, particularly on problems of the country's further economic and social development. They were pleased with this year's editorials "Democracy and Discipline" (No 3) and "We must Go Forward and Look Ahead" (No 6). These

articles created an interest because of the topical nature of the subjects, realistic approach and multiple-level treatment. Thus, A. Ranyuk (Moscow), CPSU member since 1929, was pleased with the "deep meaning and sharp formulation of the problems" in the editorial "Democracy and Discipline." As though continuing the discussion initiated by the journal, Ranyuk condemns the practice of granting workers and employees leave of absence for carrying out projects needed by society and social assignments beyond their enterprises or offices. In his view, this is incompatible with both socialist democracy and socialist discipline. Propagandist F. Yermonin (Severodvinsk) reports that the editorial "Democracy and Discipline" was "thoroughly studied by the workers in his sector. Two thirds of the article are addressed to our collective. The study and discussion of the editorial triggered questions, arguments and even objections: some people saw in it a description of themselves." He expresses the wish for the journal to describe in greater detail the "features of contemporary individual antagonism" frequently observed in our life. "Let me say frankly that it has been a long time since I have read such a sharp, practical and profound article," writes Muscovite Candidate of Technical Sciences S. Titov, Great Patriotic War veteran, referring to the editorial "We Must Go Forward and Look Ahead." "I hope that already during the lifetime of my generation it will be possible to develop a national economic management system under the conditions of developed socialism." Like other readers, he particularly singles out the question raised in the editorial on means to perfect the management apparatus on a scientific basis.

A number of correspondents, such as those we mentioned, address themselves to problems of the organization of the socialist competition. Let us mention here yet another article which deals with the role of the press in describing the better experience gained in such work and the need to describe the role of party committees in the development and improvement of labor competitiveness. In analyzing in his manuscript publications on this topic carried out in many newspapers in the Volgo-Vyatsk area, Candidate of Historical Sciences N. Pechenevskiy (Gorkiy) concludes that a great deal of disparity is apparent in the very approach to this most important phenomenon in our social life and in understanding its true objectives and principles. The newspapers essentially record practical accomplishments about which they inform the readers without, however, properly assessing such facts from the viewpoint of following the Leninist principles of organization of the competition and of summing up its results. The author suggests that "the study of the scientific theoretical problems of the socialist competition and CPSU directives on this problem by all cadres be broadened."

Let us end this part of the review of the readers' mail with an interesting and, frankly, unexpected question which Moscow worker Ye. Dubrovskiy raises in his letter. Our propaganda's customary formulation that "under socialism the working people work for themselves and not for the exploiters" is not always properly understood despite its entire seeming clarity. He defends his view as follows: In formulating this view, V. I. Lenin took into consideration the need to explain to the toiling people in simple and clear terms the nature of the accomplished revolution and the essence of their social liberation. He took into consideration the mentality of people who had become accustomed to work for a boss or bosses in the broad meaning of the term, for people who,

one way or another, were living at the expense of their labor. Unquestionably, throughout the transitional period from capitalism to socialism in our country and even for a while this formulation played a positive role. Today, although remaining theoretically impeccable on the whole, it is frequently interpreted by people as a justification of their aspiration to place personal interests above those of the collective and society at large. The same view is related to departmentalism and parochialism. That is why, Ye. Dubrovskiy concludes, in propaganda work attention should be paid above all to problems of properly combining private with public interests and to the objective and inevitable fact that it is only by conscientiously working for the good of society and being truly concerned with the good of the public we work best of all for ourselves.

The editorial article "Revolutionary Dialectics of Marxist Realism" (No 1), written on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the publication of V. I. Lenin's article "On the Problem of Dialectics," triggered a great response on the part of scientists. Responses to the article by academicians V. Ambartsumyan and B. Kedrov were published in Issue No 10. Following are excerpts of other letters on this subject.

The readers point out that the article not only emphasizes the most important theoretical concepts of Marxism-Leninism but also raises a number of timely questions relative to the further research, study and propaganda of dialectical materialism.

Candidate of Philosophical Sciences V. Vasilev (Minsk) singles out in the article the thought that true realism in science and politics is possible only if it is based on materialism dialectical materialism at that, which is precisely what gives theory and politics a true breath and daring of views. The author of the letter considers the fruitfulness of the study of nonantagonistic contradictions inherent in mature socialism as directly dependent on the methodology of the study--materialistic dialectics. This requires tireless work on mastering the "core" of dialectics--the theory of contradictions and its further "splitting," metaphorically speaking. "The questions raised in the article," V. Vasilev writes, "are of essential significance in the study and propaganda of Leninist dialectics. Let me point out that despite extensive and interesting informative data, as a whole our philosophy textbooks and curriculae are still suffering from weakness and insufficient integrity and provability. I am speaking on the basis of long years of experience in work at a VUZ and in training post graduate students."

Zh. Abdildin, academic secretary, Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences Department of Social Sciences, points out that the article justifiably emphasizes the importance of Lenin's thought on the coincidence among dialectics, logic and the theory of knowledge. The authors of scientific publications frequently forget or else misinterpret it by describing dialectics as ontology and pitting gnosiology and logic against it. They claim that since dialectics is part of all areas of knowledge it is applied in both gnosiology and logic. The groundlessness of such an approach is obvious and is explained by a lack of full understanding of the nature of the revolutionary change which Marxism made in philosophy.

"Marxism proved that the same universal laws govern nature, society and thinking. Thinking is not a separate and autonomous activity. As a reflection of objective reality, it is merely the ideal form of practical tangible reality, for which reason it does not have its own specific laws but obeys the laws of dialectics, as do nature and society. Another thought based on Marxist philosophy is that it is not the isolated psychological individual but society itself, the social man, who is the subject of study..."

"On the basis of these premises," the author claims, "Marxism surmounts and abolishes the old ontology, gnosiology and logic, which once had their own specific research topics, principles and concepts. They are replaced by a single science: dialectical materialism, which studies the universal laws of nature, society and thinking, and which is, at the same time, both logic and theory of knowledge. No separate 'gnosiology' or separate 'logic' exist within the framework of Marxist philosophy. Here dialectical materialism itself acts as both the logic and theory of knowledge. The author is amazed at the "aspiration" of some of our philosophers to combine Lenin's basic idea of the unity among dialectics, logic and the theory of knowledge with the traditional division of philosophy into ontology, gnosiology and logic. To separate dialectics from the logic and theory of knowledge means to depreciate it, to transform it, as the article accurately states, into 'something similar to Duhring's 'world outline'.' Logic separated from dialectics turns into traditional formal logic."

The analysis provided in the editorial article of the nature of the dialectical contradiction and criticism of one-sided approaches to the question of contradictions under socialism met with the approval of the readers. Candidate of Philosophical Sciences L. Yerichev (Leningrad) discusses in particular the thesis according to which reason can properly perceive the absolute contradiction only if it is dialectical; in Marxism, the theory of life is inseparable from that of knowledge and thought.

"I read this article with the greatest of interests," notes in his letter Doctor of Chemical Sciences V. Kuznetsov, RSFSR honored worker in the sciences (Moscow). "Unlike many works which deal with the subject of the philosophy of dialectical materialism, it dots all the i's in terms of the way to understand Lenin's concept of the sameness of dialectics, logic and the theory of knowledge." We can speak of the effectiveness of dialectical materialism only if it is considered not only ontologically but also as a theory of knowledge, the purpose of which is to formulate methods of creative thinking and shape an active life stance in the fighter for communist ideals. "That is precisely why," the author goes on to say, "said article is so important to me and my colleagues in the natural sciences, who are by necessity involved in resolving not only tactical problems which are part of enduring views and theories, but also problems which exceed the range of dominants, such as classical thermodynamics, problems which are increasingly arising today."

V. Kuznetsov points out the importance of the article in the education and upbringing of the young generation. "It is no secret," he emphasizes, "that it is precisely as a result of underestimating the role of dialectics as the theory of knowledge and the revolutionary transformation of the world and the separation of dialectics from logic and gnosiology and reducing it to a kind

of universal theory of life that the tradition developed of shaping a scientific outlook on the basis of the "material" of one branch of the natural sciences or another, which led to reducing dialectics to a sum of examples..." Understandably, such an interpretation of dialectics hinders the shaping of a truly dialectical-materialistic outlook.

Specialists from Rostov-na-Donu doctors of medical sciences L. Garkavi and M. Ukolov and Doctor of Biological Sciences Ye. Kvakin fully share the ideological enthusiasm expressed in the article. They see in dialectics the foundations of the standards of theoretical thinking of the natural scientist. "An understanding of this is necessary for the successful development of any science. We entirely agree with the viewpoint expressed in the journal that our time urgently requires the summation and streamlining of the data acquired in the natural sciences and their dialectical processing, as well as the fact that no method other than the ascension from the abstract to the concrete exists in resolving this problem. Numerous facts have accumulated and continue to accumulate in biology and medicine, leading to the paradox that the abundance of empirical data becomes a hindrance. The view according to which theory is derived from the simple summation of experience and leads to ever new searches and the introduction of increasingly different data, while the theoretical conclusion becomes increasingly distant is rather limited. It is the result of ignorance of the dialectics of interaction between theory and empiricism" "Without dialectics theoretical knowledge proves to be near sighted or even totally blind," the scientists conclude.

Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences A. Mishchenko (Moscow) also believes that the journal's discussion of Lenin's most important work "On the Problem of Dialectics" is quite relevant. "As a practitioner of the most abstract of sciences--mathematics--I can see particularly clearly the need for the creative interpretation of Lenin's works on philosophy and the Marxist-Leninist method. Mathematical research methods are being currently actively applied in all areas of knowledge. The subject of mathematics has become inordinately broadened of late. A number of mathematical theories have appeared, describing various phenomena in the material world around us. The specific nature of development of this science is the multiplicity of stages mediated through modelling. This circumstance has led to the formulation and development of the so-called axiomatic method which allows us to present economically a large number of various mathematical laws, thus facilitating the application of abstract theories to practical problems... However, some scientists have adopted it as the only method of knowledge in mathematics. They have begun to proclaim as its target not the material world surrounding us but the abstract mathematical structures themselves.... However, those who make concessions to a metaphysical outlook in the main thing inevitably slide to idealistic positions in the entire interpretation of the subject of his science," A. Mishchenko sums up, and cites convincing examples on the way this takes place. "Sinning against dialectical materialism leads to the distortion of another problem of importance to science: the criterion of accuracy of scientific knowledge," he writes." The role of practice as the criterion of truth is diminished and the role of the logical noncontradictoriness of mathematical theories becomes exaggerated."

In the opinion of Candidate of Technical Sciences M. Antonov and Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Persianov (Moscow), the problems of political economy and individual economic sectors require profound dialectical interpretation. Lagging in this area is fraught with great harm to the country, for it may slow down the pace of the planned profound reorganization of the planning and management of the entire national economic mechanism. In discussing the tremendous national and party-wide importance of such reorganization, the scientists emphasize that "its purpose is to harmonize the development of the general and the specific in economics and to ensure that successes in one of its aspects contribute to successes in the other, and vice-versa."

In his letter, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences D. Gorskiy disagrees with some of the concepts expressed in the editorial article. Thus, he considers erroneous the following assertion: "The overemphasis of the formal aspects of cognitive activities leads some philosophers to the conclusion that the dialectics of knowledge, as codified in specific laws, is not a reproduction of the outside world. This is clearly a case of withdrawal from the Marxist-Leninist theory of reflection" (p 44). In his view, this excerpt "rejects the existence of specific dialectical laws, principles and correlations of knowledge and claims that all dialectical laws are general, operating simultaneously in nature, society and thinking."

The specific passage cited by D. Gorskiy shows that the article raises the question not of the existence of specific laws of knowledge but of whether they reflect objective reality, for which reason the objections of the author remain unclear, for he himself claims that "all the laws of dialectics are a reflection of reality in the broad meaning of the term." He leaves unclear his understanding of the specific laws of knowledge which, unlike general laws, "reflect the cognitive relations between subject and object in the cognitive process." Consequently, the laws of knowledge are specific only to the extent to which they reflect knowledge itself and nothing else. We disagree with this view.

D. Gorskiy, who supports the accurate idea that formal-logical contradictions are inadmissible in theory, assumes that the editorial article "deals with any contradictions, including the usual logical ones." This accusation is based on a clear misunderstanding, for the editorial article deals with dialectics and the contradictions within it are considered dialectically rather than from the viewpoint of formal logic. Theoretical thinking is thinking in terms of concepts "which also may be rough, fractured, flexible, mobile, relative, interrelated and united in their contradictions in order to be able to encompass the world" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 29, p 131).

The journal's mail is varied. This also applies to the richest possible range of topics dealing with the 40th anniversary of the victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War. During the last few months the readers have discussed them in connection with the materials published in the journal on the occasion of this great anniversary, recalling in their letters their memories of the past and expressing their concern regarding the increasingly explosive international situation created today by world imperialism. In discussing current affairs, such as the various aspects of social, economic

and spiritual life, the readers voice the thought that the memory of the war and of those who did not return but who ensured the peaceful life of the Soviet people makes it incumbent upon all of us to work better, more energetically and efficiently for the implementation of the plans for the development of the country and the advancement of our society.

The letters of veterans, military servicemen and members of the young Soviet generation reveal that the memory of the hard years of the war and of the soldiers who saved the homeland will live forever in the people. Citing a variety of examples, the readers prove that the victory which was won in the flames of the battles in the Great Patriotic War was not only a victory of the Soviet Army or of our military science and art of military leadership. It was the victory of the entire multinational Soviet people, united under the banner of the communist party, who convincingly proved to the entire world their inflexible will power, firmness and resolve in the struggle against fascism and the ability to surmount even the most severe trials.

Many of the letters deal with problems of the further development of our society. We have cited a few, for it would be impossible to mention all of them. However there is one problem raised in the mail, the solution of which will enable us to improve our society, to strengthen labor and technological discipline and to contribute to the spiritual growth of the Soviet people, that must be mentioned. It applies to the struggle against the widespread phenomenon of drunkenness and alcoholism. Most of the letters to the editors were written before the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium ukase on this problem. This confirms yet once again the timeliness of the publication of said documents. Naturally, a great variety of points of view exist on the ways and means for uprooting this social ill, ranging from the most radical, such as the immediate and unconditional passing of a "dry law," to entirely realistic thoughts on how to organize our life in order to eliminate more rapidly an confidently "drunken traditions," and advance toward a comprehensive establishment of a sober way of life. "In connection with the publication of the latest decrees," writes A. Pochtar (Melitopol), "let us hope that this will not be merely the latest measure similar to those in the past. The previous ones 'adapted' quite peacefully to the annual increase in the production and consumption of alcoholic beverages, banquets, and numerous drinking bouts in honor of peace, friendship and respect." Engineer V. Podlipentsev (Kharkov) asks the reasons for which sobriety did not triumph as a norm of our life and tries to answer it. V. Strugallo (Krasnodar) calls upon the press organs extensively to propagandize the attitude of the Marxist-Leninist classics concerning the use of alcohol, particularly Lenin's instructions on preventing this terrible social illness.

In his knowledgeably written "Notes of a Dietologist on Drunkenness and Wine Drinking, Alcoholism and Wine Treatment, physician docent Z. Evenshteyn (Leningrad) emphasizes, in particular, that "antialcohol propaganda does not reach many among those at whom it is addressed. This applies not only to people who take to drink or have already become drunkards. Many "normally" drinking people believe that views on and proof of the harm of alcohol do not apply to them... I, like many of my colleagues, am convinced that it is precisely this category of people who must become the main topic in discussions on the reasons, the "trigger mechanisms" of alcoholism and the

unquestionable harm of the systematic consumption of alcohol." Docent D. Brenkevich (Kuybyshev), a party and labor veteran, entirely supports the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Measures to Eliminate Drunkenness and Alcoholism," "for this is one more party concern for the health of every person, of the entire people," and suggests that a struggle be mounted against smoking as well, "this blue snake" brother of the "green snake."

We have consciously limited this survey to statements by readers dealing only with the range of the most vital problems of today's life of Soviet society covered in the survey, although the topics on which they have written the editors cover a much broader range. In as much as is possible, the journal's mail will continue to reflect other surveys on specific topics covered in its sections. It is important to emphasize the fact that even letters which are not mentioned in the journal provide a great deal of suggestions to the editors in their work by giving them an idea of public opinion, without which no press organ can function.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985.

5003

CSO: 1802/17

END