

243053

PRS-UKO-88-013
27 AUGUST 1988



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

KOMMUNIST

No 7, May 1988

19980716 075

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

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

10
92
A05

Soviet Union

KOMMUNIST

No 7, May 1988

JPRS-UKO-88-013

CONTENTS

2 AUGUST 1988

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

Ideological Problems of Perestroika; KOMMUNIST Roundtable Meeting	1
Ecology: From Concern to Effective Policy [V. Koptug; pp 24-33]	14
Democratization of the Party Means Democratization of Society; KOMMUNIST Roundtable Meeting by Correspondence	21
A Generation [S. Freylikh; pp 43-46]	29
What and How to Teach A Director? [L.I. Goldin; pp 47-53]	31
Facing a Choice [V.I. Krichagin; pp 54-62]	36
Centralized Management and the Market [E.B. Figurnov; pp 63-71]	41
Friendly Relations Are Intensifying and Strengthening [B. Arkhipov; pp 72-78]	46
Social Progress in the Contemporary World. Theses for Discussion	51
Judicial Science and Practice Under Perestroika; Scientists and Practical Workers Answer KOMMUNIST Questions	59
Petty Corrections Cannot Be Described as Rationalizations; Documents of V.V. Kuybyshev on the Occasion of the Centennial of His Birth	64
Everything Should be Mentioned [P. Yankevskiy; pp 105-107]	71
Old Practice? [T. Yarushina; pp 107-108]	73
'Dear and Precious' [V. Chudov; pp 108-109]	74
'With Hope for Aid and Support'	75
Contradictions in the Development of Socialist Self-Governing Democracy in Yugoslavia [N. Pashich; pp 110-115]	75
Romanian Communist Forum [M. Muntyan; pp 116-119]	79
'The Soviet Challenge.' Book by West German Social Democrats on Perestroika in the USSR	82
In the Interest of Peace and Progress [G. Seleznev; pp 124-126]	85
The Light of Truth [I. Mints; pp 126-127]	88
The Perestroika Experience Must Be Shared by All	89
Meetings With the Editors. Chronicle	89
Publication Data	89

KOMMUNIST

Ideological Problems of Perestroika; KOMMUNIST Roundtable Meeting

18020013a Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7,
May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 3-23

[KOMMUNIST roundtable on the ideological problems
of perestroika]

[Text] Interest in the ideological aspect of changes occurring in society increases during crucial historical times; social apathy disappears and the vital conceptual need arises for developing an integral awareness of reality. People seek answers to questions, such as what is happening to them, to life? Naturally, absorbed in their daily affairs and needs, they formulate their problems and concerns not as philosophical categories or sociological terms but as ordinary concepts. This, however, does not make their interest any less ideological or conceptual.

At such times it is as though public awareness is awakened and an intensive mental and moral quest is launched, reaching down to the very foundations of life and its historical past, present and future. That which only yesterday was either not noticed or considered as something mandatory and invariable becomes an object of close attention, sharp debate and heated arguments. Such shifts in social awareness are backed by revolutionary changes in life, the involvement of ever broader masses in politics and the growth of social activeness and feeling of dignity of the individual.

All of this is typical of our transitional period as well, a time of restructuring, which brings new ideas and trends, new views and new approaches which reflect profound changes in all social areas, changes which affect the interests of millions of people.

Understanding of the most complex processes occurring in society, the inner logic of its revolutionary development and the dialectics of innovation and continuity, and helping to clarify for man his decisive role in perestroika set new problems and tasks in ideological activities. It was natural for the February Plenum to set the task of ideological renovation and put it on the same level as crucial changes, such as the radical democratic reform and the democratization of party and social life. The plenum's ideas were concretized in PRAVDA's 5 April 1988 editorial. It emphasized the great need for creativity, principle-mindedness and consistency in this most important trend of party work and the inadmissibility and danger in this area of circumstantial trends and efforts to present obsolete dogmas and prejudices as the truth, as party concepts.

Our time demands above all a profound interpretation of the very essence of our ideology and the revival, to the fullest extent and volume, of its Leninist revolutionary-critical spirit, without which constructive work neither

exists nor could exist. It demands the active influence of the ideological factor on life, an influence which could be fruitful if one talks with the people honestly, truthfully and frankly.

Today perestroika has shifted from theory to the practice of real life. That is what makes so important our awareness of the entire seriousness of the situation and the fact that the success or failure of our current projects, on all levels, will determine the fate of the country and the people, the fate of socialism. That is what makes so important the uncompromising analysis of the positive features in the experience of perestroika and what restrains it, what leads us to the old impasse of stagnation. Three years have passed since the April Plenum. This time has indicated that the struggle against conservatism and dogmatism—the main opponents of renovation—remains the most important task. More than ever before problems of the steady and energetic implementation of the ideas and principles of perestroika and their uncompromising defense and ideological support become most urgently relevant.

This, however, is impossible without restructuring ideological activities themselves, and we must say that the mass information media have taken a major step in that direction. The style and methods of our propaganda, our upbringing and guidance of the spiritual development of society require a profound reinterpretation. Today we cannot work efficiently in the areas of ideology, science and culture without following Lenin's principle of being able to convince the people "not by the might of power, but by the power of our authority, the power of our energy, greater experience, greater comprehensiveness and greater talent" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 7, p 14). This type of action is difficult but necessary.

The editors decided to analyze this entire set of problems at a roundtable meeting. The following participated: **Ion Drutse**, writer; **V.A. Karakovskiy**, principal of Moscow School No. 825; **N.V. Karlov**, rector, Moscow Physical-Technical Institute and USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member; **V.S. Lelchuk**, doctor of historical sciences; **Yu.A. Manayenkov**, first secretary, Lipetsk CPSU Obkom; **N.V. Motroshilova**, doctor of philosophical sciences; **D.G. Muravyev**, general director of the Krasnyy Bogatyr PO (Moscow); **M.A. Ulyanov**, chairman of the board, RSFSR Union of Theater Workers; and the following KOMMUNIST associates: **I.A. Dedkov**, political commentator; **S.V. Kolesnikov**, deputy editor in chief; and **O.R. Latsis**, first deputy editor in chief.

Did Mikhail Ulyanov Ask Rhetorical Questions?

M.A. Ulyanov. I cannot find answers to many questions. Perhaps someone would be able to answer them today, for here intelligent people have gathered. Let me begin with the beginning. Everyone claims to accept perestroika, although nuances have already appeared. Also some people have begun to work against perestroika.

Wherever I have been, starting from the very top and ending with our theater world, generally everyone says the proper thing. Nonetheless, reading the press and looking at life, I can see in some of the people an ever-growing opposition to perestroyka, not in words, but in actions. For example, I have read the draft new decisions on taxing the cooperatives. I am not an economist and I may be naive but, I hope to have understood its essence. What happens is that the more the member of a cooperative earns, the more he is suppressed, with the obvious intention to take him down to a limit beyond which he would be unable to function. Is it necessary for the Ministry of Finance to introduce the type of taxation through which suppressing an important project can be easily done? I do not understand. Honestly, I do not understand. How is it possible, while professing perestroyka, to act essentially against it?

In the law on the enterprise I read the following: directors are being tormented with state orders and are suppressed to such an extent that no possibility of independence is left. It is those same state authorities that are doing it. This too I do not understand. Why is it that not conditions which would open opportunities for development but conditions which hinder any development are being set? The explanation I am being given is that the economy demands it...

Retort. The economy does not demand it.

M.A. Ulyanov. Therefore, this is demanded by some other forces known today as the obstruction system or bureaucracy or stagnation... These are elusive concepts. They have neither sound nor smell but are as dangerous as radiation.

Right now we are struggling for authorship rights. Such rights have been granted to composers but not to directors or actors. Your motion picture can be shown or a play performed as much as one wishes without any say on your part. When we started raising this question with the Union of Theater Workers, we came across a monstrous opposition on the part of the financial authorities and Gosteleradio, which is unwilling to share its rights with anyone. It can do anything it wants with a television film or program, without even informing the author: cut, delete, allow, ban...

Retort. In Tyumen the movie "Repentance" was cut strictly on the initiative of the local leadership.

M.A. Ulyanov. This does not create a problem, although we speak and write about such illegalities every day. It seems to me that today perestroyka does not need words. Words are becoming deleted, they are not being heard. What I read about Stalin is something general, not all that... I am much more concerned with today's problems, above all the laws and the creation of conditions under which such laws cannot be violated. This applies to cooperatives, enterprise rights, authorship rights, and so on.

The laws must be obeyed. Yet they are not. I do not understand why: is it because of sluggishness or for some special reason... I do not understand why we have two ideologies. Two, because as they say in Odessa, there is a great difference between the provinces and Moscow.

Yu.A. Manayenkov. My own observations do not confirm this saddening conclusion. One cannot judge of the course of perestroyka by the frequent noise effects which accompany it. One must learn how to distinguish between the people who think intensely and sincerely about the destinies of socialism and the brawlers who loudly proclaim their alleged warm support of perestroyka but, in fact, try to adapt to it in this case. On the periphery perestroyka seems more ordinary and calm than in the center. Calm, however, does not always mean worse or slower.

M.A. Ulyanov. My observations, however, confirm this sad conclusion although, naturally, personal observations provide insufficient grounds for broad summations. I was just reminded of the scandalous story with the film "Repentance" in Tyumen. The oblast authorities cut the film without any fear or doubt and allowed an essentially meaningless picture to be shown on the screen. How can this happen in the same country, and with a single ruling party! Had there been several parties one could understand, some would pull to the left and others to the right. But here, who is pulling? Fearlessly at that. Here and there people have begun not to fear even glasnost.

I had an interesting meeting in Mannheim, in West Germany. I was invited by the mayor to his small home. It was a small, clean house, the lawn neatly mowed... "Who takes care of all this?" I asked. I was told the following: "We are afraid of immigrants and the locals will not do it. We do it ourselves. Our family is now very happy, for our daughter found a job through a computer." "How through a computer?" "Very simple. Data on the need for manpower and on unemployment are entered. If the computer matches one with the other, it means that you have a job. That is how our daughter was hired." We were amazed and asked whether the mayor himself could not have found her a job. He smiled: "Naturally, I could, but then tomorrow or the day after an article would appear in the press and two days later I would have to resign." You see what happens. I am convinced, however, that those who cut "Repentance," and who were written up in the periodical, did not resign. They probably did not even think of resigning.

Personally, I am relying on the party conference. However, if there again people start saying that one must restructure without, however, erecting any kind of barriers which cannot be ignored because of the law and universally approved decisions, we would exorcise perestroyka once and for all. That is what concerns me. Urgent legislative-legal standards are needed, which no one could violate, neither the obkom secretary nor an actor at the Theater imeni Vakhtangov. We live without

rights. I recently read that, once again, there were cases of bribery, theft and account-padding in Chimkent. Is this not business as usual? The people we describe in various unflattering terms are applying heavy pressure. In Yaroslavl journalists were suppressed, and those who suppressed them, i.e., who made an attempt on the holy of holies, on the right to glasnost, what happened to those people? They were reprimanded. We know the worth of such reprimands. Therefore, there are forces unwilling to punish such people. When shall we start identifying the bureaucrats by name rather than describing them as being some kind of abstract forces?

Now as to our pluralism. What is this? The Union of Theater Workers has wanted to expel and author but has been unable to do so. This is because of pluralism. The man, it is claimed, has his own viewpoint, although this viewpoint is driving a wedge within the intelligentsia, exacerbating it on the subject of the national problem... Nonetheless, he cannot be punished even with a public reprimand. It is thus that we operate on a highly emotional level! I realize that punishment is also no solution. However, tolerance as well should not be infinite. In short, I do not know how to behave. Life is asking thousands of questions to which I have no answer. Yet they must be answered.

It is common knowledge that, after fierce arguments, the theater in Tomsk was the first to produce the play "Farther... Farther... Farther!" They rehearsed at night. Yet the play was not banned. The artists, however, were afraid. I asked one of them: why did you keep silent? I, he answered, will wait. Another one said that perhaps it was right to restrain us. It is the intelligentsia that tries everything and then suddenly finds itself stuck.

I was walking down Gorkiy Street in Moscow when the Crimean Tatars were demonstrating. The streets were blocked. I jumped out of my car, hoping that my face would be recognized. The militia man recognized me and let me pass. I asked: what is happening? "It is you, the intelligentsia, with your letters..." He started accusing the intelligentsia. And rightfully so, as long as we have such "cautious" people among us.

What does everything depend on? It depends on the leading cadres. We have begun to replace chairmen of unions of theater workers in Bashkiriya, Tatariya and elsewhere. Another generation is taking over, strong people, 35 to 40 years old, smart and hard-working, not blabberers. Cadres we have at home as well but they are not allowed to act. They are being moved up very slowly. This concerns me a great deal.

There is no way back, nor could there be. The only way lies ahead but we are somehow marking time. We must act. Act!

Yu.A. Manayenkov. We are definitely short of practicality. Nor should we ignore the real threat against which the Central Committee clearly cautioned, that of bogging

perestroika down. However, something else must be realized as well. Frequently the attractive appeal for "more action and less words!" contains quite a great deal of trickery, speculations, and fear of the process of democratization which is gathering strength, and of increasing glasnost. The ideological area, and the stereotypes which have not been eliminated in the public consciousness, and prejudices about socialism are today among the bottlenecks of perestroika. That is precisely why the February Plenum raised so urgently the task of formulating the ideology of renovation of our society. That is why the profound theoretical work on topical problems of building socialism, and the study and interpretation of the real experience gained in perestroika are so important now. Such experience already exists. However, many social scientists remain in a state of slumber. Today one could list on the tip of one's fingers who is working at the cutting edge of perestroika, which is developing in a contradictory way, formulating new tasks and problems, and having difficulty in surmounting the inertia of stagnation in the people's minds and behavior.

This was clearly exemplified by the article written by Nina Andreyeva, which was published in SOVETS-KAYA ROSSIYA and reprinted in a number of other newspapers. Naturally, this is not a question of the author but of the feelings expressed through this article and the forces supporting it. I see in this article an attempt to reserve for oneself the possibility of a return to the past. If that article had not been properly assessed by PRAVDA, many people could have developed the idea that the initiated perestroika is a reversible process, that no one knows as yet how it will develop and that it is possible for us to return to the ways and means of work and way of life which prevailed during the period of stagnation and even earlier, during the time of Stalin, the time of despotism. The article could instill in the minds of the readers the idea that restructuring is deprived of a constructive content, that it has turned into nihilism and a rejection of the fundamental values of socialism, and brought to life phenomena alien to its nature. It also may lead us to think that democracy is a fiction, that our economic mechanism cannot work as a self-tuning system, and that administrative-pressure methods are the only possible form of management.

The 3 years of perestroika experience proves that many people hold similar views, including some leading cadres. Should such an opportunity appear, they would happily shift into reverse, going back to the pre-April period. As I have realized, the broadening process of democratization of our life is triggering confusion. To consider democratization the reason for present difficulties and complex clashes which appear, including some in relations among nationalities, is stupidity squared. Democratization merely exposes our old ills and pains and allows us to undertake their effective treatment. This must be theoretically interpreted. The level of the theoretical development of problems raised by reality will never be totally adequate, for in that case social

thinking, like social practice, would be threatened with stagnation. Therefore, the ideology of renovation presumes the critical interpretation of accomplishments. Dogmatism is seriously threatening perestroika. Our main trouble, however, is that in the course of time we have largely lost the aptitude to assess our abilities critically, with maximal sobriety. It was because of dogmatic concepts concerning reality and a non-self-critical attitude toward actions and results that sluggishness increased and sunk roots.

Aleksandr Viktorovich Kosyakin, the correspondent for the oblast newspaper, works in our Zadonskiy Rayon. He is a capable and calm person. The activities of the raykom there show obvious accomplishments but also many shortcomings. The journalist writes about them, as well as about what is good in the rayon. Like anyone else, however, he has made errors. However, as a thorough investigation indicated, such errors were part of the nature of his work. No one is insured against them. But then a letter signed by a group of raykom buro members reached the oblast party committee. It did not discuss the responsibility of the printed word. The authors of the letter accused the journalist of distorting facts, slander and other sins of which he had not even dreamed. In conclusion, they demanded that Kosyakin be removed from the rayon. Could we ignore such a fact, which proves an effort frontally to settle accounts for criticism? That is why it was decided to make this event a topic of serious discussion by the obkom buro. How else could one react to the demand of expelling from the rayon a working journalist? But what if the raykom secretary would make an error? Should he be expelled too? This is 1988 and not 1938!

S.V. Kolesnikov. Perestroika, the development of democracy and glasnost have created an essentially new ideological situation, characterized by the establishment of real pluralism of views and opinions. Yes, this is the case and the process is by no means simple. It is precisely now, when we have undertaken the practical implementation of the ideas of renovation that a noticeable polarization of forces is taking place: in response to the consolidation of healthy forces of perestroika, anti-perestroika forces are rallying and trying to impose, to absolutize their views and methods. An effort is being made to reanimate conservative views and concepts. Occasionally, the following is singled out as the "main and radical" topic of discussions under way: should we accept or reject the leading role of the party and the working class in building socialism and, therefore, in perestroika? Hardly anyone, however, questions the party's leading role in perestroika, which was initiated and is being carried out on its initiative. As to what is meant by leading role is a different matter: should we identify the implementation of the leading role of the CPSU with administrative-command methods of influencing social practices or see the need for new forms, new approaches to party life which is developing today on the basis of the democratization of life in the party and society? Concomitantly, another question arises:

should we reduce socialist ideology to a set of dogmas and stereotypes, which reflect not the essential features of the Leninist concept of socialism but subsequent deformations, or should we creatively develop Marxism-Leninism in accordance with the new realities of life? Yes, we must not ignore principles but nor should we present obsolete dogmas as Marxist principles.

Claims of a different nature have been made as well, such as, for example, that of having lost the impetus of the October Revolution, appeals to start looking for a "third way," and so on. Whatever may be motivating the authors of such "quests," objectively they are nurturing conservatism and strengthening dogmatism although perhaps this may not be what they want.

We need a principle-minded consolidation, a strengthening of all healthy forces. Naturally, this does not mean spinelessness or universal forgiveness. The contradictions of perestroika must not be suppressed. However, to conclude that they indicate the existence in our society of sociopolitical antagonisms or even "class struggle," with its consequences, means to take a very dangerous path and to pour oil on the fire of emotions which are by no means constructive.

N.V. Karlov. I believe that we have many important and specific problems which must be discussed. Despite our best will, however, we became involved in a discussion concerning N. Andreyeva's article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. This discussion was expanded by our institute party committee. As stipulated, a methodological seminar was held on Monday, 4 April, under the chairmanship of the rector. To our honor, to be mathematically precise, only 2.5 people supported the article out of 18 speakers. Believe me, we were incredibly happy when we read on the following day the PRAVDA article "Principles of Restructuring: Revolutionary Thought and Action."

I clearly feel that the mass of students and teachers (it is quite a large group, 5,000 students and 1,000 teachers) shares, as a whole, the feelings of the majority at our methodological seminar. However, there is also another stratum which accounts for a great deal in student life: it is useful because it fulfills specific organizational functions and sees to it that everything is in order: the cafeteria, the hostel, and others. In a word, I am referring to the administrative area. Here frequently everything follows a different pattern. A non-routine question asked by a student is treated as a provocation and the notorious question is immediately raised: who benefits from this? This applies not only to the political area but also to small groups. Is there not such a stratum in our society?

N.V. Motroshilova. The fact that the party committees are participating in the solution of ideological problems is very good. However, the way they participate is a question which, unfortunately, is not being subjected to proper open discussion, except in isolated cases. I would suggest something very simple. If any given directive is

issued by the rayon, it should be authored by very specifically identified individuals. Party agencies must not remain anonymous. The specific official must be named. In the same way that we can blame an architect for a poor design and criticize a scientist for formulating a groundless hypothesis, we should be able to speak of an inept decision made by the party committee. Otherwise breakdowns in the mechanism of party work will occur.

The same applies to the mass information media. Here is an example: we notice that, from time to time, some sensitive programs disappear from television. The televisioner asks: what happened to them? He has the right to know. Could it be that someone did not like them? Who? Let that person be named. At that point, incidentally, those who initiate the ban would start thinking and would those who obey their instruction. At this point we need the cry from the theater audience: "Author!" The author of the ban, the author of an ideologically questionable or reinsured decision.

Today everyone realizes that perestroyka means a struggle, a real struggle in real life. Let it be waged openly and and honestly, in specific terms, rather than shadow boxing.

V.S. Lelchuk. I turn to Mikhail Aleksandrovich Ulyanov. We greatly value your daring articles in the press and on television. I know that not everyone likes you and not everyone shares your views. I am confident, however, that victory will be for you, for your art. As to the questions which you asked rhetorically, let them remain rhetorical. Naturally, you have the answers.

M.A. Ulyanov. If such were the case...

Two Tangles of Contradictions

S.V. Kolesnikov. Our time is a time of discussions. This is good, this is a feature of the true democratization of society. However, the discussions also revealed the inability to engage in debates on a truly democratic basis, as well as confusion in the face of problems which have arisen, and pessimism. As M.S. Gorbachev said, it is a small step from confusion and chaos in the mind to sounding retreat for perestroyka. I do not think that our social consciousness have ever been so complex and conflicting as it is today. This "confusion in the minds" must become the subject of a most serious sociological study. At this point we could probably identify two tangles of contradictions: history and the national problem.

Some authors call essentially for the simple evaluation of one historical person or another based, so to say, "on end results." However, historical events are not disparate links in the social development process. We see here a primitive understanding of the nature of historical determinism.

The stereotypes of the end of the 1940s have been used as well (the struggle against "cosmopolitanism" of sad memory), and recollections, references to the classics and of the idea of "counterrevolutionary nations." Indeed, in his "Democratic Pan-Slavism" F. Engels spoke of "counterrevolutionary nations." However, he defined this "counterrevolutionism" above all in terms of the attitude of the ruling class of these nations toward the 1848 revolution (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "*Soch.*" [Works], vol 6, pp 293-294). The meaning of Engels' statements about the Russian nation at that time was typical: had democratic changes taken place in Russia, that nation would not have been "counterrevolutionary" in that specific historical context. However, as long as tsarism exists, serfdom Russia, like many other nations, "is a particular enemy of democracy" (see *ibid.*, p 294). Here again it is not a question of the people as a whole but of the position held by the ruling classes. Blanket negative characterizations of any kind of nations or ethnic groups are not simply anti-scientific but also politically harmful.

N.V. Motroshilova. Of late increasingly people who seem to be in favor of perestroyka but fear the loss of principles seem to be joining in the debates. The floor is being given to "principle-minded" people. What are their principles? They consider them as principles-ideals. But let us assist these "principled" people in formulating their principles with the type of consistency and frankness which they do not dare to display. Here is one such "principle," related to Stalin: actually, it is not a matter of Stalin only but of his retinue, of the political leadership system. We are quite frequently asked to give such leaders a positive rating. Yet these "principle-minded" people admit that Stalin and his retinue did not prevent mass repressions and bear responsibility for them, for no one can deny that mass repressions took place under their tenure, when they ruled the country. How to interpret then the "principle" on the basis of which we are asked to rate such leaders positively? It appears as follows: as a whole, we should acknowledge the positive activities of such people, who initiated or at least allowed mass repressions to take place. Furthermore, essentially, we should accept the "principle" according to which socialism "under particularly difficult circumstances" could mount mass repressions. By turning the discussion to the content of the principles and the positions held, we can clear off huge dumps in the ideological area.

That which happened with us in the past 3 years equals an entire lifetime. A tremendous deal has been accomplished. Changes are beginning to affect everyone's life. This frequently results in tragedy and dramatic situations. Many people are unable to catch up with events or to think them through, to experience them. However, dumps still exist, huge dumps at that. Although this may be interpreted as a purely female comparison, this situation reminds me of the actions of a housewife whose room is in a mess. She may pick up a misplaced handkerchief and sweep everything else into the various corners. We have swept a great deal into corners.

It is only on the basis of a strict study of the principles, of the nature of a given ideological phenomenon, that the activities of individuals can be judged. A meaningful evaluation is quite needed. Some of the people who are today active in the ideological area were at the origins of stagnation and were its flag bearers and ideologues. Many like-minded people have retained their responsible positions. They do not wish to resign voluntarily or for their errors to be recalled. No, I do not support in the least a splendid repentance ceremony. I would rather not describe them as opponents, not to say enemies of perestroika, so that the present cleansing process does not become anything like the "exposures" of the past. That is why I do not like the word "enemies." It implies a great deal of the frightening accusations of the past. All of this must be rejected once and for all. However, the real problem remains: some leaders are clearly incompatible with perestroika.

A similar situation prevails in the social sciences. For example, people who engaged (and still do!) in the study of the national problem have become clearly compromised today. They not only failed to provide the necessary recommendations but also loudly proclaimed that everything in our country was good and will become even better, that full and undisturbed friendship among the peoples had been established. Today, however, we see something else as well. I believe that the philosophers who worked on this topic as well are personally responsible for the situation in which we find ourselves today. Naturally, they are not the main culprits. The difficult problem is the following: we do not need a campaign of public repentance and exposures; nonetheless, a tremendous amount of guilt exists and must be mentioned.

D.G. Muravyev. Let me provide some food for thought. I worked at a plant for 30 years. I began with electricity. That is how historically the situation has developed since prerevolutionary times: there are many Tatars at the enterprise. Many of the engineering and technical personnel are Jews. Russians are in the overwhelming majority. Generally speaking, virtually all ethnic groups are represented. I can therefore say with absolute honesty that no national problems exist among the workers. I am not idealizing the situation. Personal enmity may develop in some people, but not along national lines.

I. Drutse. It seems to me that we are going through an exceptionally difficult period. Imagine a person whose house has burned down. He has been sheltered by his neighbors and he must think about what happened and how to go on living. Now as to leaders and their moral assessment: Consider Stalin. A puzzling personality. He would either come up on the surface or sink down to the bottom. Time would pass and again he would surface, his mustache would show up and then, for several more years, he would disappear once again. We never knew where we were. All of a sudden, Nikita Sergeyevich questioned this and the entire country started to discuss the attitude toward Josef Vissarionovich. Then came

Leonid Ilich and everything calmed down, gradually Stalin vanished from our discussions, as though disappearing again. We lived the good life, drinking on the sly, stealing on the sly.

Retort. Not on the sly.

I. Drutse. As you say. Now, he is resurfacing. You know, it seems to me that whenever Josef Vissarionovich shows up it is always a time related to our approaching the most crucial problems of life. The closer we get to this problem, the more Josef Vissarionovich begins to show up. That is because a certain crookedness in our home appeared during the decades related to his personality. We papered our house, we plastered it, but the crack was nonetheless there. Could all this fail to affect us, turning us into a third-rate, a fifth-rate country?

Naturally, no one wants this. The moment we get to the point of glasnost and begin to tell everything about everything, all of a sudden Josef Vissarionovich appears. This means that something is wrong. The moment certain national problems appear, once again so does Josef Vissarionovich. Again, there is something wrong. In my view, we must not discuss national problems but speak of the foundations of the national policy which was laid down by Josef Vissarionovich and which is leading to excesses today and could lead to excesses in the future. We must consider everything and find the proper rules for community life in our state, which would be acceptable to all of us.

I.A. Dedkov. The foundations of the ideology of conservatism, in its ordinary and theoretical variety also seem to include socialist "principles," but of what nature? To call things by their proper names, these are the principles of a simplistic, an authoritarian-barracks socialism, its extreme forms. Such principles cannot be based on the free thinking of the individual, on the search for truth, on strict and honest knowledge; they prefer "myths," a strange mixture of dogmatism with semi-mystical fanatical beliefs.

The most popular of the myths of conservatism are the following: the myth of the single-variant and historically inevitable socialism, a "retreat" from which began after Stalin's death; the myth that the Russian people love a "strong arm" and "strong power;" the myth of Stalin as the father and savior of all working people, the creator of Socialism and Victory. Anything which does not coincide with these and other similar myths or which opposes them is proclaimed as the destruction of socialism, sinking into the mud of history, and an insult to many generations of Soviet people. Combined, this is nothing other than the myth of an alternative to perestroika, of the fact that the Stalinist way, slightly improved, could be pursued in the future as well.

This myth can be destroyed only by historical knowledge of the true condition of the people at that time. The destruction of the myth means giving back to the people

their history and their true place in it. The destruction of the myth means cleansing socialism and its moral rebirth. Is this painful? Yes, unquestionably. However, it would not deprive anyone of a roof over his head, a home, a homeland or life. Yet the long years of support of this myth required precisely such a deprivation of anything that was human in man... A criminal deprivation.

In my view, as we read the works of contemporary heirs of such "mythological" thinking, an underestimated feature becomes apparent. A great deal is being written about the errors committed by various party leaders and, basically, this is right. However, there are errors and there are errors. There were errors of a theoretical nature such as, for example, in debates on the choice of tactical decisions, the strategic course, etc. However, there were also other types of "errors," which had specific, practical and severe consequences affecting millions of Soviet people. Some so-called "errors" turned into crimes committed against the people and socialism. In this connection, the following question arises: when we look at the path covered by the country, what is it that affects us and concerns us most of all? Is it a just assessment of the activities and views of major party and state officials? Yes, naturally. However, carried away by arguments about one individual or another, do we not ignore, do we not set aside those for the sake of whom, in fact, the revolution was made? Actually, it is the real life and fate of precisely these people—workers, peasants, people's intelligentsia, the toiling masses—that is the main reason for assessing the real or imaginary merits of one leader or another. In discussing history, the creators of the new myths may proceed on the basis of anything they find suitable other than the fate of the people and the party; they proceed not from the fate of the working person, and anything that had happened to that person is shunned somewhere aside, as something secondary. In history the people are presented as sand, as a nameless petty item, as parts of the mechanism of the state... The people, however, are not stones used in erecting the pedestal of someone's greatness. The greatness and good of the country rest in the greatness and good of the people.

I remember, for example, the most difficult periods of the Great Patriotic War and, almost half a century later, our troops are now being accused of lack of discipline, cowardice, lack of marksmanship, inability to obey orders and of being captured... For the sake of what kind of truths are they being accused? For the sole purpose of whitewashing the author of Order No. 227 and having everyone share in the responsibility; for the sake of accusing the people of dying with insufficient courage and, in general, insufficient obedience! To insult someone, someone of high rank, is dangerous. To insult millions and millions of ordinary people who fought, who went through German and our own camps, can be done with impunity. And any slander can be thrown at them: one could call them spies, saboteurs, vermin, poisoners... They cannot rise and speak out...

What Does More Socialism Mean?

O.R. Latsis. Ion Drutse noted that the bend in our common home may be found in its foundations. In that case, the answer to many questions is that we must look at what lies in our foundations and objectively assess it, starting with the criteria. We live in a socialist society. That is our foundation, our main one. We say, more socialism! As an economist, I think as follows: what does "more" mean? For decades, in the item "share of the socialist sector" the statistical manuals have always entered the figure 100 percent. There is nowhere else to go. If we look at it this way, as to our socialist sector, quantitatively, perestroyka may seem a retreat from socialism: individual activity has been allowed, there is some kind of suspicious cooperatives... One could think that this means less socialism than before perestroyka. Yet Lenin made a distinction between formal and real socialization, socialization as a legal act (nationalization, confiscation) and socialization in fact. What kind of sector was our entire economy in Uzbekistan, as seen by Rashidov? What about the worker who could have overfulfilled his norm or not, who could steal a sausage from a meat combine or who also could honestly submit a rationalization suggestion? The attitude of the enterprise toward him would not change, his wages did not depend on this and honors had little to do with it. Was the worker's attitude toward the common good such as befits a socialist society? To the extent to which it becomes full (or, rather, fuller), cost-accounting makes us become thriftier. When Uralmash refuses to produce something unnecessary but prescribed by the ministry, according to the old concepts it seems to reject the state plan (which is one of the foundations of socialism). We see now, however, that this, precisely, is a true victory for socialism, for the Uralmash collective is beginning to be the master of its work, as a labor collective in a socialist society should.

Retort. Is this not something like anarcho-syndicalism?

O.R. Latsis. It is not. Ownership not only remains public but becomes public to an even greater extent. The collective refuses to produce something it does not need and, finally becoming consistent, something which society as well does not need. And when the ministries go on blithely spending funds which they have not earned, there is little socialism in this.

Retort. Could it be that, generally speaking, this is not socialism?

O.R. Latsis. That is correct. Such aspects of our life express not socialism but its deformation. We must come closer to the assessment criteria in all areas, not only in economics but also in politics and ideology, at which point we would see that more socialism and more glasnost are one and the same. If there is democracy, and if the enterprise's collective has become its owner, it means that more socialism has entered the economy, although democracy may be thought of as being a

political concept. Could we accept such a criterion of assessment in all areas of our life, in culture, politics and economics: more socialism in fact?

V.S. Lelechuk. As to "more socialism," let us consider the people of the 1930s. Many of them knew the meaning of exploitation, of landlord and kulak, naturally, the real kulak... Then there were no longer landlords, unemployment was a thing of the past, and there were no longer kulaks. Plants and factories were being built. There had been a rationing system and then it had been abolished. They were being told that many enemies remained. They believed that there were indeed many. Whether we like it or not today, millions of people believed this.

Let us now take into consideration that the people of the 1930s had no real information about what life in the rest of the world was like. The newspapers wrote that there was a crisis there, that everything was breaking down. During the entire prewar 5-year periods, slightly over 100,000 foreigners came to our country. I do not know how many of our people went abroad. Today, however, we have the possibility of making real comparisons. We can see, for example, the progress made by the Japanese economy in the last 30 and 40 years and the creative activeness of the people of Japan, compared to ours. This is written in the press and shown on television. Every year millions of Soviet people go abroad. Millions of people come to our country. The world has changed greatly and to try to determine what "more socialism" meant in the 1930s and what it means today means dealing with absolutely different matters. Alas, the concept of "more socialism" is perceived by the common man not as some of our social scientists may conceive it. It is perceived quite frequently through a "shopping bag:" what one can buy or cannot buy. In short, such comparisons indicate how difficult it is today for the Soviet person to make sense of the concept of "more socialism." Life has changed, specific comparisons are being made, the level of information is entirely different and so are requirements. Yet do we always take into consideration the spiritual needs of the people, including the need for information? Incidentally, I would rate such needs on the level of the need for democracy.

I. Drutse. Let me speak precisely of this need. At one point, in Kishinev, a teacher from Rybnitskiy Rayon came to see me, to ask me what to do. The point was that in addition to his job at school, he had spent a lifetime working as an agitator. One of his main duties was to promote the bloc of communists and nonparty members at elections for the country's Supreme Soviet. Now, he says, after the newspaper with the article by Academician Likhachev has reached us, I feel like leaving the village and running away.

"But what was it that excited your village?" "Well, what else! Academician Likhachev wrote clearly that the people want to know the truth about N.A. Shchelokov. If the entire country would like to know the truth about him, what can one say about the electoral district which, for

seven consecutive terms, from the 4th to the 10th convocations, elected N.A. Shchelokov to the country's Supreme Soviet? Just think, for 30 years, the life of an entire generation, 99.9 percent of the votes were cast, and for whom? Out of respect for our human dignity, out of respect for the industrious Moldavian people, out of respect for the truth as such, the party should tell us the entire truth about the person for whom we voted throughout a lifetime."

Retort. Right. Now deputies are being recalled and new people are being elected. As to why the old deputy was recalled, there is silence!

I. Drutse. The same could be said about our former first secretary of the Central Committee, I.I. Bodyul. What is concealed behind this extremely brief statement: Released for reasons of health? Forgive me, but this standard formulation no longer satisfies us. For nearly 20 years he was, as the saying goes, both the tsar and God and military commander of Moldavia. Not a blade of grass could grow without his special permission. All of a sudden, it is his health... And what if in that 20 years he had become the favorite of the people? What if at night we yearn for him, what if we ache? Why not see to it that every month our republic's press issue brief bulletins on his state of health, his temperature and pulse rate? What are the professors saying? Is this not necessary? Is he being accused of some errors? In that case, you should no longer wave some kind of fig leaves in front of us. For reasons of health! Tell us the truth about I.I. Bodyul, not the lame general truth, nothing edited, but the full, the most exhaustive truth. If you cannot do this, if you do not have sufficient data, ask us and we shall tell the truth about our former leader. The people need the truth about such individuals, presented in simple and clear statements, for this truth includes our own destinies and we can no longer advance without being fully aware of where we were and what happened to us... Understand, I am not motivated by the writer's thirst for a tight plot, I am not. The question is not only one of principle but a strictly practical one as well. The people to whom we refer today as "principle-minded," and who are actively working in positions of middle and higher management, are quite concerned as to whether everything about them will be reported (precisely everything, properly supported by data), reporting the truth or not reporting it. Unless it is reported, they could go on applying pressure, ordering, behaving arbitrarily, and all the writing becoming nothing but talk. Naturally, there have been changes. If people were to remember what was "before,"... it may be better not to.

M.A. Ulyanov. However, we must not forget. There was so much that was tragic and ridiculous at the same time. I played the character of Yedigey in the play "A Day Is Longer Than a Century," based on Ch. Aytmatov's novel. At one point there is an appeal to God: "If you are truly listening to me, you would hear my prayer." The comrades who were passing judgment on the play said:

this is not the way. We must change this: "God, assuming that you exist, hear me out." What do you think? That is precisely the way I delivered this nonsense. Today no such insanity exists. We have been given freedom in choosing our repertory and in directing the plays. For the time being, however, there are no plays to answer our most sensitive questions.

D.G. Muravyev. Let me point out the difficulty with which the new is entering our lives. Let me describe something I know well, the way we took to the workers the idea of self-financing.

I attended several brigade meetings where socialist pledges were being given. Usually, as you know, this is a rather formal act. No one objects, people vote and disperse, after which violations begin. I went to a meeting armed with specific figures on the cost of the social benefits which the enterprise provides for the workers, such as housing, kindergartens, travel vouchers, etc. In order to make use of all this, one must earn not only one's wage but also assets for the funds. The brigade discussed socialist pledges for one and a half hours. The people became interested in specific economic matters. We converted shops and sections to cost-accounting. We explained where the 17.5 million rubles in profits earned last year went.

Generally speaking, There is some progress. However, there are many inert people as well. It is difficult to determine the size of this mass, for everyone is "for," for restructuring, although the expected returns are not there. For the time being, there is no mechanism which would enable us to increase labor productivity faster in this category, in the administrative apparatus above all. The problem also exists in the middle level. For example, no one wishes to be shop chief, although today salaries have been increased. People are avoiding responsibility. No such situation existed in the past.

Propaganda is falling behind the changes which are taking place in the economy and is finding it difficult to abandon the old and obsolete cliches and evaluations which stopped working a long time ago. Yet, above all, we must make clear what perestroika has truly accomplished.

O.R. Latsis. There is indeed a great deal of talk about perestroika but in frequent cases people fail to see any real change. Partially this is because we, the press, and in that Dmitriy Georgiyevich is right, are unable to describe it. We are unable to describe the lengthy processes which do not yield immediate results such as, for example, unquestionable improvements in housing and food production. We are unable also because, and here once again he is right, we are applying the old criteria to the new processes.

When I am asked how to explain the adverse results of the development of the economy in 1987, I answer as follows: I do not know whether they are favorable or not.

Traditional volume indicators, such as national income or industrial and agricultural output, were slower compared to 1986, and from the viewpoint of the new, the contemporary criteria, nothing can be said. What matters more, however, is increased labor productivity in industry and construction (which, precisely, has accelerated), and a slowdown in the growth of material stockpiles. All of these are deep processes which do not take place quickly. Most important, however, is that we are still unable to identify, to show them.

Naturally, what is more important is that for the time being, in general, the changes are still not sufficient. This particularly applies to actual economic relations. Since the beginning of this year all arguments have been focused on the problem of state orders. The new economic mechanism is being totally rejected in the practical application of state orders. There is talk almost about a deliberate conspiracy on the part of bureaucrats, for otherwise it would be difficult to explain the universal nature of violations of the Law on the Enterprise and of the resolutions of the June Plenum. I believe unlikely the existence of a general and deliberate conspiracy against perestroika. This is simply a result of the inertia of the old way of thinking.

I recently attended a serious meeting on state planning, where an official from the financial department discussed state orders. He said that a state order must include anything deemed most important. Machine building is important, the fuel and energy complex is important, a balanced market is important, housing construction is important and food supplies are important. Why is it that whatever is achieved with the help of economic rates, prices and the interests of the enterprises is not important but that anything based on the direct instructions of the Gosplan and the ministries is important? If we think about this we would realize that this is the real old way of thinking. It is entirely clear that **anything** that is important is taking place through the **entire** new economic mechanism, with the help of economic instruments. The state order is an auxiliary instrument through which in the entire set of what is "important" and "most important" we achieve only that which, for one reason or another, cannot be achieved through economic means.

If even market stocks are marketed with the help of state instead of consumer orders, inevitably one begins to demand volume for the sake of volume. Such an action, which may appear as a direct and open sabotage of the reform, is entirely logical in terms of the old way of thinking, according to which any decision made by the enterprise turns out unimportant, and what matters is only the fact that the Gosplan or the ministry has made a decision and what goes to the sector by order from superiors and, from the sector to the enterprises, only as long as it goes downwards. The result is that there is no deliberate sabotage of the reform but there is the inertia of the old way of thinking, imposed on a centralized

basis. This conceals a very serious threat; in this case the new economic ideology has obviously not worked properly and attained the necessary level.

The old way of thinking also includes a variety of distribution concepts of socialism and illusions that it is only the state authorities which can decide whether prices or wages can be lowered or raised, whether apartments become available, whether the market is suitably supplied with goods and whether the stores carry all that is in demand. I am referring to the fact that that same distribution and the possibilities it offers become separated from that which I personally produce with my own hands. It is impossible to demand, for example, a simultaneous increase in wages while lowering (or not raising to an economically substantiated level) prices and supplying the market and, with the current economically unjustified prices, no distribution privileges can be granted.

Yu.A. Manayenkov. I believe that a discussion on economics is entirely pertinent to our present talk about the ideological problems of perestroika. It is pertinent because, you will agree, it is difficult to speak of full ideological support for perestroika if a person is forced to run around the city in a futile search for toothpaste or any other item of prime necessity, if the shelves of food stores are discouragingly empty, and if stupefying waiting for housing is being reduced too slowly. The circumstances of daily life determine to a decisive extent the mood of the people and shape their attitude toward perestroika. It was only yesterday that we, party workers, were interested above all in providing ideological support for the production plan. We frequently encouraged its implementation at any cost. Today this approach is entirely intolerable. It is intolerable for the reason that, concerned with the implementation of the plan, we must see behind it the individual, we must always be concerned with the implementation of the production program which should not hinder but contribute to the molding of an ideologically mature and highly moral person. The new forms of organization of labor and production, in which the main role today is played by collective contracting and cost accounting, are not only and merely an efficient means for the successful implementation of plans and upgrading the efficiency of output and production quality. They are also a way of educating the person, promoting the development of self-government in production and the democratization of all aspects of our life. Under these circumstances man will become accustomed to feel answerable not only for his own work but also for the end results of collective labor.

Today the specific individual becomes the center of party work, with his real and not fictitious concerns and interests. This is a living and not an abstract person who, for example, would visit a cemetery at Easter, for example, to remember his relatives. But the day may come when, concerned with the course of production affairs in his enterprise, he will demand a change of directors. The

tremendous program for the renovation of socialism and for changing the circumstances governing the life of the individual and the individual himself, must be implemented precisely with the help of such living people and not with ideal systems.

Perestroika Through the Eyes of the Young

N.V. Karlov. History proves that students react most easily, quickly and emotionally to major social changes. The outlook, the mentality of today's student are a consolidated reflection of our contemporary social awareness in its fully contradictory nature. Today it is quite difficult to discuss our vital problems with students. They are sharp, blunt, displaying youthful maximalism. The Moscow Physical-Technological Institute is peculiar, unusual perhaps, for the type of its students. We are drafting talented young people from all over the country. Inherent in our students is an almost professional, a truly high intellectual standard which they apply to the mathematical and physical sciences. Such early professionalism and maturity make us confident that in the humanities as well they will display proper competence. Such self-assessment, not to say self-generated opinion, frequently leads to hasty conclusions. That is why the training of physicists in the humanities is an important and incredibly difficult problem. The liking they show for it is tremendous. They read and listen with great interest but... in short, we need intelligent lecturers and interlocutors. Our public will reject meaningless discussions out of hand.

V.S. Lelchuk. I am dealing with future historians but the problems remain the same: who should they listen to and what should we tell them? I agree with M.A. Ulyanov: a great deal in perestroika is still running idle. The young people see, understand and feel this. However, they see something else as well: they see the way, on the one hand, we heatedly criticize very serious shortcomings of the past and present while the elimination of such shortcomings is taking place extremely slowly and not only slowly but conflictingly, with frequent reverses.

What excites young people? By no means what excites us, the members of the senior generation. They are interested not only in the so-called "blank spots" but also in the lack of a conceptual understanding of what took place with us at different stages in our history, on the eve of the war, in the mid-1950s and today... The most vexing part is that the majority of teachers are unable to explain the nature of our socialism today and its advantages and weaknesses compared with socialism in Bulgaria, Hungary or the GDR. The students are resourceful people and ask the same questions of different teachers—philosophers, historians or political economists—but not one of them can give the students satisfactory answers. Yet such teachers include all sorts of people, some of them quite progressive.

Whether we like it or not, all of us are the children of our time. When the 20th Party Congress burst open in 1956, I recall that history examinations were cancelled in the schools. This, in my view, was correct, for it is immoral to promote duplicity, to lie to teachers and children.

Retort. Should we not make use of this experience today in VUZes, in the case of some social disciplines which have been particularly strongly marked by the stereotypes of the past?

V.S. Lelchuk. The young follow events in our country very closely. Occasionally, this is done in a rather strange fashion. I have a student who cuts out of two central newspapers expository materials and notes under the heading "In the Footsteps of Your Speeches." He then compares the two and his conclusion is that "my uncle is right when he says that they get away with it!" His uncle is serving a term for bribery. Articles exposing monstrous scandals, terrible ones, follow one after the other. For months they remain unanswered. Finally, what is made public is a remark, an instruction, a reprimand... In a word, what M.A. Ulyanov said. This must not be! Glasnost without adequate efficiency discredits democracy and socialism.

We say that only 3 years have passed. But remember that from the point of view of the young 3 years is an eternity. To us it was the years from 1953 to 1956 that were an eternity. That is why the impatience of the young to learn, to make a sense of something, is natural. Yet what do they hear from their teachers?

Their teachers have a different mentality and rich practical experience and, in their own lifetime, have experienced all sorts of things. Therefore, having realized that things are not progressing in many important areas, they not only do not function at full capacity but work quite cautiously, circumspectly, so that, should something happen, please forgive my frankness, they could fall back on their old positions. Students bring from various parts of the country newspapers and read statements by secretaries of obkoms or central committees of Union republics and what is being said by members of the Politburo. Just try after that to answer their questions...

All of us need confidence, teachers in particular. However, they always and at all times have been distinguished by their conservatism. That is why teachers, instructors, urgently need ideological help. We must eliminate the duplicity which today has become a standard in teaching, particularly in the social sciences. The word "duplicity" could be replaced by a more intellectual one.

N.V. Karlov. A daring and highly skilled teacher is a great treasure. But let imagine that he exists: daring, originally thinking and, as a rule, not very "suitable" to some. Do you think that it is easy to accept him in an institute and, furthermore, to put him in a strong position? Someone must approve him. The views of the rector and the

coordination council, one which could include noted scientists, such as Academicians Velikhov or Sagdeyev could be ignored. By whom? By people who have little to do with science.

Students need answers to the most pressing problems. If the teachers are unable to provide them, they seek other sources. At one point one of our Komsomol leaders accompanied some very interested students to see one of the leaders of the "Pamyat" Society in his home. The students came out of the meeting disappointed, while the Komsomol leader was in a splendid mood. At home, without his props and without the electrifying atmosphere of an exalted public, this leader was unable to hold his own in a one-to-one discussion with the Komsomol members.

D.A. Karakovskiy. What I am about to say is from a different source... The children sing a song entitled "Our School Country." Yes, this school embraces the entire country, the entire society, a society in which there are millions of problems and quite significant specific features. If you were to ask me today to give you a simple idea of the situation in the contemporary school, I would say the following: the school is like a big bus which is stuck. Heavy trucks, powerful equipment pass by it and on the side there are people, hundreds of people, all of whom are giving advice, many of them cursing but almost no one is helping. The school bus cannot get out of the mud helped only by its crew, by its own power.

That is why we impatiently awaited the February Plenum. The reaction of most of the teachers to the plenum was two-fold. On the one hand, we heard at it a great deal of what we expected and, in particular, quite sound views were expressed about school variety, and accurate statements on the personality of the teacher were made... Generally speaking, the plenum justified our hopes from the viewpoint of the main ideas on which the schools should be structured. Nonetheless, the impression developed among the teachers that our society has no overall concept of public education or of the nature of contemporary schools. Today the teachers have more questions than answers. Let me mention one.

As in the past, the school is viewed essentially and primarily as a training institution. Yet it is the educational function of the school that must be given priority today. To act constructively in the course of the training process is easy, for it is something specific. It seems to me that in the past several decades the educational function of the school has generally disappeared. Makarenko and collective pedagogy have disappeared, replaced by another pedagogy, that of drilling, a barracks pedagogy, which led to the alienation of the student from the school, and to the school becoming formalized and bureaucratized. Clearly, this was also influenced by old tradition. I may be wrong, but it seems to me that in our country the education of children in the past was either ignored or dealt with on the basis of the most simple and primitive method: "Do what I do." Please remember,

who in folk tales raises the children: the grandmother, the grandfather and the older sister. It is as though the parents are absent. Children began to be truly educated among the Russian intelligentsia toward the end of the 19th century, and that applied to a small stratum only. The process of upbringing in the family is structured on the basis of a peculiar reverse logic: "The parent knows better what the child needs and what it does not." In the education of the child we proceed not from the child but from our adult dogmas.

Recurrences of this approach—from omniscient adults to children absorbing everything—are still being felt at school. That is why today we must see to it that the educational function of the school is truly given priority. I do not wish to pit upbringing against instruction. However, in our country instruction has always been considered the main thing and education its free appendix. Education, in fact, includes instruction. The lesson is a means of shaping the personality and not simply a means of instilling or transmitting knowledge.

There is a period in human life during which man reacts to educational influences most sensitively: childhood. Unless the child is taught to be honest, industrious and do good in school and in the family, subsequently such qualities do not develop by themselves. If something is not given to the child at school, in adulthood the thirst for knowledge may arise and the gap may be filled through self-training. Educational losses, however, are irrecoverable. If moral guidelines are clearly defined in childhood, the person will develop in accordance with such guidelines. An educated person will accept knowledge differently. That is why we must not delay education.

Yu.A. Manayenkov. Indeed, during the period of school restructuring there have been virtually not essential changes. One way or another the school provides instruction. As to education as such, it is virtually absent. Essentially, the school is not engaged in developing in the children honesty and honor, ordinary decency, respect for labor and honoring their elders. The school does not instill in the students even the basics of political culture.

Under the conditions of perestroika the fact that the school is a totally undemocratic institution becomes particularly clear. It rejects from the start any conflict of opinions, promotes obedient unanimity of thought and suppress any shoots of a critical attitude toward life. Our schools do not even offer a hint of mutually respectful partnership between teachers and students. What dominates, as a rule, is the belief that the student is not old enough to understand the problems of the country and the rest of the world. The pedagogue is no longer the educator of the young, the promoter of what is sensible, good and eternal. We must develop a firm stratum of innovative teachers. We must persistently cultivate high intellect in teachers' circles.

However, I am by no means surrendering to panic. Despite all the obvious weaknesses of our school, our youth is good. I believe that the mass information media are overdramatizing the situation. Actually, today's youth is not the same as the one on the eve of the war or in the postwar years. However, in frequent cases, forgetting the main thing, the way our young people live, work and study, we pay unjustifiably great attention to the way the young sing and dance. Each period has its own songs and its style of clothing and dancing. It is of little use to our common cause to judge the young on the basis of the external attributes of its way of life.

When the first news on informal youth associations began to appear in the press, the public reaction was expected: "Isolated cases," "here and there, occasionally," "atypical of our splendid youth." When these exhortations failed to help and the mass information media began loudly to discuss youth problems, school principals were summoned to executive committees where they were categorically asked to "include" young people in all traditional forms of recreation. Orders were given to open the schools evenings and holidays. The naive administrators assumed that the "punks" and "rockers" would rush into the schools. However, they did not. They avoided it. They have an allergy to official forms of organization. This fact eloquently proves our common major difficulty. For a long time we were proud of our schools' successes but it turned out that the schools were in a state of confrontation with many of their students.

Yu.A. Manayenkov. It does not befit us to act regressively, for the reason that the deformations which occurred recently and not so recently harm mostly the young. The young became what society wanted them to be. As to the anomalies in youthful circles, which cause our indignation and, naturally, such anomalies do exist, it is above all we, the members of the senior generation who are responsible. It was we who were unable to deal with the metastasis of corruption, subservience, love of material things, "Kunayevism," "Rashidovism," "Churbanovism," and others, which afflicted our society. It was our own coevals who, in front of their own children, gorged themselves and praised managers who were weak in body and soul. We can only be pleased that we have no serious reasons to refer today to the young as to the lost generation.

In their majority, the young are purer, more intelligent and more daring than we, the members of the senior generation. The young need above all to be trusted in projects they can accomplish. They also need to know the truth about our past and our present. That is why, as we master new approaches in ideological work, we must learn how to talk with the young honestly, openly and patiently.

The Live and Daring Face of the Revolution

V.A. Karakovskiy. Today we feel sharply a lack of spirituality. It is like oxygen, without which a man would choke, however technically advanced the he is driving

may be. Without it we could expect not a harmonious personality but a stupid appendix to the production process. Without spirituality mankind would perish!

I. Drutse. I agree entirely. However, I would like to shift this discussion to a somewhat different level. In the words of the old song, we should discuss "the simple Soviet person," not as a slogan but with sober realism. Let us honestly admit that today some simple people are ready to support anti-restructuring. In my view, everyone agrees that perestroika is, in addition to everything else, a struggle. The struggle must be waged above all for those simple people, who are sometimes basically uneducated.

I remember the story of the surgeon in Kishinev, a very famous person. One day in late autumn he was on air-rescue duty. It was a holiday. The sun was shining and the vineyards were crowded with relaxing people. The telephone rang. It was reported that in a little village (working on fodder procurements) the hands of a boy had been mauled by a machine and that urgent surgery was needed. No one was available. The rayon hospital was celebrating and so was everyone else. It took 45 minutes for the Kishinev brigade to fly to the village. The airplane landed on a small cornfield. The medics hastened to help the victim. But, I repeat, the entire village was in the middle of a huge party. In that situation who had priority? The guests, naturally. The people attacked the medics. "Friend! Who brought you here! Who is wounded?! What boy?! He is an idiot and so is his mother." The brigade of surgeons fought its way across the village. There were literal fights. The people's clothing was torn. Finally, they reached the boy, gave him first aid and flew him to Kishinev.

Today a great deal is being said about sociology. If at that time the question were to be asked in the village as to what the medics should do: save the boy or sit at the table, 99 percent would have voted for sitting at the table. The point is that we ourselves are to blame for this and so is our propaganda, and so are some literary workers. We pushed the individual right and left, we instilled in him all sorts of information... The individual was confused, this simple man on whom the country stands and for the sake of whom all of us live. We must find a way to reach him and then march along with him.

N.V. Motroshilova. Let me recall other words from that same song we just mentioned: "He proudly marches along, changing the flow of rivers and moving high mountains, the simple Soviet man." They told man that he must "move high mountains and change the flow of rivers," and he started doing it. Although the simple man did not make the decisions, he did not object. One of the most important topics which we are as yet to discuss is that of the guilt or innocence of that "simple man." I believe that a discussion about the people would be exceptionally timely. From speakers' platforms the people are frequently flattered. It is being said that we have

a splendid people and that everything with the people is in order. What about 4 million registered alcoholics, and "unregistered" ones. Are they not part of the people?

Question. I would like to hear the view of the plant director on the following: Dmitriy Georgievich, does it seem to you that economic interests, the more so under cost-accounting conditions, are pushing the spiritual needs of the workers into the background?

D.G. Muravyev. In other words, in the term used in this roundtable, is the view on the world through a "shopping bag" determining? I am convinced that it is not, although there is a substantial stratum of workers who look at life in precisely that way and do not conceal it. Since I am sitting next to a playwright, I shall illustrate this with an example quite close to his type of work.

A brigade assumed the obligation that if anyone were to violate labor or technological discipline the brigade would forego its bonus. One person did and the members of the brigade did not ask for their bonus. Is this situation familiar? Not one member claimed the bonus, as depicted in the famous play and motion picture. People are different. No one forced these people, no one encouraged them to assume this obligation. Everything depends on the objectives which a person sets himself, and that includes the workers.

I.A. Dedkov. I would like to quote one of Andrey Platonov's characters, as it applies to our present: "The expression on the face of the revolution has changed." It has changed. It is not officially fine or cold and inflexible; it is not condescendingly loosened up... This "different" expression needs, as yet, to be confirmed by reality but nonetheless it is different! According to Platonov it is a face which no longer expresses the excessive exigency of war communism. What is our case? Perestroika reminded us that the long-expected face of the revolution had not been expressed entirely, the face of humaneness.

Let us realize that today we are reasserting the socialist choice we made in 1917. It may seem that the argument is about Stalin's merits and crimes and about whether his actions more good than bad. Actually, what we are discussing is the path we must follow in the future, how to live, what type of people to be? If we look deeper, it is a clash between different and even opposing viewpoints concerning values and the purpose of mankind and, in broader terms, popular life and the right of the state to control it. It is a clash among different and even opposite concepts of socialism and man.

As a revolutionary change, perestroika neither could not should suit everyone. However, based on democracy and glasnost, it grants freedom of speech also to those who find it not to their liking, i.e., to its overt or secret opponents. Opponents who, should they win, would

naturally not act so thoughtlessly: any different type of thinking would be immediately suppressed! Which means that perestroika must defend itself.

We note today a psychological phenomenon of a particular kind. Once Lenin said that "animosity" in general plays a "bad role" in politics. The animosity, intolerance, mercilessness and treachery cultivated by Stalin and his retinue are similar in nature. These bad seeds, sensing that the climate is not changing in their favor, are trying to grow and occupy ideological and real space. We are being given a simple and tangible lesson: nothing in history vanishes without a trace. Everything has its immediate and later consequences...

We read articles in some journals and newspapers and listen to some writers' speeches: We see the familiar zeal with which suspicion, fear and nationalistic passions are being encouraged and the willingness with which "investigations" and "interrogations" are being conducted in order to lead people astray and, above all, to divide them, to pit one against another, and to destroy the civic peace. Arguments are being used which, one would think, should have been discarded. Their very presence in ideological circulation violates the dignity of socialist society.

Using the old and tried method, it is being proclaimed that the reason for our difficulties, troubles and "ideological confusion" is to be sought in remaining bourgeois, NEP-men, kulaks, mensheviks and SR, but even more so masons, to whose anti-Russian intrigues Russia owes its misfortunes, starting with 1917 or even earlier... And, naturally, the West as well is to be blamed: if young people are seriously thinking about something, the only reason is because they listen to Western radio. They fail to notice that they are denigrating their own youth by refusing to acknowledge the independence of its mind, knowledge and civic qualities.

Particularly disgusting is the logic of people who try to write off the losses suffered by the nation during the Stalin years, referring to the inevitable "construction rubbish." In my view, this is the worst of the Nechayev varieties, with its arithmetic of progress. It is a fated Nechayevism, with its score of sacrifices and benefits, risking nothing, absolutely conforming, skillfully promoting its official and other careers. It is the Nechayevism of successful political bookkeepers: so many disappeared but then others survived, and if we subtract the first from the second, a great deal remained... The ideology of perestroika rejects this arithmetic of inhumanity.

I believe that today the ideology of perestroika, the ideology of renovation, would be inconceivable without the contribution of literature and the arts. When I read today attacks on one work or another, I recall the attitude which the press had toward the war prose of the 1950s and 1960s. At that time it was accused of being defamatory. Today we are amazed at the spiritual purity

and loftiness of such lieutenants' prose. The time will come when the artistic significance of one work or another published today will be assessed differently. Critics and readers will determine how consistent this literature was with the ideals of socialism, ideals which withstood all trials.

Nor does what is bad, sinister and shameful vanish without a trace. Nor does what is good, bright and pure. It is precisely for that reason, for what was bright and pure that we inherited, for the power of the opposition offered by honest people loyal to socialism, which has always existed, that perestroika became possible. For the first time in many years an idea, a set of ideas, a spiritual and moral program appeared, which could rally the people and give them a real social future. Life was taken out of its state of apathy and proforma existence. All of a sudden we realized that the revolution has another, a live and daring, expression on its face.

From the Editors

The discussion covered many but by no means all problems. The editors hope that this initiated discussion will be continued in the pages of this journal by ideological workers, social scientists, writers, VUZ and secondary school teachers, and all readers interested in the renovation of our ideology and ideological work. This is no simple matter and could be accomplished only through the efforts of many. The discussion convincingly proved how much we need a renovated ideology, and how responsible and serious its role is in the entire gigantic project of perestroika. Perestroika must not stumble on the rocks of conservatism and dogmatism, and it is the prime task of ideological work to remove them from our way, to clear all dumps which hinder the creative interpretation of life and the ever-broader and profound mastery by party and nonparty members of the revolutionary ideas of renovation, which help to raise our society to a qualitatively new level. It is a noble and most thankful task, for it is dedicated to the ideals of our revolution, success of restructuring and assertion of the truly humanistic principle of socialism: the greatness and good of the country rest in the greatness and good of the people, of the working man.

The material for this roundtable was prepared by KOMMUNIST editors V. Kadulin, M. Krans, O. Kuprin and V. Nekhotin.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Ecology: From Concern to Effective Policy
*18020013b Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7,
May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 24-33*

[Article by Valentin Afanasyevich Koptug, USSR Academy of Science vice president, chairman of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department]

[Text] In January 1988 the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers passed the decree "On

Radical Restructuring of Environmental Protection in the Country." The urgent solution of problems relative to the efficient use of nature and environmental protection was considered a vital need for the entire Soviet people and an inseparable part of the country's economic and social development.

The document emphasizes that in the implementation of environmental protection activities particular attention should be paid to ensuring a favorable ecological situation in areas with high concentration of extracting and processing industries and agricultural production.

Without attempting an exhaustive consideration of ecological problems and possible ways of solving them, I would like to share with the readers some general ideas which took shape in the course of the discussion of the work being done in this area by the institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department.

Sources and Scale of Ecological Problems

The ecological concern of mankind has increased at a headlong pace over the past 10 to 15 years, for it was during that period that the global changes in our habitat, resulting from the fast intensification of industrial and economic activities, became apparent and noted.

According to the UN World Environmental and Development Commission, at the present time 6 million hectares of fruitful land is lost and turns into a sterile desert every year; more than 11 million hectares of forests are either uprooted or lost to fires or as a result of harmful anthropogenic actions; in 30 years this would cover an area the size of India.

The number of types of plants and animals classified as vanishing species is increasing at a headlong pace.

The results of intensive chemicalization of agriculture and harmful industrial waste are that an increasing number of such substances find their way through the food and drinking water into the human body, thus irreparably damaging man's health.

According to available data, every year some 14,000 people in the world die of pesticide poisoning; the thoughtless use of pesticides is adversely affecting the health of more than 700,000 people (mainly in the developing countries).

As the volume of output and the size of transport vehicles increase, so does the scale of the damaging consequences of accidents. Many ecological problems are already spilling over national boundaries and affecting all mankind. Suffice it to recall the shipping of harmful effluents of industrial enterprises across borders and the acid rain falling on territories of neighboring countries.

Concern has been voiced that the increased concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, formed by the combustion of coal, petroleum, natural gas and timber, could lead, at the beginning of the 21st century, and as a result of the "greenhouse effect" to a global warming up of the climate on earth and, as a consequence, a rise in the level of the world's oceans, the flooding of coastal areas and seriously damaging the economy of many countries.

The attention of the scientists has been drawn to the study of the reasons and possible consequences of the formation of "pockets" in the ozone layer over the Antarctic. There are reasons to believe that this is related to the accumulation of certain chemicals in the atmosphere. The destruction of the ozone layer, which protects the planet from radiation, threatens all life on earth with grave consequences.

The growing concern caused by ecological problems throughout the world and the development of extensive international cooperation in this area, under the aegis of the United Nations and organizations affiliated with it, are understandable. The ecological concern of the public in our country as well is increasing, for the results of the departmental-egotistical activities of a number of ministries are becoming increasingly apparent. This includes insufficiently controlled timber felling and filling the reservoirs of hydroelectric power plants without removing the timber, land salinization caused by thoughtless water reclamation, the drying up of Kara-Bogaz-Gol and the Aral Sea, the catastrophic pollution of rivers and the air over many industrial cities, and so on. Ecological problems have become especially severe over the past 2 years, when increasingly complete information on the true situation became public knowledge.

I must mention Siberia. Traditional concepts of a hardly destroyed and practically "virgin" Siberian nature are, alas, inconsistent with reality. The overall ecological situation in that area is already now greatly worsened and shows a clear trend toward further worsening. Let me describe a few urgent situations.

For example, the condition of the medium-sized and small Siberian rivers is very unfavorable in areas with large industrial centers, as a result of the small water volume and the great quantities of polluted substances discarded in them. The impact of effluent water from Biysk, Rubtsovsk and Barnaul on the upper reaches of the Ob may be traced as far as the Novosibirsk water reservoir. The Inya, Tom and, as a result, the middle reaches of the Ob have become polluted with effluents of the metallurgical, coke, chemical and coal industries of the Kuzbas.

In many large cities and some industrial areas in southern Siberia, as a result of high technological activities, air pollution frequently exceeds admissible levels to a significant degree. According to Goskomgidromet data, the high concentration of harmful admixtures is regularly

recorded in the air over Kemerovo, Novokuznetsk, Novosibirsk, Omsk, Prokopyevsk, Barnaul, Tyumen and other cities. Further contributing factors are the specific features of the Siberian atmospheric system (frequent anti-cyclones, the stills and inversions which accompany them in winter, when the cold air masses somehow "trap" polluted air over the cities, particularly if they are located in a depression or a valley).

Nature is gravely damaged by the extraction and mining of petroleum, natural gas, coke and polymetallic ores, and cement production.

Our society has realized the gravity of ecological problems. However, we are as yet to determine the scale and extent of difficulty of these problems and earmark their constructive solution. It is time to convert from the study of isolated, albeit sometimes very serious, ecological situations to a systems analysis of the problem for the country at large.

Usually, in considerations of such situations which appear in industry, the first to be blamed is the imperfection of treatment systems. However, taking a broader look at the problem it becomes clear that the root of our difficulties may be found rather in the backwardness of industrial technology and rural and residential activities. **The ecological stress starts in the technological area, and only worsens as a result of imperfect treatment systems.** The extensive method of development of our economy and the pursuit of "gross output," while ignoring the need to lower the specific consumption of natural resources, materials and energy and to reduce waste and harmful effluents by steadily improving the technology are the main reasons for economic and ecological difficulties.

Despite numerous resolutions, no effective steps have as yet been taken to ensure resource conservation in our national economy. In Japan, between 1973 and 1984 the average consumption of raw materials per unit of industrial output declined by a factor of 1.5. Starting with 1973 (the first energy crisis) the EEC countries have been increasing the efficiency of utilization of power resources by 1.5-2 percent annually. We were planning to lower the power intensiveness of the national income by 1.8 percent in 1987; in fact, there was an increase in power intensiveness by 0.9 percent. Between 1965 and 1986 outlays of electric power per ton of smelted steel increased in our country from 689 to 727 kilowatt-hours; per ton of paper, from 697 to 867; per extracted ton of coal, from 29.6 to 33.6; and per ton of petroleum, from 26.3 to 59 kilowatt-hours.

The policy of resource conservation and comprehensive utilization of raw materials is important both from the viewpoint of realizing that natural resources are finite as well as on the level of the formulation of strategic solutions of ecological problems. The fewer outlays of

raw materials, energy and water per unit of output, as a rule, the fewer become the specific wastes and discards by industry, which have an adverse effect on the environment and on man.

Aware of the sources of our ecological problems and their interconnection with the overall condition of our economy, it becomes easier to realize the scale of such problems and the resources and time needed to solve them. Equally clear is the need for a comprehensive, a systematic approach to the study of the existing situation and the formulation of solutions.

On the Strategy of Solving Ecological Problems

Naturally, ecological problems cause a great deal of concern not only among the public but on the part of the government as well. We have initiated the formulation of a long-term state program for environmental protection and efficient utilization of natural resources in the USSR for the 13th 5-year period and the period until the year 2005. The effectiveness of this program will considerably depend on the strategy to be applied.

The USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department, which has been working on environmental problems and, of late, done particularly intensive studies of ecological problems of the basin of Lake Baykal, has formulated certain elements of the overall concept of environmental protection policy. It is clear from what we already said that such a policy must be based on the demand for a steady advancement of industrial, agricultural and forest technologies, and residential systems, as the main way for resource conservation and lowering the anthropogenic influence on the environment. This coincides with the party's general line on raising the country's economy to a qualitatively new level and is consistent with the new economic mechanism.

What type of long-term ecological standards should be included in the plans for improving sectorial and specific enterprise technology? We must be realistic and, therefore, rely above all on the world standards, those either reached or anticipated on the basis of the latest achievements of scientific and technical progress. This means, above all, that we need information on the extent to which the individual enterprise technology is lagging behind the best global technologies. Raising the technology to world standards would enable us, along with solving problems of lowering outlays of materials, energy and labor and upgrading production quality, drastically to reduce the anthropogenic influence of industry on the environment (reduce the release by industrial enterprises of polluting substances in the water and the air, reduce the use of toxic chemicals in agriculture, etc.). This possible lowering of harmful influence could be conventionally described as a "potential ecological reserve" (PER) in the production process.

We cannot formulate a purposeful and efficient ecological program for the country without knowing the PER of enterprises, sectors and regions. In the view of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department, the introduction of enterprise ecological passports should become the base for the formulation of a comprehensive ecological plans and raising environmental protection policy to a higher standard.

The environmental protection passport should include general information on the enterprise, the raw material used, a description of technological systems for the manufacturing of basic commodities, systems for the treatment of sewage waters and emissions, their features after treatment, data on solid and other waste and information on the availability in the USSR and throughout the world of technologies which can ensure the reaching of the best specific indicators for environmental protection. The second part of the passport should include a list of planned measures aimed at reducing the pressure on the environment and indicating deadlines, amount of outlays and specific and overall volumes of emissions of harmful substances before and after the implementation of each individual measure.

The drafting of an environmental protection passport reflects certain essential aspects, as follows:

Conversion from the study of the consequences (condition of the environment) to a detailed differentiated study of the reasons (situations for each enterprise separately and for groups of related enterprises);

Conversion from a consideration of the overall volume of emissions to specific indicators per unit of output, comparing them with the best indicators in the world.

We are proud of the fact that in terms of a number of harmful emissions the norms of maximal admissible concentrations (PDK) are stricter in our country than elsewhere. However, we bashfully fail to mention that such standards can be reached not only with the help of improving production technologies and treating emissions but also through simple ways such as, for example, diluting stocks of clean water to specific levels of concentration with pollutants. The same applies to air pollutants: a higher chimney stack means greater dilution. It is precisely this system that is preferred by many industrial enterprises.

In converting to specific indicators, such industrial tricks, which cause tremendous harm to the environment, become immediately apparent. Let us take as an example the average specific discharges in the air generated by coal-fueled thermoelectric power plants. In terms of dust and sulfur oxides, they are several hundred percent higher in the USSR than in the United States; furthermore, in our country these specific indicators

have remained virtually stable over the past 5 years (and even increased in terms of dust and nitric oxides), whereas in the United States they have declined substantially.

The ecological reserves of our thermoelectric power plants are obvious. Let us add to this that the utilization of slag in the USSR does not exceed 10 percent, compared with 75-80 percent in France.

Another example is that of the stock waters discharged by the Baykal Cellulose-Paper Combine. Its equipment for water treatment is the best in the country for the sector; nonetheless, releases of mineral salts (in kilograms per ton of cellulose) are nearly 400 percent higher than in the United States.

Water consumption in cellulose-paper enterprises in developed countries averaged 180 to 250 cubic meters per ton of cellulose until 1970. At plants built after that date specific water consumption was reduced to 70 cubic meters. Those planned currently stipulate a water consumption of 20-30 cubic meters per ton of cellulose.

Let us note, incidentally, that the frequent complaints made by ministries concerning science, including academic science, that it pays insufficient attention to the development of new progressive technologies, are only partially justified. In a number of cases the required technologies are known and applied in global practices. Consequently, the task is less scientific than organizational. That is precisely why our industry is not all that willing to publish comparative data on its achievements and the best global specific indicators. The formulation of a realistic and efficient ecological program is impossible without taking stock of the existing situation. With environmental protection passports at their disposal, the local soviets would have the possibility truly to control the efficiency of environmental protection measures taken by enterprises under their supervision (not in terms of capital investments but closeness to the best global standards). These would be measures which they would mandatorily apply in accordance with the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association).

Surveys of worldwide publications on the influence of various production facilities on the environment and a study of the trends of technological improvements could be of great help in drawing up the ecological passports of standard enterprises in terms of lowering this influence. The world scientific community has done a tremendous amount of work in this area, including within the framework of international environmental protection projects. We should organize the translation and publication of the most important surveys and books on such problems. Particular attention should be paid to publications on ecological problems related to the power, aluminum and ferrous and nonferrous metallurgies, the production of protein-vitamin preparations and antibiotics and agricultural chemicalization.

In addition to the writing and publication of surveys, it would be exceptionally useful to hold in our country an international conference of environmental protection experts to discuss specific groups of production facilities.

Surveys on "Influence of the Production of Sulfate Cellulose on the Environment," "Harmful Discharges of Thermoelectric Power Production Facilities," and others, drafted by the institutes and the State Public Scientific-Technical Library of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department were of great help in working on the "rates of admissible influence on the ecological system of Lake Baykal," which is of great help to the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department, the USSR Goskomgidromet and other departments. They helped to determine the worst toxic agents which require particular control and to refine the classification of substances based on their relative threat to human health and the environment.

Stipulations concerning each category of substances were formulated, from total ban on releasing "ecologically particularly dangerous" substances to mandatory observation of universally accepted or stricter standards and regulations, based on the specific nature of the area. Rates will be set for maximally admissible overall releases of effluent waters and discharges in the air must be set on the basis of expert evaluation included in the environmental protection passports of industrial projects (or groups of enterprises located in the same area), based on the requirements of their location, the extent to which they affect Lake Baykal and its environs, and the results of modeling water and air dynamics.

Reducing the amount of harmful emissions in the environment is only one aspect of the environmental protection problem. The efficient utilization of biological resources as well must be based on steady technological improvements. Each biological object is a necessary element of the earth's biosphere, supporting its existence and established balance. That is why the significance of any biological resource is much broader than the narrow utilitarian interest on the basis of which such resources are frequently assessed.

In formulating their suggestions on protecting the waters of Lake Baykal and the natural resources of its basin, the institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department have developed extensively all aspects of economic activities on the basis of the preservation of important elements in the ecosystem, such as soil, forests, natural complexes and landscapes. Corresponding recommendations have been issued on the structure and management of agriculture, protection of forests and development of a forest economy, and the admissible scale of recreational activities.

Ecology and Economics: Inevitable Compromise

With the conversion of enterprises to full cost-accounting and self-financing, a systematic environmental protection policy is possible only if it is based on a stimulating economic mechanism. This encourages the need to activate economic instruments.

The pace at which the potential ecological reserve may be applied could and should be controlled by penalty sanctions. However, in setting the penalties we should also take into consideration the scale of outlays which must be mandatorily subject to expert evaluations. That is why information on the PER of each enterprise must be mandatorily supplemented with information on the funds needed for the gradually reaching of a better global production standard. As we pointed out, the required funds for the entire national economy will be quite considerable. In 1986, for example, about \$1 billion was spent by the U.S. chemical companies in improving their systems for the treatment of sewer waters and atmospheric emissions. Therefore, the gradual nature of solving the problems and the choice of priorities at each stage of the work are inevitable, so that within the framework of the funds appropriated for the ecological program, the fastest possible overall lowering of the anthropogenic influence on nature can be ensured. Let us re-emphasize, in this connection, that **the formulated decisions will, naturally, be a compromise between what is desirable and what is economically possible.**

Therefore, the ecological problems of an area, sector or enterprise must be oriented toward **minimizing the influence of economic and production activities on human health and nature, taking into consideration the latest achievements of science and technology, the condition and possibilities of the economy and the specific features of the natural environment of the region.** In the case of Lake Baykal a factor in the natural features—the unique nature of its ecological system—should play a greater role than economic aspects, as was stated in the 13 April 1987 CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures to Ensure the Protection and Efficient Utilization of the Natural Resources of the Basin of Lake Baykal in 1987-1995."

The implementation of a concept based on perfecting technology is the main way for lowering the overall anthropogenic influence on nature. It is precisely on the basis of such positions that we should formulate plans for the development and deployment of production forces in the country and in its individual areas. Possible adverse effects on nature caused by new production facilities and other projects of economic activities should be reduced to a minimum and, unquestionably, compensated by a greater reduction of the anthropogenic load generated by existing production facilities and economic complexes.

Role of the Public and the Mass Information Media in Solving the Country's Ecological Problems

Under the conditions of broadening glasnost and democratization, the initiative and creativity of the masses in formulating problems, drafting decisions and implementing them are of prime importance in terms of progress. This applies above all to the problems of social life and development of the economy, including environmental protection.

The activities of the public and the mass information media played a substantial role in making decisions on grave ecological problems, such as transferring some of the stock of northern and Siberian rivers, the pollution of the lakes Ladoga and Baykal and others.

Today the ecological concern of the public occasionally assumes some unusual forms, such as demonstrations, blocking certain projects, and conflicts with the local authorities. The confrontations which appear in a number of cases are largely the price of our inability to make use of democratic forms of social life and painful manifestations of the period of conversion to such forms from the previous strictly administrative management methods. The public, the press and the administrative authorities are learning to live and work under conditions of increased democracy. Naturally, each side is guilty of errors and exaggerations. What matters most is to draw proper conclusions from them.

Naturally, the public could be blamed for the fact that in many discussions on ecological problems emotions prevail over rational studies. However, even in such cases the actions of the public and the mass information media are useful, for they motivate ministries and departments, scientific institutions and the authorities to undertake more thorough work on specific ecological problems. Obviously, an emotional coloring will always be inherent in such discussions, for our attitude toward nature is, to a considerable extent, a moral category. However, the formulation and adoption of decisions must be based only on the sober and comprehensive study of the situation, taking all of its aspects, the moral included, into consideration.

Drawing the attention of the public is only a small part of the possible public influence on solving environmental protection problems. The broad public must become involved in the process of decision making and implementation. This is actually being done in the drafting of many documents dealing with major problems of perfecting the economic mechanism (the discussion of the draft Law on the State Enterprise), the social and cultural development of society (medical services, school education, higher schools). It would be expedient to adopt a similar approach in the consideration of ecological problems pertaining to already extant as well as planned major national economic projects. The public must be given the opportunity actively to participate in the discussion of the ecological and economic substantiation of the most major projects. Is it capable of it? Unquestionably, it is, for its ranks include representatives of absolutely all professions and skills. Nonetheless, some organizational prerequisites must be met which would contribute to channeling this discussion toward an objective critical analysis and a constructive approach. Otherwise frequently extremist viewpoints and unrealistic approaches and suggestions begin to predominate. It would be pertinent to recall M.S. Gorbachev's remark expressed at one of the meetings with the heads of mass media and creative associations: "Some problems must

be solved urgently. However, there also are problems which cannot be solved immediately. We stand with our feet on the ground and we are aware of the financial situation and the economy and what we must do. All of this must be taken into consideration so that it will not seem that whoever says 'let's go' is a patriot, while the one who stops to consider how to do it is no longer considered one. Everything must be looked at honestly and objectively."

One of the primary conditions for developing a constructive approach is providing the public with sufficiently complete and reliable information on the problem. The need to do this in an atmosphere of increased glasnost and democracy was felt by the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department particularly sharply in the course of its expert evaluation of the project for the Katun GES. Both the public and the mass information media paid and are continuing to pay a great deal of attention to this project. An expert conclusion was drawn up by the RSFSR Gosplan.

A study of writings on this topic in newspapers and journals would clearly indicate that most of them are not consistent with the requirements of organizing a public discussion. Each such article deals with a limited range of problems without providing an overall idea of the problem.

For that reason the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department deemed it necessary to develop a systematic publication of materials on the Katun GES project in its newspaper *NAUKA V SIBIRI*. The basic stipulations of the project were published along with the conclusions of the Siberian Department's commission of experts and the answers provided by specialists in sections and other departments to all basic problems raised by the public and the press. Articles on this project are being published to this day and some of them are reprinted in the newspapers *ALTAYSKAYA PRAVDA* and *ZVEZDA ALTAYA* and the journal *SIBIRSKIYE OGNI*.

What are the results of this form of systematic discussion conducted in newspapers, to which we add meetings with members of the public? It enables us to accomplish the following:

To solve problems for which we had adequate scientific and engineering and technical substantiations;

To refine or identify problems which require additional scientific studies or planning;

To determine the views of individual specialists on specific problems, which sharply increases responsibility for the conclusions they formulate;

To offer the possibility to every member of society interested in this problem, and using the entire volume of published information, to develop his own point of view on the problem.

The latter is particularly important for it is consistent with the main task of the mass information media: to develop the **conscious** activeness of society. Limited and particularly tendentious information threatens to degenerate into the opposite of democracy: the manipulation of public opinion in order to serve specific interests. We are all too well aware of the consequent results.

In our view, it would be expedient not only to hold information meetings with the public and press conferences, which is already being done, but also to hold scientific-public conferences sponsored by organizational committees of the respective specialized institutes, committees which would include scientists and representatives of the public. We are amazed at the fact that the leaders of some independent associations, which include in their work program discussion of ecological problems, have responded unenthusiastically to such suggestions. Their activities reveal a certain inclination to separate themselves from science, scientists and specialists in specific areas of knowledge, to avoid any type of established forms of work and to act as the only absolute experts and umpires. This leads to an impasse.

However, involving autonomous associations in constructive and critical analysis of the situation, summing up global experience in solving ecological problems created by different industrial sectors and agriculture, developing ways and means of analytical control and promoting the ecological and economic education of the population could be of tremendous importance in solving ecological problems of individual areas and the country at large. The efforts of the public could become particularly effective directly at enterprises. In particular, this would apply to its participation in the formulation of ecological passports and organizing supervision over the formulation and implementation of enterprise ecological programs.

Labor collectives must become profoundly interested in this problem, for under the new economic management conditions, enterprises bear serious material responsibility for any harm caused to nature. This is exemplified by the recent decision of the State Arbitration Authority of the RSFSR Council of Ministers to satisfy the claim filed by the RSFSR Minvudkhov against the Cherepovets Metallurgical Combine for a 20 million ruble penalty for the harm caused to the Rybinsk water reservoir and the rivers flowing into it by releasing substantial amounts of untreated stock waters from coke-chemical production. The money will be taken out of the combine's profits, which will result in a substantial loss to its collective.

The extensive and organized discussion of ecological-economic substantiations of major projects seems to us to be a necessary element in the democratization of social life. It is exceptionally important also in the formulation of the best substantiated decisions. In this case society must remain confident that no construction can be undertaken before the completion of the expert evaluation and the approval of the project by the state

authorities. Violations of this requirement were largely the reason for particularly strong objections on the part of the Irkutsk public to measures related to laying a pipeline to carry the treated sewage waters of the Baykal Cellulose-Paper Combine to the Irkut River. In the final account, under the influence of the public and the scientists, the Minlesbumprom was forced to abandon the project.

In the course of the planned restructuring of environmental protection in the country, increasingly ecological problems will become targets of the serious attention of the local soviets.

The formulation of the main trends of the country's social and economic development for the next 5 years and for longer-term periods is discussed at sessions of oblast or kray soviets of people's deputies. It is at that point that they must thoroughly consider the possibility of locating any production facility planned for the oblast or the kray from the ecological viewpoint. The USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department was part of the epic event of terminating the building of the Trans-Baykal Apatite Plant, which would have had a major negative impact on Lake Baykal. We were able to bring about this decision with a great deal of effort. However, the local soviet authorities should have thought of the consequences earlier, at the point when the basic concepts were merely being outlined and discussed concerning the building of such a plant.

At the present stage the role which scientists play is exceptionally important. A great deal of the blame addressed to them for our past ecological errors is justified. In making major decisions one cannot be guided only by individual authorities, and a comprehensive and substantiated discussion in the formulation of recommendations must become the standard in scientific circles as well. We must remember that differences among scientists nurture public fear of making wrong decisions. Although such differences are inevitable, they must be reduced to a minimum with the help of broad scientific debates.

In conclusion, let us re-emphasize the fact that environmental protection and socioeconomic development are, essentially, the two sides of a coin and that they can be considered only in a state of indivisible unity. This was quite accurately expressed by the noted ecologist Bernd von Drost, the secretary of the international council for the UNESCO program "Man and The Biosphere." He described the concept of the program as follows: "Environmental protection with a view to stable development." based on these words, ecologists no longer say "stop doing thus and such, otherwise you will destroy the environment." Instead they provide the following advice: "Try to do thus and such, and then you would be able to make use of the benefits of development while having protected the environment."

Let me point out that the roots of this concept may be traced to the works of V.I. Vernadskiy, the 125th anniversary of whose birth was extensively marked last March. Vernadskiy made a tremendous contribution to the study of the earth's biosphere. Realizing the inevitability of its transformation, appealing to the collective intelligence of mankind, he called for directing scientific thinking toward having such reorganization follow the channel of the development of the noosphere, the sphere of the habitat of the "sensible person," harmoniously combining his material and spiritual needs with preserving the balance in nature.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

**Democratization of the Party Means
Democratization of Society; KOMMUNIST
Roundtable Meeting by Correspondence**
*18020013c Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7,
May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 34-42*

[KOMMUNIST roundtable by correspondence on the democratization of the party and society.]

[Text] We are continuing with the publication of letters on problems of party building and the further democratization of the party and society (see KOMMUNIST No 18, 1987; Nos 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, 1988).

**Returning to Lenin's Understanding of
Party-Mindedness** V. Ovchinnikov, head of the department of philosophy, Kaliningrad State University, doctor of philosophical sciences.

The structure of the administrative-command management style and its logic of action have influenced and continue to influence more than the base in social life. Its numerous manifestations in ideology, science and culture have led to the development of unanimity of thought and of unreasoning obedience. Gradually talent, originality and independence were restricted to a level of depressing averages. Inasmuch as any outstanding individuality could be shaped under these circumstances, as was justifiably noted at the all-Union conference of heads of departments of social sciences, it was only despite such conditions and in the struggle against them.

Naturally, such a trend could not fail to influence the level of party-mindedness and the party principle-mindedness of cadres, distorting the initial, the Leninist meaning of these concepts. However, what I mean by this conclusion is not only the statutory or the general theoretical status of these concepts but their real, their practical interpretation and the criteria which were used in the majority of cases in assessing one specific phenomenon in social practices or another.

I assume that a similar situation has been noted by many people in the recent past. On the one hand, those who observed instructions issued by superiors with a simple persistence and, if you wish, mindlessly, were considered principle-minded party members. On the other, those who tried to approach directives creatively, taking into consideration the real situation, usually were harshly admonished for lacking party-mindedness and party principle-mindedness and showing prejudicial dissidence.

Usually managers, who considered themselves guardians of ideological "purity," were the last speakers at meetings or seminars and, on behalf of no less than Marxism-Leninism itself, instructed the audience, displaying their intolerance of an opinion which would differ from their own albeit by a single millimeter. In frequent cases a variety of ideological labels were applied. In some cases a statement which may have been somewhat different from the generally accepted concept, was assessed on the basis of dogmatic positions as "politically harmful" or "ideologically alien."

Even now, in the course of perestroika, we occasionally hear complaints that social scientists are not unanimous in their views on the problems under discussion. What does this mean? Is it a yearning for the recent past, for a dull monotony, when social scientists could express only unquestionable and trivial truths? Or is it the familiar hind from the past, of lack of ideological firmness on the part of those who may express unusual views? The effort rigidly to limit the range of views on most theoretical and practical problems is still leading us to the familiar phenomenon, intolerable in terms of communist principle-mindedness, of doublethink: one thing is being said in private while something else is voiced in official public situations.

I believe that the restoration of the Leninist understanding of party-mindedness and party principle-mindedness is one of the most important aspects of restructuring the political life of the party and society at large. Actually, it is a question of restructuring the nature of party intercourse and party comradeship, and of communist awareness.

These concepts are dialectical. They are aimed at maintaining the stability of political activities but, at the same time, also at changing and developing it. Whereas non-party mindedness, as V.I. Lenin wrote, "means indifference toward the struggle waged by the party," and "lack of clarity and underdeveloped political awareness" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 12, p 137; vol 19, p 109), party-mindedness means surmounting such negativism. As Lenin emphasized, "Party-mindedness is both a condition and indicator of political development" (op cit., vol 32, p 190). In my view, this Leninist thought clearly indicates the democratic, the creative content of the concept of party-mindedness.

As a "prerequisite" for political development, party-mindedness presumes discipline and responsibility; as "indicator" of this development, it implies independence, initiative and a creative approach. This is particularly important under the conditions of perestroika.

The dialectical nature of the concepts under consideration should be seen also in the fact that they presume unity of views among party members but, at the same time, allow the existence of differences in such views, naturally within the framework of an overall principle-minded strategy. "The more varied, the better and the richer the common experience, the more accurate and faster will be the success of socialism...." V.I. Lenin wrote in speaking of the extreme need for a struggle against the institution of "unanimity from above" (op cit., vol 35, pp 203-204).

The democratization in CPSU life cannot fail to make corrections to the understanding of party-mindedness and party principle-mindedness. These concepts cannot be identical under conditions such as a class struggle and a circumstance in which there is no such struggle, when priority is given to universal human values, when the party strengthens its interaction with society and acts on the basis of the power of persuasion and political and moral authority.

In turning from a general formulation to a specific study of the concept of party-mindedness in the light of restructuring the political activities of the CPSU, the following could be noted: First, the concept of party-mindedness cannot clash with qualities such as tolerance for different viewpoints, based on the understanding that no new idea appears "in its pure aspect." Second, an important feature which concretizes the concept of party-mindedness is the organic combination of two features: the political and the universal, the humanistic. As M.S. Gorbachev noted, we struggled to achieve this new thinking which must close the gap between political practices and universal moral and ethical standards. Finally, we cannot fail to note an inseparable feature of party-mindedness as involvement, as a critical attitude toward events. This presumes autonomy of judgment, courage and firmness in defending one's own convictions, the ideals of social justice and the truth.

I am aware of the fact that the features of party-mindedness formulated here are a reaction to its interpretation during the period of dominance of administrative-command management methods. I believe that today such a reaction is natural. It is equally unquestionable that the questions raised in this letter are exceptionally serious, for which reason they call for a profound discussion. However, the more daringly we undertake this, the faster we shall achieve clarity in this area of social knowledge, which is steadily and powerfully influencing the practice of perestroika.

Priceless Lessons in Party Democracy and Glasnost V. Surikov, Moscow.

It is natural, on the eve of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, to turn to Lenin, to the party's practical experience in the first post-October years. This experience contains truly priceless methodological lessons of democratization of party life. I would like to make particular mention of some of them.

The 9th Party Congress, which took place in March-April 1920, elected 19 members to the Central Committee.

The elected Central Committee membership functioned for a period of 11 months, until the middle of March 1921, the time of the 10th Party Congress. Within that period the Organizational Buro held 103 sessions; the Politburo held 66 and there were 30 Central Committee Plenums.

As a whole, the intensiveness of Politburo work is consistent with the one today; yet Central Committee Plenums met 10 to 15 times more frequently. This fact alone indicates that at that time the center of gravity of the work fell on Central Committee Plenums: concretizing the political line drafted by the congress and discussing and solving arguable and extraordinary problems. The Politburo, not to mention the Organizational Buro and the Secretariat, which were the authorities which **made the preparations** for such work, acted more as executive than "legislative" authorities. Systematically, on an average of once every 10 days, a plenary discussion of the most important problems prevented any purely bureaucratic segregation. This authority was elected for a term of 1 year only and, in the interim, was answerable to the All-Russian Conference.

How did the system operate? Here is an example: As we know, the trade union discussion preceded the 10th Congress. How did all of this start?

At the beginning of November 1920 a conflict broke out at the Fifth All-Russian Conference of Trade Unions, between M.P. Tomskiy, chairman of the AUCCTU Presidium, and L.D. Trotsky. Tomskiy appealed Trotsky's statement at the Conference faction in the Politburo and the question was submitted on 8 November to the Central Committee Plenum, to which Trotsky presented a draft of his theses on the tasks of the trade unions. Lenin firmly supported Tomskiy, formulated his own theses, which were adopted by eight out of 15 votes. Amendments were made to Lenin's draft and the resolution was then adopted with 10 votes. Four: Andreyev, Krestinskiy, Rykov, and Trotsky were against; one, Preobrazhenskii, abstained. On the initiative of the "buffer group" which was formed, the Central Committee Plenum decided that differences of opinion must not go

beyond the Central Committee; it deleted Lenin's report to the trade union conference and instructed G.Ye. Zinovyev to present a nonpolemical report at the conference.

At the beginning of December a conflict broke out at the All-Russian Tsekttran Conference. It was debated by a Central Committee commission headed by Zinovyev, which suggested to the Central Committee Plenum (7-9 December) several practical steps, one of which was making an immediate change in the membership of the trade union central committee. This resolution, which was supported by Lenin, was not adopted at the plenum (eight votes against, seven for), and the "buffer" resolution submitted by Bukharin was adopted. It recommended that for the time being the membership of the trade union central committee remain the same. The "buffer" was rejected and there was a split: On 10 December the water-transport workers left the trade union.

Therefore, no stable majority prevailed in the Central Committee: Lenin had either 8 votes for and 7 against or 7 for and 8 against. Efforts were made through "buffer" resolutions to localize differences within the Central Committee. Essentially, however, the split within the trade union of transportation workers had essentially taken the discussion outside its range. The consequence was the 24 December resolution of the Central Committee Plenum to open a debate on problems of the agenda of the forthcoming party congress and, at the same time, to postpone its opening date. Judging by all available information, Lenin found himself in the minority on the matter of holding an open discussion. He opposed it. This is confirmed also by the tone of his article "Party Crisis" (January 1921) and his speech at the 10th Congress to the effect that a debate was "excessive luxury," etc.

Nonetheless, there was a plenum resolution and on the same day Trotsky initiated the discussion with a speech at the meeting of the trade union workers and delegates to the Eighth All-Russian Congress of Soviets. Initially, the Central Committee submitted three platforms. The discussion spread to the local areas. By the end of January, Trotsky and Bukharin adopted a joint platform. Among the members of the Central Committee, it was supported by Andreyev, Dzerzhinskiy, Krestinskiy, Preobrazhenskiy, Rakovskiy and Serebryakov. Separate platforms were submitted by the "worker opposition" (A.G. Shlyapnikov) and the "democratic centralism" group (T.V. Sapronov), which were not represented in a Central Committee. The elections for the 10th Congress were based on platforms. The Trotsky-Bukharin platform showed traces of the January debate and the fiercest possible criticism made by Lenin. Even in terms of its form it was consistent with the Lenin-Zinovyev draft ("The Platform of the Ten"): Some sections of it had been borrowed from it almost verbatim. In other

words, there was an obvious effort to reach agreement and clearly to single out problems on which there were no disagreements from those on which there were.

I deliberately omit a discussion on the essence of the differences. What matters here is the purely procedural aspect of the matter which reveals, to begin with, the tremendous role of the Central Committee Plenum and, secondly, indicates that democratic principles governed its work: The possibility of free exchange of views, regardless of personality, combined with strict party discipline: Until 24 December, i.e., for 1.5 months, the Central Committee members were restrained in their differences, strictly observing the resolutions of the November Plenum. The effort to develop a joint viewpoint was obvious.

The 10th Party Congress summed up the results of the debates: 83 percent of the vote was in favor of the Lenin-Zinovyev resolution. Most importantly, this did not reflect on the election of the new Central Committee.

A total of 479 votes were cast at the 10th Congress for the election to the Central Committee. Lenin was the only one of the former Central Committee members to be unanimously re-elected. There were 475 votes for Radek, 472 for Tomskiy, 470 for Kalinin, 467 for Rudzutak, 458 for Stalin, 458 for Rykov, 452 for Trotsky, 447 for Bukharin, 438 for Dzerzhinskiy, 430 for Rakovskiy, 423 for Zinovyev, 406 for Kamenev and 283 for Sergeyev (Artem). The three former secretaries were not re-elected for, above all, the Secretariat was obviously linked in the minds of the delegates to the growth of bureaucratism which was so extensively discussed at the congress. A.G. Shlyapnikov, the leader of the "worker opposition," was elected member of the Central Committee (354 votes), although his trade union platform garnered only 18 votes at the congress. There was a balloting on the election of T.V. Sapronov, head of the "democratic centralism" group, but he was not elected (89 votes).

Thus, in holding a discussion, the congress elected its members on the basis of platforms; however, in the elections of a new Central Committee the official results of the debate played no particular role. Something else was taken into consideration: the results of previous work and, naturally, the future potential. Views could be rejected and even condemned as errors without this being reflected on the assessment of their supporters or spokesmen as individuals and as workers!

The second episode applies to the conversion to tax-in-kind.

One and a half months before the end of December 1920, Vrangeli had been defeated. Peace talks with Poland were under way. The 8th All-Russian Congress of Soviets was opening. The main topic of the congress was the GOELRO plan. Concessions were to be the main source of financing this plan. The question of leasing all of Kamchatka was discussed, and plans for timber and

even food concessions existed. The lease was long-term, and the conditions were exorbitant! This was a trickier maneuver compared to the Brest peace.

In terms of the peasantry, the course adopted at the end of December was the same one, that of requisitioning of farm produce. The system was introduced in 1920 in Siberia and the government was planning to requisition about 300 million poods of grain, i.e., 50 percent more than during the preceding year. A draft Sovnarkom law "On Measures to Strengthen and Develop Peasant Agriculture" was submitted to the congress. It stipulated, in particular, bonuses to individual rural communities and "individual farmers," which was a timid strictly economic measure. Not a word was said about tax-in-kind at the 8th Congress.

By the end of January, i.e., 1 month later, the situation in the country had changed drastically. Kulak mutinies had broken out in Siberia, Antonov's mutiny had spread, and a fuel and food crisis had hit Moscow and Petrograd. Several plants had to close down for lack of fuel. "Slow-downs" were practiced at plants in Petrograd. The Kronshtadt mutiny broke out on 28 February.

On 8 February, in a Politburo meeting at which reports were presented by N. Osinskiy, deputy people's commissar of agriculture and supporter of the "democratic centralism" group, on the sowing campaign and the situation of the peasantry, Lenin wrote the "Preliminary Draft Outline of Theses on the Peasants," a half page on which the idea of replacing confiscation with tax-in-kind was formulated.

On 14 February, at a joint Politburo and Organizational Buro session, a resolution was adopted on substituting Lenin's reports to the 10th Congress "On Basic Economic Construction" with a report "On the Policy and Tasks Concerning the Peasantry."

On 16 February the Politburo adopted a resolution on opening a discussion in PRAVDA on tax-in-kind.

The Central Committee Plenum met on 24-25 February. A report was submitted by a commission which had studied the idea of the tax-in-kind.

On 7 March the question was discussed once again at the plenum and a commission was set up to provide a final draft of the law on replacing confiscation with tax-in-kind.

The 10th Congress opened on 8 March.

On 15 March Lenin addressed the congress on the subject of the tax-in-kind.

Only 5 weeks separated the rough draft from the report submitted at the congress, which called for a drastic change in the domestic policy course. The initiative came from the party leader but the question had been

developed collectively and thoroughly by the Central Committee. No more than 1 week later, it was discussed at a joint Politburo and Organizational Buro session. Clearly, this session performed the functions of a plenum for, starting with the end of January, the Central Committee members were traveling around the country attending discussions on the trade unions. Two subsequent plenums were held. Naturally, the haste here was dictated by the situation which was very critical situation, so critical that the haste might have had an influence had there been no Party Congress to which the question was submitted, had the congress not enjoyed exceptional authority and had there been no atmosphere of exceptional freedom of opinion, which prevailed. The congress would discuss and, if necessary, correct matters. At that time this was the only accepted work style!

Finally, here is a third event:

In discussing the draft Sovnarkom law on the agrarian problem, the RKP(b) faction at the 8th Congress of Soviets demanded the deletion of the item on awards to individual heads of households. The reason was quite convincing: bonuses to "conscientious farmers" could strengthen the kulaks.

The formulation was amended in the Central Committee response: It was emphasized that individual household owners would be awarded bonuses essentially in consumer goods and if improvements had been achieved through non-kulak methods. The faction adopted the vote with supplements. Before the matter was put to a vote, however, a curious note was passed on to Lenin: "If the faction would reject the Central Committee decree would we be worthy of being members of the RKP?..." Lenin, who had consulted the party statutes, answered: "'On problems of internal life and current work, the faction is autonomous.'" Therefore, all members of the faction have the right and obligation to vote their conscience and not according to Central Committee instructions. If you, voting your conscience, would submit a second resolution opposing the Central Committee motion,...we should gather and would immediately gather the Central Committee to a meeting to which you would send your representatives. It would be better to discuss such a serious problem two or three times in order to try to eliminate essential differences among us.... We must now vote not because a directive has been submitted by the supreme party authority but because one has or has not been convinced" (op cit., vol 42, pp 194-195).

This was an example of Leninist party leadership of the soviets, and example of honest and fearless democracy. This was not the style of the leader himself but the style and the principle governing the work of the Central Committee. We do not know what appeared more convincing to the faction: the supplements or the trust which was indicated not in words but in a specific matter, such as the approach to a grave and complex problem.

We must admit that after Lenin there was a change in the upper power echelons toward strengthening the Central Committee functions as an apparatus. The number of its members was increased, the principle of representation was strengthened, the frequency of congresses diminished, and conferences were no longer summoned. In my view, there should be more frequent plenums and, in order for such plenums to have a more efficient influence on perestroika, they should hear out brief reports on what is being done to implement already passed resolutions, and so on.

Trust Nonparty Members V. Kramnik, teacher, Leningrad Pediatrics Medical Institute, candidate of philosophical sciences.

The practice according to which nonparty members are virtually never allowed to work as assistant professors and not at all as senior professors and docents has been established at social science departments in VUZes throughout the country. Essentially, this means that people with specialized training and publications to their credits and with scientific degrees are not allowed to teach.

Why are nonparty members prevented from working as social science teachers? In my view, in terms of their professional and ideological qualities they are not only as good as some party members but sometimes even superior to them. During the period of stagnation many of the most initiative-minded, principled and free-thinking students, postgraduate students and teachers, who the leadership found inconvenient, were kept outside party ranks despite their wish. Today it is these same people, who thirsted and worked for perestroika, that are still refused teaching positions simply because they are nonparty members. Any reference to the documents of the January CPSU Central Committee Plenum triggers the following answer: The plenum mentioned the promotion of nonparty people to leading positions; here it is a question of ideological and teaching work, which should be the exclusive prerogative of party members.

But if nonparty members could be promoted to leading positions, why could they not be given teaching positions? Not only party members but nonparty people as well can support the party line, the more so at the present stage of development of our society. It is precisely like party members that nonparty people today are brimming of a feeling of love for the homeland, faith in the ideals of socialism and desire to make our country better and more humane. Graduates of sociopolitical departments, who have defended their dissertations and who deal with ideological problems share, by virtue of this fact alone and, furthermore, deliberately profess the ideology of the party, regardless of whether they are party members or not. All applicants for teaching positions should be chosen on an equal footing, on the basis of their political, professional and moral qualities.

I am convinced that if we solve this problem practically, the unhealthy aspiration of "joining" the party in pursuit of a position at all costs and as fast as possible, would disappear. It is only then that the scientific potential, high standards, firm theoretical training and teaching skills, with a mandatory ideological maturity, would become the main criteria for competing for vacancies as teaching assistants, senior teachers and docents. The result would be an improvement in the party stratum among teachers and the enhancement of professional standards in teaching the social sciences.

The Political System: Ways of Improvement A. Migranyan, candidate of historical sciences, Moscow.

I would like to express several considerations on the subject of improving our political system, proceeding above all from the historical aspect of the problem.

In 1920, in summing up his observations on the nature of the functioning of the new system, Lenin drew the following conclusion: "...We have a state of workers with a **bureaucratic distortion**" (op cit. vol 42, p 208). He also noted the trend of the development and increased power of the bureaucracy (unelected administrative-management workers) on the one hand, and the weakening of elected authorities, on the other. He cautioned that the development of these trends is fraught with the alienation of the masses from the system and a clash between the political and the bureaucratic apparatus. This indicated the "sensitive spots" of the political system which was being established and the embryo of the internal contradictions, the growth and accumulation of which subsequently led to the appearance and development of the obstruction mechanism.

Lenin noted that without the "apparatus" we would have long perished. "Without the systematic and adamant struggle for improving the apparatus we would perish before being able to lay a foundation for socialism" (op. cit., vol 43, p 381). However, he repeatedly emphasized that "the apparatus must be for politics...and not politics at the service of a "good" bureaucracy (ibid., p 373).

At the initial stage of the establishment of the new system, we indeed had within our political system both bureaucracy and "politicians," i.e., people who, through social activities and political struggle, had earned the right to hold high governmental positions through which to implement party decisions. The new political system which was developing at the initial stage of its functioning allowed, within a broad range, openness, glasnost and internal party democracy. The same spirit prevailed in the soviets. The press had tremendous opportunities for informing the masses of the events which were taking place in the political area. This created prerequisites for successful struggle against bureaucracy, favoritism, dependency relations and efforts to remove from the area of public opinion and control the process of making the most important decisions relative to the economic, political and cultural life of society.

In time, however, as the administrative-command system expanded, the executive apparatus of professional employees, including those of the soviets, began to play an increasing role and gradually "swept under it" the elected authorities. This is not astounding, if we take into consideration, in particular, that because of holding full-time jobs, the overwhelming majority of people's deputies were simply unable truly to participate in the decisionmaking process within the soviets. The practice developed according to which, meeting no more than a few days annually, the people's deputies could only ratify decisions drafted by the machinery of the executive authorities.

On the other hand, a certain "naivete" on the part of most deputies in legislative positions, concerning the fine points and specifics of management, led to the fact that the activities of the executive authorities became virtually uncontrolled. All of their decisions were subsequently and as a rule ratified by the deputies unanimously, appearing as the resolution of the deputies and the voters who had elected them. The appearance was created that a democratic procedure was observed, whereas in fact the legislative authorities were essentially "not ruling," having surrendered the power monopoly to the executive authorities which had been essentially neither elected by nor accountable to anyone.

It is difficult to determine today the specific forms in which the full authority of the legislative agencies should be re-established. What is clear, however, is that the principle of popular representation is the inviolable foundation of the soviets. In my view, however, the deputies must be provided with all the necessary conditions to master the science and art of management. We must also see to it that deputies are elected not on the basis of automatic assignments, "percentages" or positions but on the basis of their personal qualities, including their inclination to engage in sociopolitical work.

Under the conditions of a steady narrowing of the range of democracy, the organization of executive authorities assumed an increasingly bureaucratic nature, with features such as loyalty to one person and to superiors, the blossoming of a patronage system, a struggle among bureaucratic clans, concealed from the public view, etc.

By the 1930s there was essentially no conflict between "the politician" and the bureaucracy, for we no longer had any public policy which included the formulation and discussion of different approaches and programs for the solution of the radical problems affecting our society. This led to the further bureaucratization of the political system which became increasingly locked within itself, and the alienation of the working people from management, which assumed a formalistic nature.

Furthermore, neither political theory nor the USSR Constitution presume the administrative intervention of party authorities in the solution of daily problems of

managing governmental and economic affairs. Obviously, that is why the Fundamental Law does not set the legal framework for the activities of party authorities within the political system. In daily practice, however, there is a duplication of the functions of state administration by the party authorities. Frequently the party agencies take over the duties of the executive, legislative and even judicial authorities. This was particularly characteristic of the period of the cult of personality.

Because of the low level of professionalism in the area of legislation, the absence of a clear division of powers and of a mechanism for restraining and counterbalancing (in which some power units balance others in terms of power and influence on public affairs), our society ended in a situation in which at each level the superior manager, using the centralized and hierarchical nature of power concentrated in his hands, and having no proper control on the part of the deputies and, therefore, the public, became the virtually exclusive ruler. This made possible all kinds of arbitrary actions and malfeasances, not only on the part of Stalin and his closest retinue. Such a structure triggered big and small cults of personality on other levels of power as well. Managers on different levels began to be considered charismatic, i.e., as people possessing particular prophetic gifts, as the only ones who could make proper decisions and people whose actions were infallible.

One of the characteristic features of the Stalinist period, as we know, was the systematic persecution of the personnel of the administrative apparatus, starting from the very top. At that point this triggered in many people the illusion that under Stalin officials and bureaucrats were being controlled. The fact that such control was taking place through illegal methods was frequently ignored; cruelty and arbitrariness were conceived rather as something inevitable and many people endured them with a truly stoic attitude. The consolation was that this affected everyone and, even more so and more frequently, one's superiors.

The stronger the individual charisma was manifested in society, paradoxical though it might seem under a command-administrative system, the weaker become the positions of the bureaucracy and the more difficult opposing such personalities became. Was this not the reason for which many of the steps taken in our economy, particularly in the military area and in heavy industry at the initial period of industrialization, when with no particular effort the center could become familiar with the situation in the country as a whole, took place on the basis of the direct interference on the part of Stalin, who made various cadre appointments and decisions, bypassing normal institutions and procedures.

Maintaining the cult of the leader required the permanent existence of some kind of exceptional situation in which only he would find the "only proper and right solutions" in all difficult and confused situations. Stability and routine are the death for such a leader and a time

for blossoming of the bureaucracy, unless developed democratic institutions have been created. That is why, as our political system developed, wizened by the experience of its coexistence with Stalin and the memory of the impermanence of its status during that period, the bureaucracy tried to prevent the growth of a new personality of this kind when it came to N.S. Khrushchev, the more so since the 20th CPSU Congress dealt the harshest possible blow at the charisma itself of the supreme leader. In the final account, the bureaucracy defeated Khrushchev when he tried, through arbitrary means, to promote the dynamism of the bureaucratic system. As the years passed, the bureaucracy became increasingly strong, leaving to the leader only the external, although impressive, perquisites of power. This was manifested with particular clarity during L.I. Brezhnev's rule. As a result, we reached a period of stagnation and domination of bureaucratic methods. Within the framework of the existing system the executive, the power apparatus has extensive opportunities to reduce to naught the efforts of any superior authorities in solving radical socioeconomic problems if its interests are harmed, to one extent or another. That is why the economic reform and the changes which have either been made or are planned today in other areas (public education, health care, and so on) can hope for real success only if they are based on the restructuring of the political system, and the broad process of democratization and expansion of glasnost.

Due to the exhaustion of its source of development—contradictions—and, above all, the lack of said mechanism of restraint and counterbalance, the existing political system loses its flexibility and is essentially doomed to the reproduction of the existing status quo in its basically unchanged, i.e., stagnating aspect.

Taking into consideration the special nature of our political system, we must bear in mind that in the course of perestroika we must display exceptional watchfulness, for there is nothing more dangerous than excessively hasty reforms and changes which could become uncontrolled. For, as the entire experience of social development teaches us, the broad masses are not always able to perceive, to master radical innovations and to adapt to them, and changes in the socioeconomic and political areas are unable rapidly to take shape and to strengthen. That is why the process of eliminating the obstruction mechanism will obviously have to undergo a number of stages.

At the first stage, in the interest of promoting reform in the economic and sociocultural areas, in my view, we should create institutionalized barriers to block the path of bureaucratic distortions. What is needed here, above all?

First, we believe, in order to change the nature of the current legislative branch of the governmental system, it would be expedient, on all levels, from the rayon to the Union, to create permanent legislative authorities in which professional politicians would be quite extensively

represented. In order to be appointed to the legislative agencies on the republic and Union levels and to ensure that the worthiest people are elected, it would be expedient to grant the citizens the right to vote not only for the candidate of their electoral district but also for other candidates, in other parts of the republic or even from anywhere in the country.

Second, it is important on all levels, from the rayon to the Union, to ensure the true democratic organization of executive authorities. The heads of the executive authorities on all levels should be elected through direct vote by the voters of a rayon, city, republic or the Union. In elections for legislative and executive authorities we must also provide conditions for the nomination of an unlimited number of candidates who would compete for the seats. We should bear in mind in this case that it is a question not only of representatives of the people but also of professional administrators.

In my view, all of these steps would strengthen the development of a more advanced political system. In all likelihood, in the establishment of such a system, within which conflicts and contradictions will inevitably arise among its various elements, we should also create an independent constitutional court which would interpret the Fundamental Law and could proclaim as unconstitutional some decisions made by various authorities.

Third, the increasing participation of the working people themselves in all forms of direct and representative democracy would actually contribute to improvements in the political system, integrating within it the new social forces, and strengthening the stability and durability of individual institutions and the system as a whole.

The party authorities on all levels must guide the improvements in our political system. However, would they be able successfully to implement this most difficult task while remaining unchanged themselves both functionally and on the structural-organizational level?

The processes of democratization themselves, and the country's turning to economic methods of management introduce functional changes in the activities of party authorities; they reduce the possibility of conscious or subconscious administrative interference in the work of the soviets, in the daily executive activities of economic managers and in the area of culture. As to organizational-structural changes, it would be expedient, in my view, above all to change the procedure for the election of first secretaries of raykoms, gorkoms, obkoms and central committees of communist parties of Union republics.

In my view, such elections should be direct, involving the participation of all party members and be competitive in the nomination on each level of an unlimited number of candidates by primary party organizations or groups of party members. Every candidate must submit a specific program for the development of the rayon, city

or republic, proceeding from the strategic line of perestroika as formulated by the party. Such an electoral system would, to begin with, make the realm of elaboration of specific programs and decisions and vitally important problems affecting the population of a republic, city or rayon open to discussion and make it possible to select the most acceptable candidates and break down the existing closed promotion channels. Second, it would make control of the party masses over their elected leaders efficient and would strengthen the power and authority of the latter over the apparatus. The party masses would be able, in subsequent elections and in the course of the electoral struggle among different candidates for corresponding party positions, to obtain an objective picture of the extent to which the elected secretaries have been able to implement their programs.

Finally, another question which, in my view, is of both theoretical and practical interest is the following: Is it possible, under the conditions of a one-party system, to ensure the true pluralism of opinions, i.e., are different, non-party institutional forms possible, through which the variety of interests could be represented in the political sphere?

In our political system, from the very start the Communist Party assumed a dominating position. The party's ideology and program, expressing the class interests, eventually became those of the entire nation. However, this does not exclude the broadest possible exchange of views and the search for the best possible solutions, i.e., all that has been described as "socialist pluralism." Within our political system this can be achieved through a variety of social institutions, as a result of the gradual transfer of a number of governmental administrative functions to public organizations in the economic and sociocultural areas and the establishment of independent self-governing economic, cultural, educational and other units within the social framework.

Obviously, each one of these institutions will have its own interest on the regional, city, republic or national scale. The task of the CPSU in this case, at the stage of conversion from the present economic and political system to the stage of true socialist self-government, we believe, would be to rally these interests, and to see to it that they do not harm the interests of some population groups or provide unjustifiably more advantageous or privileged conditions for other.

Excerpts From Letters

P. Panchenko, head of the CPSU history department, Dnepropetrovsk Chemical-Technological Institute imeni F.E. Dzerzhinskiy, candidate of historical sciences:

Today the administrative apparatus is one of the main obstructions to perestroika. The multiple-step and multiple-stratum structure of this apparatus inevitably leads to excessive centralism, red tape and duplication. Since

no member of the apparatus can be paid a salary "for nothing," instructions, memoranda, reference documents and other "indications of activity" are generated. To the aktiv of the primary party organization all of this is transformed into a "paper tsunami." It is time to put an end to it. For that reason I suggest the closing down of party gorkoms in the oblast centers and cities with rayon subdivisions, and the sectorial departments in all local party authorities. On the other hand, I believe that we should strengthen the rayon party committees. Naturally, this is not a question of increasing the personnel but of recruiting, particularly as instructors, competent and capable personnel with practical experience, which would include, as a minimum, that of deputy secretary of a shop organization. The cadres of party raykoms could be staffed with the personnel released from other party units, without any reduction in salary.

V. Guzenko, worker, city of Azov, Rostov Oblast:

I suggest the following in the struggle against bureaucrats: To eliminate from our life, above all from the area of productive work, the concept of "position salary," and remove the firm glue which keeps bureaucrats stuck to their seats. The salary of a manager (starting with the lowest level) should be paid, with the agreement of the workers, on the basis of the results, of the way this official makes the production process possible. The workers should have the right to determine whether or not they need a given manager (of a brigade or a link). If such a manager is not needed, they should raise the question not only of electiveness, as is the case now, but also of the very need for a manager. If a manager is needed, they should stipulate who will pay his salary. Only thus would we be able to dismantle the bureaucratic clan, the size of which is huge.

D. Abdurakhmanov, chairman, rayon trade union committee, APK workers, Charodinskiy Rayon, Dagestan ASSR:

According to the current instructions and regulations (although in some cases they may be home-grown), within a single year our village must: hold four general and as many trade union meetings of kolkhoz members; two meetings of parents; 12 meetings each of brigades and trade union groups; and four rural rallies. Then it goes into the dozens: party meetings, kolkhoz board sessions, sessions of the rural soviet and the trade union committee. Add to this four sessions of the soviets of people's deputies and six party committee sessions.

Bearing in mind that our village is small, all such steps affect the same people. It is thus that we remove the peasant from his work and train him to vote for decisions which, in frequent cases, have been already either "drafted" or predetermined by authorities which are "above" one type of meeting or another. All of this is done under the pretext of broadening democracy. However, democracy is incompatible with petty supervision.

We must put an end to the practice according to which public organizations, deprived of the possibility of displaying initiative from below, act on the basis of instruction "from above."

A. Eynman, editor of the plant newspaper, Kuybyshev Motor Building Production Association imeni M.V. Frunze:

Plant newspapers are the only type of newspapers in our country the publication of which is not strictly regulated. According to the 6 March 1966 CPSU Central Committee resolution, they can be published wherever the number of workers is not fewer than 2,500-3,000.

The fact that "they can," I believe, does not mean that "they must." Yet, virtually every manager of an enterprise, organization or school deems it his duty (for it is prestigious!) to have his own printed organ. In our oblast alone about 70 such plant newspapers are published. This means the consumption of paper and paid personnel, although results are frequently nonexistent. For example, over a period of 2 months, and before the party obkom intervened, the aerospace and agricultural institutes did not publish their own newspapers, and nothing happened!

Is it possible, in fact, to close down many of them? At the same time, one could strengthen the newspapers which have truly established a reputation among the readers, for here, as in other areas, quantity frequently is achieved to the detriment of quality. In short, the problems of the "worker press," as such local newspapers are known, are quite extensive. They would remain unsolved until the main thing happens: a restructuring in the attitude which the party committees on all levels have toward them.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

A Generation

18020011d Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 43-46

[Article by S. Freylikh, doctor of art studies, bearer of six combat orders]

[Text] I always await 9 May with emotion.

I know that I will meet with people with whom I spent 4 years in battle, from the Caucasus to Prague.

The fewer of us remain the more precious every person and every hour spent with him become.

We put on our old uniforms and are not shy to display our medals.

We have never spoken lofty words about ourselves. We did not describe ourselves as a specific generation. However, brought down by steel and burned by fire we, the fellow-workers of those who fell, were precisely a generation which history shaped to perform a specific objective.

Yes, a generation means people who do not simply exist on earth at the same time but people who share a single idea and act together.

In periods of popular trials a sharp sensation of the meaning of generations arises.

The date 22 June became a turning point in our lives.

We had a premonition about that day and the posthumously published poetry by my comrades from the IFLI reminds me sharply of this fact.

We fell where we fell And we got up no more.

And, gasping with the Internationale, Falling, face first, on the dry grass, No longer rising, and unrecorded, Without glory to our families.

These lines were written by Pavel Kogan, author of "Brigantines," in April 1941. Do those prophetic lines express only a tragic premonition of personal destiny? No, they also express the anticipation of victory over fascism: In the last moment of his life the poet hears the Internationale as an echo of immortality.

Pavel Kogan was not an exception in such a perception of the war. Poems expressing the same world outlook were left behind by Mikhail Kulchitskiy, Nikolay Mayorov, Georgiy Suvorov, Vsevolod Bagritskiy, Nikolay Ovsyannikov, Leonid Shersher, Nikolay Otrada and Aleksey Lebedev. Their antifascism was mixed with love for Russia and an international feeling of tremendous, I even dare say global, significance.

"He was buried in the globe....," was the way Sergey Orlov described the final honors rendered to a soldier. This line could become the epigraph of the creativity of the war generation not only of poets but also of cinematographers.

In their "A Soldier's Ballad," by V. Yezhov and G. Chukhray, in the scene of the first battle, Alesha, who has never been shot at before, imagines that the earth is standing on end. This is probably the way it was seen by the future director—the landing soldier Chukhray, and now it is this foreshortening that allows us to see the universal nature of the action of Alesha Skvortsov, the Russian soldier.

In the film "The Fate of a Man," by M. Sholokhov and S. Bondarchuk, the key scene is the one in which Andrey Sokolov escapes from imprisonment. Exhausted, he falls on his back spreading his arms; the pursuers with their

dogs are approaching and at that point the camera is pointed sharply upwards, panning the endless blueness of the sky, showing the eternity which belongs not to the pursuers but to the soldier.

The war gave us not only plots but also a new view on life and death. It opened the infinity of human possibilities, courage, daring and firmness of the Soviet people who took up arms to defend the homeland and mankind.

This became a property of our vision and appeared not only in movies about the war and not only in the generation of artists who fought.

In "No Passage Through the Fire" by Gleb Panfilov, and "Bench-Stoves" by Vasilii Shukshin we suddenly see, within the limited area of the frame, the spherical topography of the earth, its hugeness.

Bulat Okudzhava's song "The Planet is Burning and Turning" is the theme song of the film "Belorussian Station" by V. Trunin and A. Smirnov. Such a song could not have been composed during the war. It projects a contemporary feeling of those stormy years. It is their lyrical comment.

We make movies about the war not as historical pictures, for the pain is still there. The people's memory of the war years is not a museum, but a living memory. The motion pictures about the Great Patriotic War "Check on the Roads" by E. Volodarskiy and A. German, and "Go and See" by A. Adamovich and E. Klimov are contemporary works in the most profound philosophical meaning of this word. They are contemporary not only for those who fought but also for those who today are young and must accept the moral experience of the victors.

The Great Patriotic War awakened the awareness of each one of us. It made of us the generation which today is known as the war generation. It established for each one of us, as individuals, a new relationship with history and nation. Before the war, to us history was something that **had happened once**, something we read in textbooks. The concept of people was also generalized. It was something accomplished and once again related to the history which the people made whereas, meanwhile, everyone of us separately was living in the present, in a transient time, respectfully studying these age-old concepts based on school curriculums. But then millions of people found themselves in the trenches and we were among them. It was on the manner in which these millions of people would behave that the further march of history would be determined. This meant that we were history and we were people. This feeling does not develop quickly. Until you have been under fire it seems as though each shell is flying at you and each bullet is seeking you specifically. Subconsciously you feel that you are the center of the world, that your pain is most unbearable and that the sadness of your mother, if you are buried, would surpass in tragedy the feelings of all mothers, the young lives of whose sons and daughters were ended by the war. Then

you learn to forget yourself for the sake of others. This does not mean that you have mastered the martial art. Something greater occurs at this point: You have become a person with a world outlook.

In science decades may pass before such a knowledge of the world occurs, and sometimes even a whole century. Let us recall that 1,500 years separate Ptolemy's theory and Copernicus' brilliant discovery, which provided a true concept of the structure of the universe.

The war made such a break in our consciousness immediately. Understanding of time and space changed, for the time of war is measured by the number of years that 20 million Soviet people did not live. History proved to be compressed before the conflict, which was cosmic in scale. Realizing the infinity of the people's tragedy, man no longer considers his personal death as the end of the world. With all of its sympathy for human suffering, existentialism cannot explain such an emotion, for which reason it cannot become the moral support of the individual. It is precisely here that the advantage of socialist art and literature, of our perception of the world, is manifested, with its inherent understanding of people, history and individuals.

Yet how difficult it was in recent decades to display such an understanding of history and man. The publication of previously banned novels and films is changing value criteria. Some praised giants all of a sudden turn out to be dwarfs in the face of the tremendous changes which have been initiated in society, in spiritual life.

Truth becomes the supreme value, the moral tuning fork of perestroika. However, there is something which still literally grabs our arm: Stop, enough talk about the bitter and tragic pages of our history, as though criticism is a campaign, as though it is pleasing unto itself. But let us recall the reason for which Tolstoy wrote such pages as he worked on his "War and Peace" epic.

He wrote: "For the third time I went back, guided by a feeling which may seem strange to most readers but which, I hope, will be understood precisely by those for whose opinion I care; I did this because of a feeling resembling shyness and which I cannot describe in one word. I would have been ashamed if I wrote about our triumph in the struggle against Bonaparte's France without describing our failures and our shame. Who has failed to experience that hidden yet unpleasant feeling of shyness and mistrust in reading the patriotic works about 1812? Whereas the reason for our triumph was not accidental but was found in the essence of the nature of the Russian people and soldiers, this nature should be expressed even more clearly in a time of failures and defeats." As we know, Tolstoy changed the layout of his novel and the history of 1812 begins with the defeat at Schongraben in 1805.

I am convinced that a hypothetical "War and Peace" based on the materials of the Great Patriotic War cannot be written without an awareness that 1945 is connected not only to 1941 but also to 1937.

These 3 dates are interconnected, and each one has left a mark on the body of my generation.

The great attention which is being paid today to Stalin is explained by the fact that he is related to the knot of events we are trying to untangle. Yes, precisely untangle and not cut through.

Stalin is a myth and a simplistic exposure can only strengthen it.

Yet Stalin's myth must be debunked, for he distorted the ideas which are sacred to us, he usurped the victory which was won by the people.

I heard a writer say at an important meeting: "It is said that it was not true that soldiers hurled themselves into battle shouting 'for Stalin!' The point is that this is the truth. I was in those ranks, shouting 'for the motherland, for Stalin!'."

We must speak and write the truth, otherwise once again the young will not believe us.

The dramatic nature of the situation must be described in its entirety.

Here, for example, is what happened to me. In 1938 my father became the subject of repression. He was a simple unsophisticated man with only 1 year of schooling, and he was terribly proud that I had been accepted in a famous VUZ in the country. In his youth he was an athlete. He had taken part in World War I, had distinguished himself with his courage and had been awarded the Cross of Saint George, which is still in my possession. In the 1930s he became gravely ill. In the provincial city where we lived treatment was not all that good. He had a stomach surgery and it was in that condition that he was detained. Without any trial or investigation, he was exiled for 5 years to Arkhangelsk Oblast, and 3 months later died in a camp, somewhere in the area of Kotlas. I did not deny my father. I did not call him an enemy of the people, for which I was issued a severe Komsomol reprimand.

I envy anyone who can visit his father's grave, and I hope that a monument to the victims of Stalin's terror will be erected as yet.

Need I explain the emotional turmoil I experienced in subsequent years?

I was literally saved by the war. I joined the army on 23 June.

I joined the party with the same feeling, in 1942, on the southern front which was breaking down under the pressure of the Guderian's tanks or at least that is what it looked like at that time when, wounded, I was being carried away from the battlefield.

I write about this because young people frequently ask us: "Where were you?" We cannot answer this question if we replace the old feelings with those of today. One cannot tear out pages from the book of life the name of which is history. The past is torn away from us with blood, like bandages from unhealed wounds.

At any point in our history, even the most dramatic, there were people, millions of people about whom we shall always speak with tremendous respect. Nonetheless, it is only at crucial times in the development of society that the concept of generation arises.

Three generations of Soviet people stand out clearly.

The first is the one which made the October Revolution and founded a socialist state.

The second, which crushed fascism, saved mankind from bondage and, under most difficult conditions of the postwar years, rebuilt the country from its ruins.

A third generation is taking shape today, which will take the country out of the stagnation and restore the link between our age and that of Lenin.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

What and How to Teach A Director?

18020013c Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 47-53

[Article by Leonid Isaakovich Goldin, professor, doctor of philosophical sciences, head of the department of production management and social psychology, Institute for Upgrading the Skill of Leading Personnel and Specialists of the Ministry of Chemical Industry]

[Text] Today society is faced most urgently with a dual task: to equip all categories of working people with the knowledge needed for the implementation of the program for the qualitative renovation of socialism and, at the same time, to create conditions so that such knowledge may be put to full practical use. In the second stage of perestroika it is vitally important to ensure the unbreakable interconnection between the growing social responsibility and the professional competence and creative potential of cadres. That was discussed at the February CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

How can we best implement the new requirements facing cadres?

I

Above all, we must answer the following question: What is the role of knowledge in the system of factors which determine the success of perestroika? It is obvious that not all such factors are of equal value and their interconnection and interdependence by no means indicate the absence of hierarchy and priorities.

Today the groundlessness of the inflated and, at the same time, utopian concepts concerning the role of knowledge and its unlimited opportunities has become particularly obvious. The consequence is efforts to explain the sharp contradictions which arise and the difficulties of socio-economic development above all by citing shortcomings in cadre training, and the fact that knowledge has fallen behind the demands of production. This approach indicates more than a methodological flaw. To many people it has always been convenient, for it largely forgave the inertia of stagnation.

Although in publications on management we frequently saw the formula "I know, I want, I can, I succeed," the prevalent practical opinion was that the decisive link in this chain was the first and that it was precisely on this point that main efforts should be concentrated. However, daily observations and historical experience reveal that the main thing was the real interest shown by society in encouraging the people learn and, if possible, make practical use of their knowledge.

From the very first years of the Soviet system, the country faced a most urgent problem: a shortage of scientists, specialists and highly skilled workers. This problem was solved within the shortest possible time, for this was demanded by the public interest. It was precisely for that reason that at that time here the status and recognition of the educated man were higher than anywhere else in the world. Today the aspiration to broaden knowledge has greatly declined and the prestige enjoyed by the person who is erudite, literate and master of his work is not what it was. This is explained not only by shortcomings in educational work and the imperfection of the incentive system. It is also a question of the fact that priorities in social needs have changed and that today education is no longer a privilege but something universally accessible.

Contemporary practices indicate that the weakest link in the chain of components for successful activities is "I want." Even despite possibilities of substantially increasing earnings, with increased skills, broadening the boundaries of creativity and providing opportunities for initiative, despite the expectations of those who organize training, many people are unwilling to do so. Particularly worrisome is the substantial lowering of interest in the study of economic-management subjects, although with every passing year the funds appropriated for the development of universal economic training and the system for upgrading skill, people's universities, and all kinds of courses, schools and seminars, are increasing. Such

forms of training, which have encompassed the virtually entire able-bodied population, absorb millions of hours of working and leisure time and function according to the principle of the more (participants, disciplines, measures, education expenditures), the better. The training process pursues essentially the objectives of enlightenment and is structured primarily on the basis of administrative methods. However, the authors of the respective orders and instructions do not take into consideration that of late the possibility of obtaining knowledge from newspapers, publications, radio and television has increased tremendously.

The basic contradiction was the fact that life, practical experience taught essentially not that which was taught in VUZs or what propagandists explained. Under the conditions of the obsolete economic mechanism the worker and the manager had properly realized the actual value of appeals to identify and use reserves and to upgrade labor intensiveness: based "on achievements," the plan would be increased, and norms would be raised. Meanwhile, a substantial percentage of economic managers had mastered, without the help of teachers and aids, both social mimicry and the art to manipulate value indicators and varieties, and to submit pleasing reports.

This mentality cannot be eliminated in the classroom, however well equipped with computers it may be. The old economic traditions yield to the new under the influence of radical changes in social life, through the economic conditions under which the labor collectives and their managers toil. In this case glasnost and "extra-departmental" criticism play a tremendous role, for without them even self-support could become an object of manipulation as good as the notorious "gross output."

"The viewpoint of life and practice," V.I. Lenin wrote, "must be the first and fundamental viewpoint of the theory of knowledge" (*Poln. Sobr. Soch.* [Complete Collected Works], vol 18, p 145). On this basis (bearing in mind that it is a question of social life, social practice) we must also approach the shaping of practical, political and moral qualities in the working people. The conditions under which man works have been and remain the principal, the most authoritative teacher. A brigade which uses true cost accounting, which distributes earnings based on end results, teaches people economics and social justice more clearly and quickly than any lecture on this topic or any business game. A conversion to self-financing, the real possibility of closing down an unprofitable enterprise, can quickly restructure economic thinking. Self-management and the election of managers become a school of democracy for all.

All such new phenomena in the life of labor collectives trigger the real need for reinforcing, for updating already acquired knowledge, which cannot be satisfied only through empirical means, through the method of trial and error. I recall that in our institute the first business game "Elections of Management" were held 10 years ago. Let me frankly say that it triggered no interest and

was received skeptically. Recently, however, three chemical enterprise directors voluntarily and most seriously competed for the right to hold the position of director of the Vilnyus Plasta enterprise, where they had undergone practical training. Although all of this took place in a classroom, both the candidates and the participants in the vote—their study group colleagues—perfectly realized the usefulness of such training.

Another positive feature is the fact that the instructions, methods, and regulations issued today related to enterprise activities are much simpler and understandable than those issued in the past. One of the active developers of the conditions governing the Sumy experiment, Doctor of Economic Sciences V.P. Moskalenko, noted that the previous economic management system had become difficult to understand not only by the ordinary worker but also the manager and even the economist. The present system of rates governing fund setting is substantially simpler.

Making use of the experience of the base enterprises provides tremendous opportunities for upgrading the purposefulness and efficiency of training. Of late virtually all directors and chief engineers who have been retrained at the IPK of the Ministry of Chemical Industry, have practiced at the Polimir Production Association in Novopolotsk and the Plasta plant in Vilnyus, which are the flagships of scientific and technical progress in the sector. The heads of these enterprises—Hero of Socialist Labor L.V. Novozhilov and Laureate of USSR State Prize A.L. Grishkyavichyus—spared neither efforts nor funds to help their colleagues. Particularly useful to directors, chief engineers and teachers in our institute were classes taught by A.T. Kholodkov, director of the Kremniypolimer Plant in Zaporozhe.

Unfortunately, the activities of enthusiasts, both today as during the time of the Unionwide practical experience pilgrimages to the Shchekino Chemical Combine are virtually left without encouragement. Why not organize, on a cost accounting basis, training centers at enterprises and institutes whose experience is of particular interest?

II

At the present time the restructuring of postgraduate training and changes in the numerous forms of cadre retraining are being extensively discussed. A number of suggestions have been made, which are sometimes mutually exclusive. This is not astounding, for a great variety of solutions to this problem exist throughout the world. Centers have been organized for management training, where the students concentrate on philosophy, political economy, sociology and systems analysis. Other centers are engaged in the study of strictly practical problems, essentially through business games.

It would be very difficult to provide a simple answer to the question of which forms of training are more efficient. Scientific and production activities are as varied as the possibilities of learning about them.

It is important for methods, the groundlessness of which was seen in economics not to be applied in training. Rigid bureaucratic administration, petty-supervision and incompetent interference in work of systems for the professional training of managers, specialists and workers could be as harmful as the bureaucratic invasion of science and production. The mentality that everything is permitted and known, and strictly hierarchical concepts of responsibilities and rights have, unfortunately, become typical features of the way of thinking which also shape the behavior of many officials in the central management agencies. These officials must restructure their work and learn how to take into consideration the opinion of scientists and specialists. They must abandon claims to the monopoly on truth.

The results achieved by the workers in the course of upgrading their skills will now be mandatorily taken into consideration in their certification. This will strengthen the planning principles in the organization of training. Here as well, however, it is important not to allow administrative-command distortions. Some personnel services deem it their duty to formulate as orders, long years in advance, who will study where and how. They find ways of punishing people for avoiding (which is a frequent phenomenon) the implementation of such a strictly formulated training plan. Coercion invariably lowers interest in knowledge. We must encourage or punish above all on the basis of end results, whether good or poor work has been done, and not for displays of official zeal.

The USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) stipulates, among others, that workers, with their consent, could be assigned by the enterprise to training in secondary specialized and higher educational institutions and to postgraduate studies with a scholarship. We believe that this stipulation should be extended to the state system for upgrading skills, again based on voluntary participation.

The skill upgrading system should have a flexible structure, which could be quickly reorganized, and which would encompass a great variety of areas and forms of training. Unquestionably, the main role in this system should be that of sectorial institutes for upgrading the skill of leading personnel. It would be hardly expedient to grant such functions to the VUZes. It is not even a question of the fact that the VUZes would become mired in a tremendous flood of managers and specialists (for example, in a 5-year period more than 200,000 people upgrade their expertise at the skill upgrading institute of the Ministry of Chemical Industry). What matters most is that the methods used in organizing student training are inconsistent with the requirements of efficient postgraduate retraining.

The sectorial skill upgrading institutes must efficiently react to production-technical and economic-management changes and to the vital requirements of enterprises. To this effect, the IPK must be granted greater autonomy in determining the ways and nature of training and supervising the knowledge of the students.

The organization of the training process presumes the teaching of sociopolitical disciplines, economics, management, technology, ecology and civil defense. However, the duration of the training process (which usually does not exceed 2 months) does not make it possible to provide serious specific training, which is replaced with simple instruction. We believe that the scientific councils of institutes can independently solve the problem of who to teach, and how and what to teach him.

Furthermore, in terms of urgent practical problems, it is also important to avoid the narrow-pragmatic and technocratic orientation in IPK activities. Practical experience has proved that the competence and skills of a manager and specialist are inseparably related to his world outlook and life stance, and his ability objectively to assess phenomena in social life, establish contacts with the collective and the public at large, and proceed on the basis of the national interests.

Currently training frequently provides a very simplistic concept of man and his interaction with the social environment. Recommendations aimed at economic managers are usually reduced to developing stereotyped actions in frequently recurring situations, teaching managers to master standard "prescriptions" and methods. Yet, such means and methods are unsuitable in terms of the most complex and rapidly changing circumstances in real life. Equally questionable is the moral sense of such advice. Let us recall Lenin's subtle remark: "...If a person with whom we wish to engage in a common project...uses toward his comrades a move as in a chess game, it becomes unquestionable that this person is not good.... that he is insincere" (op cit., vol 4, p 344). Nonetheless, today's teachers are frequently directing their students precisely toward the mastery of such "chess skills," and toward manipulating interpersonality relations.

Some economic managers complain that the current laws are too soft and that the pace of democratization is too fast, claiming that the people are not ready for this. They see in the laws on labor collectives, the state enterprise, the brigade organization of labor, the electiveness of management and the expansion of glasnost a virtual violation of the foundations of managing the socialist economy. An automatic replacement of cadres and their mandatory training will not provide a democratic style of management.

As the results of joint sociological surveys conducted by the Ministry of Chemical Industry IPK and the Scientific Research Institute for Systems Research of the USSR Academy of Sciences indicated, one of the most significant qualities in working with people was the ability to

be honest in one's views and behavior, to solve conflict situations and to take into consideration the situation of the people. The ability of a manager to amend his behavior and to surmount a negative attitude toward individual workers was considered the least important.

An authoritarian management style is not the least important reflection of technocratic thinking. It is based on the concept that social relations are a purely technical system and that man is a machine. With this approach learning how to press the necessary buttons on time and accurately becomes the main feature. This approach is frequently identified with concrete actions, which are so greatly needed in management and which, it is claimed, are missing in philosophy and political economy.

At the present time, understanding the role of the human factor in production life greatly rests on empirical concepts. Everyone understands that a manager cannot make any technical decision without consulting with specialists. Yet the most complex problems affecting the life of the collective and in some cases the interest of thousands of people are practically and comprehensively solved in the best of cases on the basis of common sense. Nonetheless, problems of humanizing production relations are no less relevant than the elimination of "computer illiteracy." A technocrat, although hard-working, with good specialized training, will not accept democratization, glasnost or independent judgments. That is why world outlook training of people who are familiar with the latest achievements of science and technology is needed today more than ever.

This equally applies to interpreting the problem of capitalist production. It is no secret that some of our economic managers, clearly simplifying matters, consider unemployment as just about the only efficient means of decisively strengthening labor discipline. The real difficulties, breakdowns in the economic mechanism of contemporary capitalism, triggered by the struggle for sources of raw materials and markets, and the existence of "trade secrets" and rivalry have not been realized in full. A sober understanding of the real successes and the equally obvious faults in the organization of capitalist production would make it possible to highlight the unquestionable advantages of the socialist economic management system and to encourage their more efficient utilization. Let us note, incidentally, that in the United States social disciplines account for up to 40 percent of training in higher management schools. In our country this figure is significantly lower.

In training a manager, we must observe Lenin's requirement of "greater comprehensiveness and greater talent." Naturally, this problem cannot be solved exclusively within the system of upgrading cadre skills. It is important to promote steady independent work by the students on improving their cultural and technical standard. It would be useful to supplement regular job training with training at short seminars and sectorial and regional courses.

Practical training conferences and discussions involving, together with the students, the participation of scientists and senior ministry and departmental personnel, are efficient forms of training. The development of communicative skills is helped by specialized practical studies, such as videotraining, used not only at the Academy of the National Economy but also by many IPK. Most economic managers have mastered only the monologue style of thinking, according to which ideas and information are spread vertically. The truth, however, is always the product of a collective quest. It is born in the course of a creative dialogue in which a variety of viewpoints are freely expressed. The lack of dialectical thinking and a narrowness of outlook cannot be corrected by any kind of specialized training. This is the conclusion of anyone who has watched a videotape of his own behavior in training classes.

Currently the training groups consist of 25-30 students. The students are people whose individual training, age, level of development and other features show significant disparities, compared to students in a class in a secondary school or VUZ. In the conservatory, for example, only a few future conductors are taking a given course. Training is essentially individualized for some other categories of creative workers as well. Why, therefore, should a major economic manager who is faced with making daily decisions concerning unique and most difficult problems, be taught "on an assembly line" basis?

III

It is the job of the instructors to ensure uniform theoretical-methodological training of students and to help them to master practical experience. The selection of such instructors is no simple matter. The load of teachers of sociopolitical and economic-management subjects in the IPK is greater than in VUZes. Furthermore, here virtually no time is set aside for preparations. Yet each study group has its own specific features. I can hardly conceive of a teacher who is ready to teach a class after a single evening of preparation and stand in front of that class. However, that is precisely what the volume to be taught requires. The constant redrafting of programs and abstracts takes a tremendous amount of time. However, one must be able to "reflect" the new concepts, new experiences and necessary specific features! Why not reduce such work without harming in any way the covering of a standard curriculum? Furthermore, are curricula always necessary when courses are being changed constantly? Long practical experience confirms that departments and individual teachers should be trusted more, particularly the authors of major scientific works; all bureaucratic procedures which waste the people's time and efforts should be firmly eliminated. It would be much more useful to the project to give sufficient time to the teachers to teach creative seminars and engage in informal intercourse and independent work.

This 5-year period the salaries of IPK workers will be increased. What criteria will be considered decisive in assessing the labor contribution of the teacher: Will it be his scientific competence, professional standard or the functions he performs in service subdivisions? Today instead of a section or laboratory, frequently a department is organized and docents and professors are assigned obligations inconsistent with their qualifications. The consulting professor, as a rule a doctor of sciences with great practical experience in the sector, must be one of the main personalities in the IPK. However, such a position has not been contemplated within the skill upgrading system.

The salaries of non-staff lecturers were recently raised substantially (they were almost doubled). This was a reasonable and overdue step, for no skills can be enhanced today without attracting into teaching major scientists and specialists. However, the IPK wage fund did not increase proportionally. It would be hopeless to seek a solution by substantially reducing the number of "hourly" and increase the load of full-time teachers. Suffice it to say that usually three to five (or even more) instructors are needed to conduct a business game with the use of computers, not counting computer operators. The share of lectures (the most "inexpensive" form of training) is being reduced steadily. Furthermore, training with computer displays and video cameras is taking place by subgroup of students which further increases the cost of training. For the time being no one knows how to cope with this situation.

Red tape, formalism and mistrust of teachers are today garbed in democratic clothing. Thus, in some institutes the students rate the teacher after each class and express their views on his scientific standard and practical usefulness. Meanwhile, one can hardly recall a case in which a grade lower than "good" has been given to a high-placed manager, although by no means all such managers are conscientious in their training and although some of them have such a limited basic knowledge that it is simply impossible to compensate for it during their short IPK training.

It is becoming increasingly clear under the conditions of democracy and glasnost that every person has his own individual social experience and specific level of knowledge and his own way of reacting to events, and the fact that the range of views, beliefs and assessments is huge. There is nothing terrible if a view expressed by a teacher will not be universally accepted by the students: today total unanimity of opinion can be achieved only by encouraging triteness. Should any one of the students eventually become a "power," to this day a teacher has few guarantees that he will not share the fate of G.G. Strashko, a department head and the main character of the "Nezhin Story," which was discussed in KOMMUNIST last year.

The functions of the instructors and the criteria used in assessing their work are so loose that any day and in any department one could easily find a reason for sometimes

mutually exclusive critical remarks and demands. A great deal of subjective features which are regulated by superiors prevail in defining the volume and structure of the training load and in assessing the quality of training. Sometimes voting by a scientific council develops into a purely formal procedure. Whereas in VUZes the selection and development of cadres have their scientific and ethical traditions, a great deal remains to be done in this area in the IPK. The fact that even a major scientist depends on administrative arbitrariness and that he is "vulnerable" favors the blossoming of time-serving, subservience and lack of principles.

Postgraduate training should be cleansed of dogmatism, bookishness, excessive organization and rigid regulation of the content and forms of the training process. It is exceptionally important to involve in it highly skilled specialists, such as scientists and practical workers, who are the "production organizers of perestroika." To this effect we must, above all, provide scope for creativity and initiative for both students and teachers.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Facing a Choice

18020013f Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 54-62

[Article by Vladimir Ivanovich Krichagin, candidate of medical sciences, department head, All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Medical and Medical-Technical Information, USSR Ministry of Health]

[Text] Of late it has become fashionable to criticize health care. More than enough suggestions have been formulated on how to take medicine out of this situation. However, how constructive are the discussions in newspapers and journals? Do such discussions highlight the main steps which would enable us to halt the negative trends in the development of this sector?

Unfortunately, we must point out that most suggestions can be reduced merely to improving the existing ways and means of providing medical services. Add something here, change something there, upgrade skills and strengthen or expand one area or another. As a rule, it becomes a question of improving the old mechanism, of repairing its "assemblies," of lubricating "ball bearings" which became worn out a long time ago. Actually, many people consider this to be the essence of restructuring the health care system.

Nonetheless, the large number of tasks, targets and subtargets (everything, furthermore, is considered important and essential, one way or another) confirms, above all, the insufficient theoretical interpretation of the existing situation on the basis of the new positions consistent with the requirements of our time. The period

of stagnation could not fail to influence the development of our sector as well, its theory above all. The crisis in this area was paralleled by an active counteraction to the revision of existing concepts, the self-isolation of scientific developments from world experience, refusal to undertake a profound analysis, economic in particular, and the ever-broadening departmental concealment of information on adverse processes in the health care system.

Our scientists, who had dedicated all their strength to the solution of tactical problems within the framework of the old theories, were unable promptly to react to the changes which were taking place in the structure of population pathology. They did not offer to society a strategy for further development. This, I believe, is today the most important problem.

Why and when did the noteworthy principles which were formulated by N.A. Semashko, the first people's commissar of health care, and which were the foundations for the domestic health care system (national, planned, free, universally accessible and preventative) grind to a halt? In order to try to answer this question, let us turn to our history and to the global processes in health care which, unfortunately, are still being ignored.

The essential possibility was substantiated and a technology for mass prevention and treatment of most epidemic and other acute diseases was created as early as the turn of the century as a result of the efforts of epidemiologists and hygienists in Germany, England, France and Russia. The successes achieved in microbiology and asepsis enabled physicians to save masses of people from premature death and to prolong their lives with the help of relatively simple and inexpensive prophylactic measures. It was thus that science significantly outstripped practical experience: at that time medicine consisted essentially of providing treatment, which was accessible to a few people only. It was uncoordinated and actually uncontrollable (only part of it was under the supervision of internal affairs departments, war ministries, and guardianship and charity departments). For that reason scientific achievements remained unused for long periods of time even in more economically developed countries than Russia, with its 28,000 physicians (1913).

The practices of the young Soviet health care system and the very effective application of its new principles in the USSR during the first 5-year periods, the Great Patriotic War and the postwar years amazed the world. Our experience in the elimination of malaria is to this day considered a miracle, never duplicated elsewhere on such a scale. These successes were achieved at a cost significantly lower than in other countries pursuing the same objectives and within the same period of time. Equally very economical were steps to encompass extensively the population in prophylactic measures, such as mass examinations, immunizations against infectious diseases and comprehensive hygiene-educational work.

The noted American scientist H. Siegerist, who visited the USSR, wrote a number of enthusiastic books and articles on Soviet health care experience, describing what he had seen as a new era in preventive activities. Three of his books and other sources of information laid the beginning of the movement for socialization and even nationalization of health care throughout the world. In particular, while the war was still on, the British Labor Party included in its program the task of full nationalization of the sector and, after coming to power, the parliament drafted and passed a corresponding law.

On both the theoretical and practical levels, in the 1930s and 1940s our health care system was leading and justifiably considered the most efficient. It retained its high reputation through the end of the 1960s. In 1970 the World Health Organization passed a resolution which recommended to its member countries to apply principles similar to those developed by N.A. Semashko.

These principles (with and, frequently, without references to their author) were borrowed and reshaped in accordance with national conditions by virtually all developed capitalist countries. Comprehensive state control was instituted over private medical practice, which forced its reorganization. Autonomous health care departments or sections of related ministries were set up and the role of state medical statistics was enhanced significantly. Free and accessible services in this sector began to be provided by many countries through mandatory national health insurance, which was a form of additional taxation. In Great Britain general taxes are levied for local and state budgets, used to finance health care expenditures. Denmark proclaimed complete free medical aid of all kinds, which it was forced to abandon by the end of the 1970s after extremely costly treatment technologies made their appearance.

Therefore, today health care in the developed capitalist countries has become one of the most socialized sectors in their nonproduction sphere. Clearly, this must be considered less a manifestation of the humane nature of governmental social policy than a major gain by the working people, which was achieved not without the influence of the successes and examples set by the Soviet Union and the other countries which have taken the path of socialism.

However, as has frequently been the case in science and technology, domestic progressive theoretical concepts were taken up abroad and developed there faster and in a greater variety than at home. As a result, today we are facing a number of problems of mastering and, sometimes, purchasing ways and means of improving the population's health, which were developed by world science on the basis of Soviet medical achievements.

The study of changes in the efficiency of medical aid in the 20th century reveals an interesting pattern: until the 1950s-1970s the curves of expected life span increased (differently in different countries); correspondingly, the

mortality indicators for the leading age groups dropped quite sharply, particularly among children and active-age groups. Unexpectedly to health care managers, in many countries such favorable dynamics suddenly stopped and, for a period of 10 to 15 years all efforts to correct the situation proved futile. However, British and American epidemiologists found quite quickly the reason for this phenomenon, formulated a new theory and provided the necessary cadres for intervening in this situation. Once again, this was followed by an increased span of life and reduced mortality although, it is true, at a slower pace.

Milton Terris, a student of A. Siegerist, who studied these trends, formulated the most important concept of changes in epidemiological revolutions. In Terris' view, having developed the theory and specific ways of eliminating mass epidemic, parasitical and social diseases, N.A. Semashko and his followers thus substantiated the conditions leading to the full elimination of an entire class of diseases, which was brilliantly proved in global practical experience. The diseases of that time were such that after treatment, as a rule man recovered his full ability to work and his chances to live to a ripe old age increased. From the purely economic viewpoint, investments in health care were extremely effective, for they saved from death essentially people in the young active age groups, and the additional product they created more than compensated all prevention and treatment costs. High infant mortality was also relatively easy to eliminate, for simple preventive measures, improved overall hygiene, and an aseptic attitude in maternity homes and nurseries sufficed.

Hospitalization, thanks to the characteristics of the structure and simplicity of diagnostic methods, required relatively small expenditures and also yielded significant results. The very number of mass diseases which caused premature death was also substantially lower. All of this created conditions for their prevention and free treatment on the basis of the then latest scientific achievements.

M. Terris classified that period as the first epidemiological revolution which enabled us within a short historical period (30-50 years) to essentially eliminate from the list the leading reasons of death in practically all essentially treatable population diseases.

However, following their elimination, the people by no means acquired an immortality patent. Typhoid fever, dysentery and croupous pneumonia and other somewhat "standard" diseases were replaced by previously relatively infrequent chronic diseases which were either transmitted hereditarily or related to physical aging. As we know, diseases caused by the gradual blocking of blood vessels—atherosclerosis—which, in the final account, leads to infarcts, insults, gangrenes and many other terrible consequences became prevalent. They were followed by malignant growths, the incidence of which increased because people began to die at an older

age. Third were accidents, followed by diseases of the respiratory and metabolic organs. Their appearance and development were accelerated by social and environmental factors and, above all, an unhealthy way of life and the harmful influences of the environment.

Worldwide experience indicates that whenever such diseases become prevalent the strategy of health care must be changed and restructured. Otherwise the natural decline in reducing the negative indicators in the work of the health care system would be extensively prolonged. M. Terris described the new stage as the second epidemiological revolution. In his view, although said diseases cannot be cured in principle, a change in strategy could successfully slow down their development and postpone the advent of lethal complications.

The success of the new concept was indisputably confirmed by the efficient results of preventive programs which were carried out in a number of countries which have presently achieved the longest life span. In Japan today 99.4 percent of all newly born children can reach the age of 1; 98.9 the age of 15, 95.6 the age of 45, and 81.4 the age of 65. The U.S. indicators are slightly worse, 98.7, 98.2, 92.5, and 72.5 percent respectively. Somewhat higher than in the United States are those of Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, the FRG, France, Denmark and a number of other developed countries; closer to the American level among the socialist countries are the GDR and Cuba. Facts are stubborn things. They prove that the adoption of new concepts and tactics in the struggle against chronic noninfectious diseases largely improves the state of health of the people and the majority of the population lives to a deep old age.

In the opinion of many noted health care workers in the Western countries, the principles established by M.A. Semashko's school have not become obsolete but have merely changed in accordance with the demands of the times. Thus, the role of the state in preventive work has increased, carried out in the guise of major target programs, using budget subsidies and local funds. Henceforth the strategy will be based not on extensive general measures in the struggle against all diseases but on concentrating appropriations, based on programs consistent with the main trends. The role of centralized control and planning in treatment is reduced, whereas the importance of specific assistance funds and initiatives of insurance companies and local authorities will be increasing.

The principle of free care changed as well. Under present-day circumstances, total free health care is essentially unattainable. It is not a question of a set of preventive measures and popular medicine, which can ensure the health and longevity of the entire population, but of so-called exquisite medicine and the technology of virtuoso scientists, which are beyond the financial possibilities of even the richest countries. It is true that in the course of time any supercomplex technology is either rejected for ethical or other reasons or else simplified

and becomes accessible to broader range of patients, or else yields useful "spin-offs." Thus, the entire organ transplant campaign did not create any noticeable changes in population mortality statistics but developed the theory of immunity of the body, which is of exceptional value to mankind. Without it, for example, today we would have no hope in the struggle against AIDS and, possibly, in general we would be unable to identify the general causes of this disease.

As a principle, prevention remains the leading trend in health care in countries which have adopted the new strategy. This is perhaps due to the fact alone that, spending for such purposes about 4 percent of all health care appropriations, they achieve (essentially through such funds) a real increase in the life span and favorable changes in the mortality indicators. Ordinary prevention and treatment are the two motive forces which help the population reach a healthy old age. However, the nature of prevention and its strategy and tactics change drastically. Since it is a question of postponing for a later age chronic diseases, "screening" becomes the basic methodology: the study and a kind of classifying the population into specific "risk groups," and subsequent lowering of the influence of such risk factors.

We must openly say that with the exception of individual and limited experiments, the new strategy and tactics of the second epidemiological revolution have not been applied in our country. Unfortunately, their importance has not been fully realized by the leaders in this sector and by many scientists. It is precisely for this reason, and not exclusively because of a decline in the attention paid to the health care system, that negative trends began to appear and increase in our medicine. It is precisely from this viewpoint that, I believe, we should consider the state of affairs if we are to correct the situation.

Inadequate financing is justifiably considered one of the specific reasons for the lag in health care. We can only agree with this. Estimates have indicated that while subsidies remained unchanged or even dropped between the 1960s and 1980s (taking inflation into consideration) the number of physicians and beds approximately doubled. Meanwhile, as a result of the use of new drugs and technologies, the cost of medical aid increased at least by 50 percent. Medical services could not fail but worsen by virtue of the fact alone that now the same resources had to be spread among a larger number of medical centers, beds, treatment facilities, etc.

During the period of stagnation the sectorial management usually accepted gratefully each absolute increase in subsidies. However, the share of outlays for health care and physical culture over the past 25 years did not increase in the country's national income and, as before, has accounted for approximately 4 percent. For comparison's sake, let us note that within the same period of time allocations doubled in the United States and more than doubled in Japan.

This, however, has its caveats. Increased appropriations have by no means invariably led to improvements in ordinary medical practices. The United States, for example, acknowledges that it has been quite successful in most complex types of treatment but is behind other countries in the level of assistance to the poor, the elderly and the national minorities. It is blaming both its own and the multinational industry for "pursuit of medical equipment," while being unable to oppose the spiraling price of services which cost Americans a great deal more than the British. There is yet another caveat: whereas in the past differences in the cost of treatment were insignificant, today the difference between minimum and maximum has increased immeasurably. The cost of diagnostic procedures or most complex surgeries, which take several hours, or of drugs is very high! Today the cost of a heart transplant is equal to the annual budget of several intensive-care wards which could save hundreds of lives within the same period of time. By extensively applying such novelties with limited funds, for the sake of isolated successes, the country may be deprived of several such wards which could directly help a substantially greater number of people in critical health conditions.

Today some countries allocate substantial funds not for the development of ordinary medical treatment but precisely for technologies of extreme complexity and cost. It may become necessary to impose restrictions in the development of such technologies in the area of treatment, based on rational-ethical and economic standards, for if they continue to be used at the same pace, by the middle of the 21st century the countries will be investing their entire budget in health care. This is another serious and difficult problem.

In the period of the second epidemiological revolution expenditures for medicine will inevitably increase. This increase is particularly threatening in the free health care system where, unfortunately, money is handled extremely poorly. Incidentally, although socialist health care is a relatively autonomous system, it would be erroneous to assume that overall increases in the cost of services would bypass us. The facts prove that the economics of our medical sector are influenced by the prices on the world market and the processes occurring in the business world.

However, is merely increasing expenditures sufficient to solve all problems? While greatly welcoming the planned future growth of appropriations for health care, could we, medical workers, promise today that such additional allocations would be used thriftily and not spent on the latest "fireworks?"

In discussions with economists we reached the simple conclusion that economics cannot be tricked. The moment funds to support each "service unit" become insufficient, such an increase in resources would worsen the situation. For example, a case of pneumonia can be cured at a nominal cost of 6 rubles per bed per day.

However, due to the extensive growth, while allocations remain stable, actually only 2 rubles are available. What are the physicians to do in such cases? In the case of hospitalizing a pneumonia patient, in order to have funds for his treatment, 2 out of 3 beds must remain empty. This, however, is forbidden by the "beds turnover" indicator, for which reason physicians put in such beds patients who do not particularly require in-hospital stay. Whatever juggling the norming workers may do with the figures, in a free health care system it is only properly supported facilities that are used properly, while others are left idle. That is why pursuit of world leadership in such indicators without a faster growth of appropriations is economic nonsense.

By concentrating all finances and funds in centralized accounts and assuming responsibility for the health of the people and, having created a widespread apparatus to this effect, the state easily loses track of the individual and his needs. Gradually the system begins to work not for the sake of end results but in the way it finds simpler and more convenient to govern its own activities. That same notorious diktat of the producer over the consumer arises, which is so extensively mentioned today but the elimination of which, for the time being, is proving to be difficult.

The reasons for such a phenomenon can also trace their roots in the past. In times which were easier in terms of free care, we brought control over financing to inadmissibly primitive levels. Unquestionably, today it is unacceptable to concentrate in the same hands resources and cadres and payment for their work one year in advance. The triple system of the financed producer of services, the consumer, who pays, and the third element which controls the first two appears to be the only possible form of cost-accounting in a free system in our age of complex technologies and exceptionally difficult allocation of limited resources, which are extremely varied in terms of their cost. Unquestionably, maintaining a system of inspectors which would supervise and meet the costs of treatment institutions from a "hospital fund" would be expensive. However, the material and moral losses suffered by society as a result of the inefficient allocation of resources and services, the inevitable corruption which develops like a mold on the lack of control over the allocation of subsidies, would be much more expensive.

In a number of countries national health insurance assumes a leading role as the paying and supervising agency. In our country "hospital banks" were set up by the trade unions. They protected the rights of individuals in the area of health care. Eventually, however, it was considered possible to eliminate this third party and grant all appropriations to the medical establishments themselves, thus awarding them "dictatorial" rights. This deprived the population of the possibility of actively influencing the state of affairs and development of the sector.

"Territorial-individual" crediting of medical institutions exists, in one form or another, in many countries. However, it is provided on a minimal, on a basic level, with a view to maintaining the viability of the existing network of medical institutions. The balance of the money needed for the purchase of equipment, some drugs, salaries, and so on, must be earned by polyclinics and hospitals in providing population services while, at the same time, setting funds aside to repay such loans.

But who pays for medical services in countries in which health care is totally or virtually free? In the most centralized systems, where payments come out of funds collected from the taxpayer or through national health insurance, the money comes from two sources: general funds (the smaller part) and the specific maintenance funds (most of it). For example, fund No. 1 may be used for insuring the health of mothers and children (up to 1 year of age); fund No. 2, for adolescents; fund No. 3, for aid to the population under catastrophic conditions, and all the way to No. 15, aid to veterans.

In observing the work of health ministries in the Western countries, as the representative of the WHO European Regional Bureau, I failed to find in them subdivisions without any funds at their disposal. In our country, the Ministry of Health main administrations and departments do not provide loans to anyone and are even unaware of the funds which they spend today in protecting the health of specific population groups. And even if such figures can be found, no one is able to determine whether the amounts are sufficient or not.

I consider that the main way to democratize the health care system is that of sensible decentralization: organizing finances by funds and management on the basis of a hierarchical system. The gradual abandonment of standardization should be promoted wherever it is totally unnecessary. There should be less all-Union and more local financing, consistent with the real needs of the people. We must learn how to attract the various sources of financing which should not go to the central fund, where the money vanishes without any visible returns, but to specific funds and local budgets, which would receive contributions from industry, departments and individual enterprises. In order to pay for specific types of medical aid, which are still in the stage of scientific experimentation or are entirely based on expensive imported equipment, additional insurance funds should be set up.

Many countries offering free forms of health care also provide a great deal of paid services. Newspapers are crowded with ads placed by nurses who would provide treatment at home or care for patients. Occasionally associations, such as companies for which such nurses work, would also advertise. Dozens of means exist for channeling the available money of patients into matters related to their personal affairs. For example, societies of

people concerned with problems of preventing or treating a specific disease are set up. They engage in performing a number of tasks, from collecting information on new preparations and controlling the quality of treatment to providing one-time aid for the purchase of a particularly expensive drug. All of this helps to relieve the health care system of a number of substantial expenditures and to protect population rights.

I believe that an efficient reform in domestic medicine should affect, above all, its economic and organizational foundations. The struggle "from above" for upgrading the quality of medical services is so far based on **appeals** to work better and **threats** of punishment for errors. Have we still not learned properly that one cannot rely seriously and in the long term on such "incentives?" Health problems will not be solved without an efficient system of payment for quality, for the active and humane treatment of patients and for perfecting the health of those who are already healthy.

In speaking of perestroika, as a former official of the USSR Ministry of Health, I would like also to touch upon the question of the efficiency of the sectorial management structure. After 20 years of work within the ministry's system, I have developed the impression that no one can make any kind of substantial change: The only possible thing is the juggling of regulations controlled by planning and financial managements in accordance with instructions issued by the minister; any new development can disturb the delicate balance of this poorly balanced sector, constantly infringed upon by other departments.

Currently the health care system is governed by several thousand basic controlling regulations. As it expands, this list of regulations begins to operate as though for its own sake, taking into consideration exclusively the use and allocation of resources rather than their usefulness. It is thus that the outlay mechanism in planning and accountability arises. In one of the scientific councils, a specialist voiced the unexpected conclusion of the unparalleled perfection of a regulatory economy. In his view, it enabled the ministry to "manage by branch," i.e., to reduce the main content of its work to "supervising the observance of regulations." My conclusion would be the direct opposite: the system of rigid control usually appears in periods of crisis, when creative thinking becomes a superfluous luxury. Such was precisely the case until the beginning of perestroika.

A strange conclusion is reached at a first glance (and not only then), according to which under contemporary conditions physicians, particularly clinical workers, can no longer efficiently manage the health care system. They lack proper economic training and knowledge of the theory of social health care; they focus all their activities on standardizing prevention and treatment methods which, for a country as large and heterogeneous in terms of local conditions as ours turns into an absolutely futile occupation. The economics of the sector, the

organization of specific financial support of different local initiatives, supervision over the population's state of health, constant discussion of related problems with the government in drafting new laws and perfecting old ones are the functions which should become today leading to health care departments. However, so far they have not become such. Clearly, in this case better work could be done by specially trained economists, mathematical statisticians, new-type epidemiologists and public health care specialists. Incidentally, for quite some time it is not physicians who have been trained in such skills in the United States.

Views recently expressed in the press to the effect that our Ministry of Health is generally not dealing with such problems seem justified. Actually, I cannot remember the last time when our scientific press discussed the functions of the main medical department. How to discuss such activities, to begin with, if scientific research institutes and scientific journals are both organs of the Ministry of Health? Its associates are members of editorial boards, the work of which they control. Unquestionably, administrative supervision contributed to stagnation in the theory of socialist health care.

In order to make a decisive efforts to review obsolete concepts, we must, above all, introduce glasnost in the scientific press. To this day glasnost has remained the privilege of mass journals and newspapers while in sectorial science administrative suppression of initiative and departmental prohibitions prevail. Officially, the old procedure of expert evaluation of scientific articles has not been abolished; although this provides a fully legitimate protection of authorship, discovery and invention, as in the past it allows managers on all levels to ban the publication of anything about which they would not like to inform physicians and the population. The conservative procedure governing preparations for conferences and symposia also hinders the open and honest discussion of pressing problems. As in the past, a heap of documents and signatures are needed before any article or even a thesis can be published. In my view, such an atmosphere clearly clashes with the ideas of democratization and glasnost.

The subject of perestroika in our sector is extremely complex. Understandably, no simple and indisputable solutions can be offered in this case. We must think together, argue and compare various choices. It is precisely in the course of a free clash of opinions that the truth emerges.

I am an optimist and I believe that despite the present extremely poor indicators, our health care system has not lost its ability once again to assume the leadership. However, this requires a decisive revision of many postulates, which only yesterday seemed indisputable. We must formulate real targets and adopt a strategy for the development of the sector which would be accurate and consistent with the new conditions.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Centralized Management and the Market

18020013g Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7,
May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 63-71

[Article by Evald Boleslavovich Figurnov, doctor of economic sciences]

[Text] The radical restructuring of the economic management system is accompanied by a sharp struggle between the new and the old and efforts to preserve the customary administrative methods and make them fit the categories of the new economic mechanism. This frequently triggers improper interpretations of the changes taking place, interpreting them as a rejection of centralized economic management. The supporters of such views objectively turn out to be the allies of the defenders of the command-administrative system. Both are willing to put their signatures under the formula of "plan or market."

Centralized management, the task of which is to eliminate uncontrolled development and ensure the proportional and most efficient development of society, is considered by some the reason of all shortcomings in our national economy. Yet difficulties in the economy are related not to centralized management but to the administrative methods applied in its exercise and neglect of the democratic foundations of socialist centralism. Quite recently enterprises were issued assignments which included hundreds of indicators; their activities were limited by tens of thousands of legal regulations. Labor collectives were merely the executors of the will of superior authorities and the managers they appointed. No conditions were provided for displaying initiative and enterprise and for combining the interests of the state, the collectives and the individual workers.

Excessive details included in the assignments led to numerous errors. Correcting the plans became an ordinary phenomenon, proving that the system of administrative management does not ensure the necessary proportionality and efficiency in the development of the economy.

Bureaucratic administration was closely related to the erroneous theoretical concept according to which the more indicators were approved by the center and issued to the enterprises, and the more detailed were the instructions, the more accurately will national economic proportions be established and the better the principle of its planned development would be observed. It was precisely faith in the omnipotence of the plan indicator and the order that triggered the universal prescription according to which all economic problems could be solved by issuing an assignment or promulgating a decree. Tasks were set but the situation in the national

economy did not improve and disproportions worsened. This is not astounding, for the interests, initiatives and enterprise of the producers themselves were not involved in solving national economic problems.

Under the new economic management system, centralized management will be concentrated only on matters which could be solved by the center more efficiently than by the enterprises themselves. This is a national strategy for economic, social and scientific and technical development and for creating conditions for the efficient activities of the basic economic unit. Plans, financial-credit instruments and incentives and legal regulations will be formulated in such a way that enterprises and territories, while pursuing their own interests, would at the same time ensure the coordinated development of the national economic complex. Under this type of management, from performers of assignments issued by superiors, the enterprise collectives will become active subjects of planning and management.

The new feature of centralism, characterized by democracy and management through economic methods, is unattainable without the support of commodity-monetary relations. Economic practice has indicated the groundlessness of concepts according to which ministries, the Gosplan and the Gossnab could determine more accurately the real demand of enterprises than the enterprises themselves. Ignoring commodity-monetary relations is the most important reason for the increased outlay of material resources per unit of output compared with countries which use the market and trade in means of production. Per unit of national income, the USSR produces more steel by a factor of 3.1 and more cement by a factor of 2.6 compared to the United States.

The underestimating of the market led to a scarcity of virtually all types of raw and other materials and the stockpiling of huge material resources. The production of low quality and high cost goods is also the direct consequence of the shortage of means of production on the market, for the state guaranteed the marketing of any item, including items not in demand, produced at abnormally high cost. The slogan of the old economic mechanism of "the product at all costs" was essentially an appeal for waste and obedience to the "gross output" system.

With the new management system, trade in means of production, prices, credits and long-term economic rates of distribution of enterprise income become instruments of planned centralized management. That is why we are astounded whenever we are asked to choose between the plan and the market. Surmounting the lag in our economy and reaching world standards in production organizations, efficiency and quality are impossible without the utilization of both principles of economic management—centralized management (plan) and decentralized relations among enterprises, based on working for the market.

The formulation itself of the matter of the incompatibility between plan and market means ignoring historical experience. There has been no real planned economy which did not make use of the market in the practice of the development of socialism. There has never been a country in which commodity-monetary relations have not been present. There was a market in our country even during the period of war communism.

The objective need for the functioning of a socialist economy as a centrally managed production of commodities is determined by the basic features of the first phase of the communist social system, which separates socialism from its second and higher phase, communism.

A socialist society cannot ensure the distribution of material and spiritual goods according to need. It is not indifferent to the amount of consumer values created by workers or collectives within a specific time unit. It expects of producers not labor outlays per se but a product they create. It is forced to encourage an increase in efficiency and to distribute production not in proportion to the time worked but to the socially necessary labor outlays. In turn, they are determined indirectly, on the basis of a consideration of the sum of production conditions and the consistency between output and social requirements.

The most common argument against the need for indirect consideration of the actual labor outlays of collectives is the claim of the direct-social nature of labor under socialism. It is presumed that society could plan the production of goods in quantities needed by the sum total of consumers.

However, the possibility of such prediction must be assessed realistically. It is simply impossible for a single center to anticipate everything. In our country, centralized plans for production and distribution cover only several tens of thousands of consolidated groups of products and not the entire 24 million specific types of goods produced. The state plan cannot stipulate the quality and deadlines for commodity procurements, as they are decided by the individual consumers. Furthermore, what was planned was by no means always implemented by labor collectives.

Paying producers on the basis of individual labor outlays regardless of results leads to the fact that it is the inept and negligent enterprises that find themselves in the best position; interest is created in increasing outlays rather than end results and dependency appears.

In the proportional distribution of socially necessary labor outlays both the worker and the collective are interested in achieving the best possible results, for the share of the product they receive for their labor depends specifically on them. Under socialism the amount of time spent by a skilled and unskilled worker, or by members of different professions and specialties cannot

be directly equated. Their social value varies and they can be reduced to socially necessary labor indirectly, through the exchange of the products they have created.

The objective need for an indirect, a value consideration of labor outlays for commodity output and for the satisfaction of social needs through purchase and sale are based, under socialism, not on the vestiges of capitalism, as is frequently claimed, but on fundamental characteristics of the socialist system, the fact that society is unable to ensure distribution according to need but is forced to distribute according to labor. As long as communism has not been built, the socialist economy will remain a system in which the production of commodities is controlled on a centralized basis. It will use not only the law of planned and proportional development but the law of value as well.

The main feature in the production of goods under socialism is that it takes place on the basis of the public ownership of means of production and centralized management of the entire national economy. The public ownership of means of production is such not only because it belongs to the entire society but also because it is managed by society itself, through the state agencies and enterprise labor collectives. This objectively requires the coordination of the interests of producers and consumers. In terms of the basic economic ratios, such coordination can and must take place on a centralized basis. As to the consistency between producing enterprises and demand of specific consumers, this can be achieved only on the basis of the utilization of market instruments.

Fears that under socialism the market would lead to the revival of capitalism as an overall system of production relations are groundless. Exchange presumes equivalence, and no added value appears in the course of the exchange or in the market. Capitalist exploitation is based on separating the workers from the means of production. Under socialism the working people are both owners of the means of production and workers, who have voluntarily united for the sake of joint labor.

The power of the socialist economy does not lie in setting up on a centralized basis production and consumption assignments but ensuring the fullest possible application of the human factor, the emancipation of man and the fullest possible utilization of the creative potential of the individual.

The active use of commodity-monetary relations is one of the prerequisites for the development of the economy on a democratic basis. They are not an inevitable evil which should be restricted in all possible ways. Nor are they an aspect of the low level of maturity of socialism. They are a legitimate component of socialist production relations which contribute to subordinating production to social needs and to upgrading its efficiency.

In the next few years we shall be converting from an administrative economic management system to centralized control over the production of commodities, the main features of which were defined at the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. It is exceptionally important to implement the plenum's stipulations on state orders and the conversion to a state trade in means of production.

Neither the Gosplan nor any other state agency can know better than the consumer himself what he needs. Orders placed by consumers and the trade system must become the determining factor in the formulation of enterprise and association plans. Only in that case will the voice of those who are paying with their own money, earned under the conditions of full cost-accounting and self-financing, become decisive. The state authorities should place orders only for items which are paid for not out of the cost-accounting funds of the enterprises but out of the budget. Their orders must enjoy priority, require the reciprocal responsibility of the parties and be placed, as a rule, on a competitive basis.

We were unable to meet these requirements in formulating the state orders for 1988. Actually, this year's plan had been essentially drafted prior to the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, and could not adequately embody the new planning methodology. State orders included the overwhelming majority of output and, in a number of sectors, the virtually entire volume. At the Minpribor, for example, the situation of which is not exceptional, orders account for 99 percent of the output. Essentially state orders are administrative assignments for production variety and have not become instruments for combining the interests of the state with those of the enterprise.

The Gosplan and the ministries which have placed orders bear no responsibility whatsoever for them. That is why frequently the orders were not supported with available material resources and capacities. State orders for which there simply were not solvent consumers were issued to the Orgsintez Association in Azerbaijan, the Uralmash, Uralelektrotyazhmash and Turbomotornyy Zavod Associations, the Kurgan Wheel-Driven Tractors Plant, the Issyk-Kul Production Association of Electrical Engineering Plants, the Baku Tires Plant and many agricultural machine building enterprises.

This situation undermines the logic of the new economic mechanism and discredits the reform. In accordance with the state order, the enterprise must sign a contract, the violation of which (which is inevitable if the order is unsubstantiated) leads to loss of profit, fines and reduced economic incentive funds. The nonimplementation of the contract triggers an entire chain of procurement shortfalls and increased consumer outlays.

Many labor collectives and their managers, aware of the danger of accepting state orders which cannot be implemented under the conditions of full cost-accounting,

opposed them actively, turning to superior authorities, the press and the State Arbitration. Forcing collectives to conclude contracts merely creates the appearance that problems are being solved and harms the national economy.

It is very important in the formulation of the plan for 1989 to correct this situation and to achieve a consistency between the practice of making use of state orders and the logic of the economic reform. Otherwise conflicts between enterprises, which operate on the basis of full cost-accounting, and managing authorities will become a comprehensive phenomenon.

To begin with, we must exclude from state orders goods the production of which is profitable to the enterprise. Let the consumers, operating on the basis of cost-accounting, order such goods themselves and pay out of their own funds. There is absolutely no sense in making use of this instrument in controlling the output of enterprises engaged in the production of a single product (coal, petroleum, natural gas, ores, etc.). Such enterprises cannot produce anything other than the product in which they have specialized. Cost-accounting and self-financing motivate them to satisfy the needs of specific consumers and to make maximal use of and to increase their capacities. Why are state orders needed in this case? If they are below capacity and actual demand or else equal them, they become simply an unnecessary instrument; if they exceed capacities (based on their possible increase), they will obviously not be met and this can only harm society and the enterprise.

Nonetheless, the Gosplan and the ministries include such commodities in the state orders, with the justification that they are of major national economic significance. Elementary common sense indicates that the importance of such goods will not diminish by not including them in the state order. Bureaucratic administration in the economy would become lesser and proportionality between production and consumption would improve. The line pursued in this respect reflects mistrust shown by the personnel of the state apparatus of the fact that newly applied economic instruments would force the enterprises to make fullest possible use of their production capacities. Yet if the volume of marketing is reduced the wage funds would decline and so would the amount of economic incentive. Supporters of bureaucratic administration in management object that the success depends not on the collective but on the administration. The income of the director and other managers is essentially based on the implementation of contractual obligations and is unrelated to the use of production capacities. If the volume of output is reduced, the life of management would become easier. Therefore, if the enterprise is not issued state orders it would immediately reduce its volume of output. Nothing other than administrative and party pressure on them could ensure the accelerated development of the economy.

Extracoeconomic coercion conflicts with the interests of the working people and relying on it is futile. The initial experience in the reform convincingly proves something else: wherever economic instruments are given the opportunity to prove their efficiency the results sometimes turn out to be unexpected to the superior authorities. For example, the Sintezkauchuk Association in the Azerbaijan SSR suggested an increase in the production of latex, which is in extremely short supply, compared with the assignment based on the 5-year plan. Initiatives calling for increased production compared with the initial orders were formulated by the Kirghiz Ore Mining-Metallurgical, Kirghiz Gold Mining and Kadamzhay Antimony Combines, the Ust-Kamenogorsk House Building Combine and many others.

The immediate implementation of steps for the development of production self-management, the establishment of labor collective councils and the conversion to the electiveness of managers will drastically upgrade the role of the labor collective, which is objectively interested in increasing end production results and solving the most important problems of enterprise work. Therefore, the concept according to which wages of enterprise managers are poorly influenced by the extent to which production capacities are put to use should be rejected.

If we are guided by the criterion that only those who can pay for the goods should have the right to order, it would make no sense to issue state orders to multiple-production enterprises of items advantageous to the producers. As it were, they would produce such items on the basis of direct orders placed by consumers.

The real problem will exist only in terms of commodities and services of multiple-product enterprises, considered unprofitable. In order to solve this problem it is necessary either to eliminate the reasons which make such production unprofitable or else to order the enterprises to produce such commodities on the basis of administrative state orders.

The former method is entirely consistent with the logic of the new economic management methods. As a rule, significant possibilities exist for upgrading profitability by reorganizing the production structure and expanding the production of goods at enterprises where such goods are profitable. This must be determined and applied in the course of the formulation and implementation of programs for improving sectorial finances. If the unprofitability of output is caused by a disparity between its prices and the socially necessary outlays, until the price reform has been accomplished and through 1989 the system of state orders for such commodities will have to be retained. It is only by standardizing prices for such commodities and developing in the course of economic competition production specialization and, in some cases, using centralized capital investments for the reconstruction of enterprises and updating equipment and technology that administrative methods could be abandoned.

We were unable to include in the 1988 plan substantial changes in the development of economic methods in the area of material and technical procurements. As in the past, it remains dominated by a rationing system which affects no less than 5 percent of the good marketed. Two areas for the development of wholesale trade become apparent: either some resources are sold to all consumers throughout the country without restrictions and without assigning enterprises to suppliers (this is used in the case of some types of construction materials, electrical and industrial rubber goods, instruments and special clothing); or else all consumers in a given sector (region) can purchase without restrictions all or most varieties of material resources. Such a trade system is in operation in the Estonian SSR and is applied by the Ministry of Construction in the Armenian, Belorussian, Moldavian and Tajik SSRs, many enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Science and Scientific Organizations and establishments in the nonproduction area and some agroindustrial combines. Under the conditions of wholesale trade cost-accounting enterprises formulate fewer requests for many types of products compared with the system of allocations. Such consumer behavior proves that such resources could be sold to all consumers. The production of such items is consistent with demand and the scarcity is caused exclusively by the rationing system. This confirms the conclusion of the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum: "...The faster we convert to direct relations and to wholesale trade, the faster we shall leave scarcity behind and eliminate unnecessary stockpiling of material values."

Setting limits for material resources is justified only for varieties in which demand exceeds production capacity. Even then, however, it is unnecessary to assign consumers to suppliers. The Law on the State Enterprise clearly stipulates that a priority exists in the right to retain developed long-time economic relations with manufacturers and to broaden them. The supplier must, above all, meet the needs of his steady clients and only then those of new ones. The marketing of scarce products based on ceilings but without assigning consumers to suppliers is a necessary intermediary form between centralized allocation and wholesale trade in means of production.

In order to eliminate the setting of ceilings on such types of material resources, we must eliminate their scarcity. This cannot be achieved without restructuring the national economic planning and learning how to control solvent demand, or without mastering the methods of forecasting demand for material resources, comparing it with existing capacities and establishing possibilities of increasing them by using funds for the development of production, science and technology of producing enterprises. Centralized capital investments can be justifiably used in order to surmount capacity shortages. National economic planning can and must determine the type of new enterprises or shops which are necessary, when and how they must be commissioned, and the amount of capital investments needed in order to attain proportionality in the economy in 3, 5, or 10 years.

It is possible to eliminate restrictions on such resources and their scarcity only by ensuring the balancing of material and financial proportions in the economy and blocking all channels for obtaining funds not supported by material values.

In the course of implementation of the reform in economic management, prerequisites are created for ensuring such a balance. This involves above all the use of enterprise self-financing, which would ensure a strict consistency between expenditures and revenue; normalizing monetary circulation; restoring the principles of noninflationary crediting; making financial resources the starting point in planning material proportions over the 5-year period; and implementing the price setting reform.

Under socialism prices must balance demand with supply, for otherwise we cannot solve the problem of eliminating shortages or production surpluses. The fact that a shortage can be surmounted only by increasing production and ignoring the interconnection between revenue and demand is a widespread error. If demand grows faster than revenue increasing production at a pace slower than increased revenue can only increase scarcity. Both changes in the production structure and increased output of a commodity as well as changes in its price are necessary elements in a normally functioning economic system.

The elimination of scarcity has become so urgent today that it has turned from an economic into a political task. Increasingly the Soviet people are expressing their indignation at the fact that the administrative authorities are unable to solve this problem. By working according to their capability and earning on the basis of the results of their work, the working people fulfill the main requirements of perestroika and economic reform they have been assigned. That is why they have the right to expect the full satisfaction of their solvent demand. Equally reasonable demands call for the enterprises to support with material resources earned economic incentive funds. Finally, the elimination of shortages would substantially increase the attractiveness of socialism in the eyes of the simple working people the world over.

The main fear related to the use of prices as a balancing instrument is inflation and an allegedly inevitable price increase, which could be prevented only by keeping prices unchanged on a centralized basis. The fact that such prices cannot ensure a balance between supply and demand or eliminate the scarcity of many goods is obvious. That is why scarcity is considered the inevitable price paid by society for noninflationary development.

The experience of the Soviet Union and other countries leads to the conclusion that prices set on a centralized basis cannot prevent inflation. Between 1922-23 and 1927/28, when prices essentially ensured a proper balance, they increased by a factor of 1.3. Under the conditions of prices set on a centralized basis, between

1929 and 1940 they increased by a factor of 1.4 for heavy industry, and retail prices by a factor of 6.4. From 1940 to 1986 the index of state retail prices was 1.53 and that of wholesale prices, 1.4. We must take into consideration that such indices reflect only price changes for commodities under actual production, and not price increases for new varieties, which considerably outstrip improvements in consumer qualities. Hidden price increases in construction, machine building and light industry have been particularly high.

In both centralized and market price-setting methods, the real reasons of inflation remain the same: faster increase in wages compared to increases in labor productivity; lack of interest in saving on material outlays; monopoly status and lack of economic competition among enterprises.

The prime requirement for avoiding inflation is achieving faster growth rates of labor productivity compared to average wage increases. A right instrument in this case would be setting a rate for this correlation, as stipulated in the Law on the State Enterprise.

The most important factor which encourages the wasteful use of material resources is that of outlay price setting. The high actual level of material outlays is included in the price even if the price is not set on the basis of individual but of average sectorial costs.

In the overwhelming majority of sectors whose enterprises were converted to full cost-accounting and self-financing, the first form of full cost-accounting is applied; the wage fund is based on the volume of commodity, gross or standardized net output. This as well does not ensure any incentive to save on material outlays. It is true that the material incentive fund is based on increased profit and, to a certain extent, takes thrift into consideration. The very limited nature of its size, however, predetermines the low level of economic responsibility borne by the enterprises. The reduction of this fund does not allow to compensate for the losses suffered by society as a result of the inefficient utilization of resources.

A conversion to the second form of full cost-accounting, establishing the wage fund within the framework of the first form of full cost-accounting, based on a rate applicable to the actual net output, the volume of which grows if material outlays are conserved and reduced in the case of their overexpenditure, enables us drastically to increase the interests of collectives in conserving resources.

The producers' monopoly enables them to raise prices without changing the level of socially necessary outlays. It is important to create prerequisites for economic initiative among producing enterprises and letting consumers choose among them. The administrative assignment of a consumer to a supplier conflicts with the solution of this problem. In this situation, in practice the

producer can act according to the principle of asking the customer to take the product offered, regardless of quality and variety, and at a price which suits the producer. The elimination of such an assignment is the simplest possible anti-monopoly step which must be taken as soon as possible.

Nonetheless, a real choice becomes possible only when the consumer has the right to turn to several competing producers. Throughout the world identical goods are produced not by one, but by several companies. That is why, in the long term, steps taken to ensure a gradual convertibility of the ruble will play a decisive role in the struggle against monopoly. Under contemporary conditions, however, by no means is every consumer able to obtain the necessary foreign currency which would enable him to treat the monopoly producer as an equal. This indicates the exceptional significance here of a development of organizational structures which would comprehensively restrict monopoly. Unfortunately, this stipulation is by no means always taken into consideration by the ministries in the formulation of their overall management systems. Frequently a single association would include all enterprises in our country producing a specific item. In other words, a administrative monopoly develops. In our view, such associations, wherever justified, should, as a rule, be set up on a territorial-sectorial basis, in order to ensure not only production concentration but also favorable prerequisites for the development of economic competition among them.

Combining the plan with the market is a basic feature of socialism. However, ensuring their optimal interaction is a most difficult problem which we must solve. The program formulated by the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum lays the necessary foundations for this. The experience already acquired in its implementation indicates that inertia remains strong. Many economic managers, quoting the real difficulties of the transitional period, would like to shift back into the ruts of traditional administrative management methods. This enhances the importance today of the systematic implementation of the planned course of radical economic reform.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Friendly Relations Are Intensifying and Strengthening

18020013h Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 72-78

[Article by B. Arkhipov]

[Text] The line of restructuring relations between the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, as formulated at the 27th CPSU Congress, is called upon to upgrade the

efficiency of interaction with them and to ensure the fuller identification and utilization of the tremendous constructive potential of the new social system. In this matter grass-roots relations among party committees, soviet and economic agencies, and trade union, Komsomol and other public and creative organizations and labor collectives play a tremendous role.

The experience of such cooperation between Kaliningrad Oblast and the border Olsztyn (since 1956) and Elblong (since its establishment in 1975) Provinces in the People's Republic of Poland is both instructive and useful.

It is true that in the past a certain ostentation and attraction for general projects prevailed in the organization of meetings among party, soviet, and economic officials, youth organizations and creative collectives. The cooperation was short of depth and practicality. Occasionally it was of a "superstructural" nature, poorly affecting workers, kolkhoz members and production collectives. Direct contacts among people were few.

Substantial improvements in border cooperation developed after the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Firm grounds to this effect were laid by the revolutionary perestroika in the USSR and the line of socialist renovation pursued in the PPR. New agreements on economic and scientific and technical relations and, particularly, the Declaration on Soviet-Polish Cooperation in Ideology, Science and Culture, which was initialed by M.S. Gorbachev and W. Jaruselski in April 1987, provide a reliable guarantee for improvements in Soviet-Polish relations on the grass-roots level as well.

On a Long-Term Practical Basis

The plans for cooperation between Kaliningrad Oblast and Olsztyn and Elblong Provinces are drafted for periods of 2 or 3 years. They are thoroughly prepared and, subsequent to their ratification, backed by systematic organizational work.

Here is, for example, the way the "technology" for the drafting of cooperation plans through the year 1990 appears. Initially, the basic areas of cooperation for the 3-year period were drafted by the bureaus of the Kaliningrad Oblast CPSU Committee and of Olsztyn and Elblong Provincial PZPR Committees, based on the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 10th PZPR Congress and the Declaration on Soviet-Polish Cooperation in Ideology, Science and Culture, as well as on other directives. The protocols, which were signed by D.V. Romanin, first secretary of the Kaliningrad CPSU Obkom, Tadeusz Jelski, first secretary of the Olsztyn Provincial PZPR Committee, and Boleslaw Smagala, first secretary of the Elblong Provincial PZPR Committee, stipulates the following: the CPSU Obkom and the PZPR Provincial Committees will see to it that the local ties between the oblast and the provinces are used for

promoting the achievements and advantages of socialism and proletarian internationalism, molding a scientific Marxist-Leninist world outlook, and a socialist way of life, in the interest of the further development of the economy and culture of the oblast and the provinces. Particular attention will be paid to reciprocal study and exchange of experience in organizational-party and ideological work, economic cooperation among enterprises, kolkhozes and cooperatives, sovkhozes and state farms and the organization of trade and direct relations between them on a contractual basis, and to improving the information provided to the working people on all problems of life in the oblast and the provinces.

On the basis of the main areas of work, annual plans for cooperation between the oblast and the provinces are drafted. Gorkoms, raykoms, rayon executive committees and collectives of enterprises, kolkhozes, sovkhozes and establishments draft and coordinate with their Polish partners plans for cooperation for the year, subsequently consolidated within a single plan.

On 5 February 1988 I had the opportunity to attend a meeting between task forces which were coordinating the details of their consolidated plans prior to their approval by the party committee bureaus. The feeling was that this was a gathering of people who had known each other for many years and to whom cooperation was not a formality but an active project, part of their work and life.

"To me," said later Klemens Borhardt, secretary of the Elblong PZPR Provincial Committee, "our cooperation with Kaliningrad Oblast has become a vital need, something I take very personally. I like to check myself, my thoughts, in talks with my friends, become richer through their experience and their quests and creative findings. The same attitude toward cooperation with the people of Kaliningrad is displayed by all of my fellow-workers and the majority of the urban and rural population in the province."

Economic Cooperation

Perestroika gave the local authorities greater autonomy and scope for initiative. A variety of groundless restrictions and prohibitions were lifted. This had a particularly great impact on improving economic cooperation.

Its most specific manifestation is that of direct relations between Soviet and Polish labor collectives. More than 30 Kaliningrad enterprises, many kolkhozes and sovkhozes, construction organizations and 14 oblast administrations and organizations (local industry, trade, automotive transport, reclamation and water resources, the oblast consumer union and others) maintain such relations which are multiplying and becoming more specific. The broadening of enterprise independence and the orientation toward cost accounting, self-financing and economic efficiency upgrade their interest in foreign economic relations.

However, it is not merely a question of economic considerations. Reciprocal understanding and strong personal relations are established in the course of the joint solution of difficult problems and joint work.

For example, old friendship ties exist between the Kaliningrad railroad cars manufacturing plant and a similar enterprise in Olsztyn Province—the Ostruda Rolling-Stock Repair Association.

After studying the organization of the technical service at the railroad cars manufacturing plant, the Ostruda engineering and technical personnel and workers organized a shop technical services (this experience was subsequently adopted by all railroad car manufacturing plants in the PPR). The people of Kaliningrad helped those of Ostruda to apply automatic and semiautomatic electric welding, to organize the cooling of work places of press and stamp workers and to mechanize loading and unloading operations; they learned from their Polish friends the use of a compressed air transporter for collecting waste in the timber processing shop and used their experience in centralized feeding of oxygen, combining resting facilities and applying a system of strictest possible thrift. The 1988 cooperation plan calls for cooperated production of individual parts and assemblies and joint experimental design projects.

The sister-collectives are constantly exchanging progressive experience in the work of turners, blacksmiths, welders and fitters; joint labor shifts may last as much as 2 weeks. Production frontrankers share the secrets of their skills directly at work places, live with the families of their friends and spend their leisure time together.

Such relations are becoming increasingly widespread. For example, the Kaliningrad industrial lasers and welding equipment experimental plant has an agreement with the Olsztyn Unitra-Unima Plant on reciprocal procurements: the Olsztyn people provide piezoceramic concentrators while the people of Kaliningrad supply welding equipment. The Kaliningradtorgmash Association will supply precision casting pieces to the Spomasz plant in Olsztyn, in exchange of which it will receive press moulds. The Kaliningrad Industrial Clothing Association and the Truso Association in Elblong have reached an agreement on reciprocal exchange of goods which will be sold in the company stores; the benefit here is reciprocal, for this will increase the variety of goods. Furthermore, the sale of jointly produced items at markets of "third countries" is being organized (the foreign exchange will be divided in accordance with the contribution made by each side). The knitwear factory in Gusev and the General Walter Cooperative in Olsztyn will also undertake joint economic activities in 1988. The Kaliningrad and Polish enterprises will use contractual prices in assessing the value of materials, work and services provided within the framework of direct relations.

Fruitful cooperation is taking place between construction workers. In 1988 the Olsztyn construction combine will build residential housing in Kaliningrad made of elements produced at the combine; the Kaliningradstroy Association will build a house in Olsztyn; such construction will be carried out by mixed Polish-Soviet brigades.

Close ties are maintained between agricultural workers in Kaliningrad Oblast and their Polish partners. Joint work by Soviet and Polish reclamation workers made it possible to improve the work of canals which cross the border in 102 separate places, and to drain more than 5,000 hectares of land. Soviet reclamation workers shared with their friends the method for determining and mapping covered draining systems while the Polish comrades use their experience in double control of the water flow and in the efficient utilization of fertile bottom land. Using its own technology, manpower and facilities, the Bezledy state farm in Olsztyn cultivates its own strains of rape seed and wheat at the Put Lenina Kolkhoz and the Borba Sovkhoz in Bagrationovskiy Rayon. However, direct relations between agricultural and processing enterprises are only now being established.

Trade along the border is being actively organized. In 1987, based on contracts, the sister provinces received goods worth 3 million rubles from market stocks and local production, and goods worth the same amount were supplied by the Polish side. The Kaliningrad people are supplying their friends with different types of furniture and paper products, fresh and canned fish, amber goods and other commodities; the Polish side supplies clothing and knitted goods, leather items, cosmetics, kitchen equipment and fruits and vegetables. We must point out that Soviet goods are always in demand by customers in Olsztyn and Elblong as are Polish goods by the Kaliningrad people.

The increased amount of direct relations between the oblast and the provinces necessitated the creation of a Kaliningrad Oblast Executive Committee commission on problems of economic relations with foreign countries, headed by I.V. Fokin, deputy chairman of the executive committee of the oblast soviet of people's deputies. The commission includes managers of oblast organizations, administrations and enterprises who have proved themselves in the organization of direct relations. Similar commissions, headed by deputy provincial heads were set up in the sister provinces.

The quest for unused possibilities of cooperation is continuing. It becomes the more fruitful the more open becomes the discussion of possibilities of developing direct relations. At the beginning of October 1987 KALININGRADSKAYA PRAVDA and GAZETA OLSZTYNSKAYA sponsored a roundtable on the topic of "Direct Relations Are An Efficient Way of Cooperation." It was attended by heads of Kaliningrad enterprises and their colleagues from Olsztyn Province, obkom secretaries and heads of economic commissions.

The discussion was quite useful. It indicated the reciprocal interest shown by the partners in the further expansion of cooperation in the economic and social areas, on a new basis. However, it also indicated that the existing potential for cooperation had still not been applied for its fullest extent. Such roundtables took place in 1988 between KALININGRADSKAYA PRAVDA and GAZETA OLSZTYNSKAYA in Olsztyn and between KALININGRADSKAYA PRAVDA and the weekly ELBLONGSKE VJADOMOSZI, in Kaliningrad. This was accompanied by exhibits of goods produced by partner enterprises.

The level of development of direct relations depends above all on the initiative, activeness, persistence and interest shown by economic managers and enterprise party organizations. Difficulties exist and will remain. However, they can be surmounted providing that the people do not wait for instructions "from above," and think broadly and originally, are not afraid to assume responsibility and are willing to create the necessary economic conditions for direct relations.

Particularly extensive possibilities exist for expanding border trade. In 1988 the people of Kaliningrad are planning to double commodity trade compared with 1987. This requires improvements in the organization of the transportation of the freight and the work of customs offices, for in addition to border trade, which is conducted on the oblast level, direct production and scientific and technical relations with Polish partners have been established by more than 30 Kaliningrad enterprises. The flow of freight is increasing also because it is precisely those same border points that are used in trading with their Polish partners by agroindustrial enterprises in the Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian Union Republics.

Cooperation in Ideology, Science and Culture

The process of renovation of socialism, calls for a search for new ways of organizational and ideological-political work by the party and its committees and organizations. Unquestionably, such a quest becomes more extensive and fruitful if conducted jointly by the fraternal parties.

Of late relations between party organizations in Kaliningrad Oblast and the sister provinces have assumed a new quality. Contacts along the line of party committees are taking place on a planned basis. It has become the rule for representatives of the oblast party organization to attend seminars held by party activists in the sister provinces, and those from the provinces to attend oblast seminars and training, on a reciprocal basis. The main task of all forms of interaction is to study and exchange practical experience in implementing the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 10th PZPR Congress. The Polish friends note the beneficial influence of perestroika in the USSR on the sociopolitical situation in the PPR.

Party workers from Olsztyn and Elblong Provinces studied the work of primary and shop party organizations and party groups under the conditions of perestroika. They were interested in the practice of accepting new members in the CPSU and the education of young party members, the organization of mass-political work and Marxist-Leninist training, activities of political reporters and agitators and the organization of ideological upbringing of secondary and higher school students.

Senior personnel from the CPSU obkom, gorkoms and raykoms, who visited their Polish comrades, studied problems of the organization of implementation of party decisions; secretaries and members of committees and bureaus of party organizations in the oblast's industrial enterprises studied the activities of PZPR organizations in providing organizational-political support for the implementation of the second stage of the economic reform; secretaries of party organizations in kolkhozes and sovkhoses studied the work of PZPR organizations in state farms and cooperatives in upgrading the production and social activeness of rural workers.

In turn, secretaries and members of committees and bureaus of party organizations in provincial enterprises studied the organizational and political work done by the party organizations of oblast industrial enterprises in ensuring production intensification on the basis of scientific and technical progress. Secretaries of party committees in state farms and agricultural cooperatives attended an oblast seminar of party organization secretaries in agricultural enterprises.

The exchange of experience in organizational-party and ideological-educational work, as confirmed by the personnel of the party organizations in Kaliningrad Oblast and the adjacent provinces, is very useful. It helps to solve the practical problems which appear in the course of perestroika and socialist renovation.

Relations between state authorities are being maintained on a firm long-term basis. The organization of the work for economic cooperation is the main thing. Additionally, however, regular exchanges are promoted among groups of deputies of local soviets and reciprocal studies are made of the processes governing the development of democratic principles in their activities.

The oblast trade unions council and the Olsztyn and Elblong Provincial trade unions are also steadily broadening and intensifying their contacts on a planned basis. Trade union activists from the sister provinces meet to exchange practical experience. The AUCCTU adopted a suggestion submitted by the oblast trade union council on broadening cooperation between tourist organizations and making joint use of recreation and sanatorium facilities.

Problems of youth education in the spirit of the ideals of communism and responsibility for our common revolutionary heritage account for a great deal in the ideological work of the party organizations in Kaliningrad Oblast. Cooperation between youth organizations, which includes direct contacts among workers and secondary and higher school students, have become an important means of socialist upbringing of young people in general, and their international education in particular.

A characteristic feature of cooperation between youth organizations is that practical activities go hand in hand with entertainment and a great variety of contacts are established. Labor collectives exchange youth brigades, promote joint youth labor projects and professional skill competitions. For example, participation in oblast competitions of rural mechanizers and animal husbandrymen, and young men and women from Olsztyn and Elblong Provinces greatly contributed to the propaganda of rural professions, improvements in youth skills and the popularization of work methods. At the same time, youth marches, festivals, friendship meetings, seminars, political debates, exhibits, movie festivals, performances by amateur artists and sports competitions have become traditional.

An exchange of student construction detachments has been organized and joint labor and recreation camps for secondary school seniors and technical school students have been set up. Pioneers and school students in Kaliningrad Oblast rest in the health institutions of Olsztyn and Elblong Provinces while Polish students and Pioneers spend time in the Pioneer camps of Northern Sochi, the name given to the resort city of Svetlogorsk, on the shore of the Baltic Sea. Whereas in 1960 no more than 15 children from each country were exchanged, the number increased to 54 in 1968 and 200 in 1985; the number of such children will be significantly higher in 1988.

Schools, technical schools and VUZs in the oblast manage clubs for international friendship, which promote mobile photographic exhibits on life in the PPR, and lectures and talks on the fraternal country and organize Polish language study circles and circles for people interested in Polish literature, music and dances.

It is universally acknowledged that cultural exchanges and familiarity with the spiritual values of another nation are the best way of rapprochement among peoples. Contracts have been concluded between cultural institutions, creative associations, schools and VUZs in Kaliningrad and the sister provinces. There is active cooperation among theaters, libraries, museums, painters, writers and professional and amateur music collectives. VUZs, technical schools and secondary schools exchange teachers. The Kaliningrad people are systematically helping Russian language teachers in the provincial schools.

Clubs for lovers of Polish language and literature enjoy great popularity in Kaliningrad. Polish song, music and dance festivals have become a tradition. The eighth such festival was held last year. The festival, which starts on the stages of schools and VUZs, clubs and houses of culture and in the oblast's cities and villages, ends in Kaliningrad with a major final concert with the participation of the best performers of the rayon and city festivals and the participation of amateur collectives from Olsztyn and Elblong.

Currently the oblast section of the Soviet-Polish Friendship Society is preparing a zonal republic festival of Polish songs, music and dances (20 oblasts in the RSFSR). This is not accidental, for it is not the first time that the SSOD has chosen Kaliningrad as the site for such activities, taking into consideration that it houses the oblast department and city and rayon organizations and has 300 collective members of the Soviet-Polish Friendship Society engaged in extensive and systematic work.

I had the opportunity to study the activities of a number of city and rayon organizations of the society. For example, the Bagrationovskiy Rayon Society maintains direct relations with the gmina and city of Bartoszyce, including war and labor veterans, young people and labor collectives. Cooperation has been organized in the areas of education, culture and sports. All such work is done on a voluntary basis.

The amount of such work in Kaliningrad is substantial. It is no accident that currently the SSOD Presidium and other interested organizations are discussing the question of building here a Friendship Club, for Kaliningrad Oblast, Bagrationovsk and Mamonovo are also centers for cooperation between Polish provinces and Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and a number of other RSFSR oblasts; Kaliningrad ships sail to many ports throughout the world; the oblast center VUZs train annually more than 100 foreign students. We must point out that such friendship clubs have been set up by our friends in Olsztyn and Elblong.

Days dedicated to the Olsztyn and Elblong Provinces, celebrated in the oblast and, respectively, of Kaliningrad Oblast celebrated in the provinces, are the crowning, I would say the apotheosis of the work of the Soviet-Polish friendship societies, the soviets, trade unions and labor collectives. Such celebrations are a kind of review of achievements in economics, culture and the development of a socialist way of life. Also important are joint ideological-political steps related to noteworthy dates in the life of the Soviet and Polish peoples and common holidays. For example, last May a meeting was held at a sector of the Soviet-Polish border, in the area of Bagrationovsk City, at which more than 1,000 working people from the oblast and Olsztyn and Elblong Provinces participated, in honor of the Mayday holiday. Extensive celebrations were held on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

On the eve of the holiday friendship buses carrying delegations of cooperating collectives drove to Kaliningrad, where the results of the international socialist competition were summed up and plans for further joint work were discussed. An exhibit of political posters dedicated to the anniversary was organized in Olsztyn Province and an exhibit on "Relics of the Great Patriotic War" was organized in Elblong Province. Delegations of the provinces, actors and participants in amateur activities from Olsztyn and Elblong, Lithuania and Belorussia participated in the anniversary celebrations in Kaliningrad. All such comprehensive international relations and experience in cooperation could and should be increased.

Life in the fraternal provinces is becoming increasingly reflected in the pages of oblast, city and rayon newspapers and in television and radio broadcasts. Whereas in 1985 KALININGRADSKAYA PRAVDA published 65 items on border cooperation, the number increased to 76 in 1986 and about 90 in 1987. However, it is not a matter of quantitative growth only. Of late there has been a turn from descriptive and informational coverage of the life in the provinces and the oblast to meaningful analytical surveys.

The oblast and province press tries not only to inform the working people about the state of affairs in the various areas but also to bring more completely to light specific experience in economic management, development of self-government and advancement of socialist democracy, i.e., to deal with problems which are in the center of activities of the party and public organizations of the oblast and the provinces.

Perestroika and the new way of thinking have been manifested in the course of cooperation between Kaliningrad Oblast and the Polish border provinces in the intensification of partnership and a practical approach and in turning ties in all areas to face man, and his mind and heart. This contributes to the better solution of problems of international upbringing and the use of the tremendous potential for cooperation among socialist countries in strengthening the positions of socialism and the cause of peace and social progress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

**Social Progress in the Contemporary World.
Theses for Discussion**

18020013i Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7,
May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 79-90

[Text] The following theses are the result of studies and thoughts developed at scientific seminars sponsored by the Department of World Politics and CPSU International Activities of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, attended by specialists in international affairs of many scientific institutions. These studies

and thoughts were stimulated by the resolutions of the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the 27th Party Congress and the formulation of the new theoretical and political problems in the course of perestroika and the development of a new political thinking. By publishing the theses, prepared by a group of departmental scientists the editors hope that the readers will actively participate in the discussion of such topical problems.

I.

Mankind finds itself at a sharp historical turning point. For the first time in history a document which turns the arms race back has been signed. The new political thinking and the logic of the interests of all mankind have never before so clearly prevailed over the centrifugal effect of narrowly understood national and class interests. Reason has defeated the element of clashes between these interests. Does this not mark, providing that the development of international relations follows the proper channel, even if it crosses tempestuous rapids, the advent of a new era in the history of mankind, the era of truly civilized and human relations among nations, based on the free choice of all nations of their own way and respect for this choice by all other nations?

However, if such a need has become pressing and if the realities of the contemporary world motivate mankind to be aware of its integrality, does the already existing model of global development not experience changes in all of its manifestations, in all areas? This question has begun to face science urgently.

Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory, based on the idea of the conscious reorganization of the world through the study of its objective laws, is facing today an important landmark. We must not simply "take into consideration" a new phenomenon or process and build it in within the system of the previous concepts, but solve a much more difficult problem. We face precisely the problem of an integral interpretation of the development of the world community under the new circumstances, in which all world relations have become stronger and universal objectives and interests have appeared, although still torn by contradictions on the national, class and group levels, and when the solution of such contradictions through military means is fraught with the death of mankind but which must be solved... Today we are facing the reality that the theoretical and practical answers to specific questions in the struggle for peace and social progress and the solution of virtually all serious sociopolitical problems are complicated by insufficient knowledge concerning the most general trends, possibilities, choices and laws governing the development of the global human community.

The party laid the beginning of theoretical work based, as M.S. Gorbachev noted at the 4 November 1987 meeting of representatives of parties and movements, on a "new interpretation of the theoretical legacy created by our predecessors... a legacy which enables us to make an

accurate analysis of the new realities and formulate optimally accurate political conclusions." However, even more work must be done by all social scientists.

Scientific publications have already raised the question of the changes which are currently taking place in the nature, ways, pace and forms of social progress in the contemporary world (see *KOMMUNIST* No. 2, 1988, p 7). It has been noted that concepts concerning the fast development of the revolutionary process on a planetary scale, which developed in the past, as well as the hope of gaining the upper hand in the economic competition between socialism and capitalism within a short time were based on underestimating the possibilities of capitalism, specifically those related to the utilization of the scientific and technical revolution and the reaching of an international level of production socialization. However, this problem requires further theoretical elaboration. We must answer the question of whether we take sufficiently into consideration the new aspects of interconnection and interdependence and, perhaps, the unity of natural and social processes which presume that social development which leads to the destruction of nature can no longer be classified as progress. Do we have a narrow understanding of social progress, frequently reducing it almost exclusively to a conversion from one social system to another, whereas it is possible and necessary within the framework of a lengthy coexistence between different social systems? Do we face the theoretical problem of profound changes within the capitalist and socialist systems in the course of their peaceful competition and interaction? What could be considered today as the main criterion of social progress, and how could this be manifested in the course of the rivalry between the two systems? Without claiming to provide exhaustive answers, we shall deal essentially in greater detail with some of these problems, realizing that progress toward an answer should be collective and obviously quite lengthy and difficult.

II.

The development and strengthening of global relations and interdependencies have been fully proved scientifically. The interests of mankind are shaped through economic relations, production integration processes and the establishment, if one may describe it as such, of a single "information field;" despite the entire variety of national cultures, the commonality and integrality of world culture are obvious. However, paradoxically, the interests and principles governing all mankind have become particularly clearly manifested in connection with what can most adequately be described as the concept of "civilization crisis," the Marxist interpretation of which, in our view, deserves the serious attention of social scientists.

In its most general aspect, the essence of the crisis is clear: so far mankind has been unable to find reliable means of preventing global catastrophes of a military, economic, ecological or other nature. Furthermore, the

threat of such catastrophes is constantly reproduced through the activities of military-political, economic and social mechanisms and structures which developed during previous historical stages. No sufficiently reliable mechanisms which would rally the efforts of individual countries and nations in solving the global problems of mankind have been created so far.

The genetic civilization crisis is related to a certain type of social development with the contradictions and essential features of an antagonistic society, such as the contradiction between labor and capital, the alienation and self-alienation of man, the utilitarian attitude toward the habitat, the prevalence of the principle of strength in international relations, etc. Nonetheless, the civilization crisis cannot be identified with that of capitalism or even interpreted only as its direct consequence.

To begin with, the civilization crisis questions not the preservation of capitalism but the existence of mankind. Second, the civilization crisis is caused not by the exhaustion of resources in capitalism as such. It is related to a certain historical stage and a certain type of development of this social system. Its characteristics determined the basic parameters of the existence of the world as a global system, the general "formula" of its dynamics, despite the influence of socialism. Third, by virtue of objective and subjective reasons, the socialist world did not find itself outside the civilization crisis. Because of the struggle for survival as a social system it became involved in the arms race and, in the struggle for production efficiency and competitiveness, paid insufficient attention to the preservation of the environment. Its development triggered its own problems and contradictions. So far the socialist countries have been unable to achieve a change in their favor such as radically to channel the course of global processes in the desired direction.

The civilization crisis is manifested on multiple levels. One of the most painful ones is the crisis in the system of international relations in all of its dimensions: West-East, North-South, contradictions among the basic centers of capitalism, sharp conflicts in the developing world, the huge indebtedness of the countries in that world, and so on. The threat of nuclear annihilation of mankind, regional military conflicts and the chronic poverty of two thirds of mankind are the most important consequences of this situation, "put in parentheses" within the present global formula for progress.

The civilization crisis is also a crisis of the "conquering" attitude toward nature, which became the foundation of industrial production forces and, itself, one of the most important prerequisites for their functioning. No radical answer to this aspect in the civilization crisis can be provided as long as the principle of industrialization—maximizing as opposed to optimizing, the domination of materialized over live labor and of the partial worker over the integral person—have been surmounted in all areas of social life.

Finally, the civilization crisis is the crisis of human reproduction which, in a certain sense, sums up all contradictions in the contemporary world. It is a question of a worsening of the direct threat to life and of stress situations, on the one hand, and the insufficient ability to adapt, on the other, of contradictions between the requirements which the objective logic of the scientific and technical revolution demands of people and the need to solve the global problems, on the one hand, and the characteristics and forms of human activities which are cultivated and reproduced on the basis of earlier stages in the history of social structures, on the other. The contradiction is growing between the need for a moral enhancement of the individual and the assertion of his personal responsibility for the destinies of mankind, on the one hand, and the threat of the elimination of the ethical dimension in human awareness and behavior, on the other, leading to a breakdown and "disappearance" of the individual, brought about by many phenomena of mass culture and a set of factors which create the "lonely crowd" phenomenon which concerns society. The historically transient and limited nature of mass social types and forms of human life as the partial worker, the mindless performer, the "economic individual," who perceives the world only as a "system of universal usefulness" toward which nothing comes "as something in itself greater, as intrinsically accurate" is becoming increasingly apparent (K. Marx and F. Engels, "*Soch.*" [Works], vol 46, part I, pp 386-387).

The civilization crisis triggers an inordinately dramatic and contradictory situation. On the one hand, it excludes the possibility of further global progress along directions it has followed so far. That which seemed natural yesterday reveals today possibilities of a nuclear and ecological catastrophe, the tragedy of the third world and the social impasses of the scientific and technical revolution. However, nor do the rejection of any further assent or an agreement to maintain the status quo for the sake of simple survival of mankind provide a solution to the problem. This can only postpone death without preventing it.

The solution, perhaps, is found only in dismantling such mechanisms and finding **alternate ways of social progress by the world as a whole**. A conversion of development to other tracks of progress is, in terms of its universal-historical significance, a truly revolutionary process. It is also the path leading to the social renovation of the world, which coincides with the survival of mankind, for which it provides a real opportunity. However, the interpretation of this path is hindered by the fact that it has no historical analog. Genetically related with previous waves of revolutionary transformations of mankind, the Great October Revolution above all, it offers a different model. One could say that this is a form of revolutionary change within which and thanks to which sociopolitical and other structures become consistent with the production forces which change the course of the scientific and technical revolution, the growing interdependence of the world and the new role which man and reason play in social progress.

Naturally, the question of the possibility of attaining such desired and objectively necessary changes arises. This is a most difficult problem, for a variety of conflicting interests clash in the global arena. However, a theoretical study is undertaken in order to formulate a policy which would be based not only on objective development trends but which would amend such development, expressing the interests of the broad masses. In this case this applies to the interests of mankind as a whole. The experience gained in its struggle for survival, and cooperation among people different in terms of national, class and ideological affiliations, within the peace movement, instill hope.

What are the main aspects of the social renovation of the world, dictated by the task of surmounting the civilization crisis? In our view, most generally, four such aspects should be singled out. The first is the **orientation** toward the creation of a nuclear-free, nonviolent world. The second is the **global form** of its implementation: the formative variety of mankind and the interdependence of development of social systems, including the possibility of the transition of each one of them to a respectively higher stage. The third is promoting the all-round advancement of man and the growth of his universal nature as a decisive **criterion** of social progress at the present stage. The fourth is changes in the structure and content of the overall **subject** of social progress.

III.

Orientation and objectives. It would be simplistic to pit the new political thinking against all previous concepts: support of nonviolence as opposed to the concept of the inevitability of violence in the course of reorganization processes. We know that the Marxist-Leninist theory of the socialist revolution not only did not exclude the possibility of nonviolent ways and means of struggle (multiple at that), but even in the case of some situations, considered them preferable. "Eternal peace" as the consequence of socialist change was considered in the past as well in revolutionary theory as the ideal of the future world structure. One cannot directly pit in this sense the new political thinking even against the concepts of the ways and means of social progress which prevailed in the Comintern after V.I. Lenin's death and which were, on the one hand, the schematized simplification of its comprehensive dialectically developed concept and, on the other, the canonizing of conclusions which, to a certain extent, were justified under the conditions of the pre-nuclear, the "pre-crisis" age. From the viewpoint of the new political thinking nonviolence is not a universal master key to any sociopolitical problem.

Nonetheless, the difference between the old and new approaches remains quite substantial.

At some stage we began to consider the conversion from capitalism to socialism as though axiomatic: as inevitable and determined by the effect of the objective economic laws. All we needed was to enhance the effect of

the subjective factor... In other words, social progress was conceived as predetermined and advancing within a single variant for each given segment of contemporary history. Alternatives were accepted on the level of the ways, means and sequences in the stage of implementation of this line of progress. Therefore, the question of peace and nonviolence in connection with the problem of social progress arose only in terms of the choice of the optimal **means** of achieving strategic objectives, the content of which was deemed to be indifferent relative to the means. However, even in the more distant socialist future, peace on earth was not considered a particular guideline and a determinant in theoretical and practical activities, for it was conceived as the sole and necessary **consequence** of the establishment of socialism.

Today, as M.S. Gorbachev noted in his speech at the international meeting, **"capitalism has an alternative. This alternative is socialism."**

"However, development choices remain. At each turn in the historical spiral the forces of the old world have the possibility of eliminating the contradictions which are the most dangerous for that time and to extend its domination... Naturally, the internal antagonisms of the capitalist system are reproduced at the new stage but in a new fashion, differently." Today, when the threat of a global nuclear catastrophe is with us every day, it is inconceivable of establishing a lasting peace on the basis of the socialist "stipulations." Naturally, we must study the development of contemporary capitalism in order to have an idea of the possibilities and ways of transition to socialism. However, the situation is such that a reliable and controllable peace and the elimination of the threat of mankind's annihilation must be secured under the conditions of a multivariant social development.

The new political thinking proceeds from the fact that, on the global level at least, there is no alternative to peace, for war is an alternative not only to a certain line of social progress but also to the history of mankind as such. On the surface it appears that there is no freedom of choice on the level of **means**, while the choice "shifts" to the area of **ways and objectives** of social development. Progress turns out to be multivariant. The results of peaceful ways of change and interaction among different systems are not simply predetermined. The following question arises: are we discussing means, when the new political thinking asserts that violence must be eliminated from global politics? In our view, in this case it is a question of a strategic **objective** which, in itself, requires a choice of respective means and which has a rather strict logic of implementation from the viewpoint of individual stages and the sequence of its dissemination in various areas of social life. A conversion of the problems of peace and nonviolence from the level of means to that of targets and strategic guidelines is one of the most important distinguishing features of the new thinking.

The survival of mankind is not ensured exclusively through control over nuclear armaments, their reduction or even their elimination. We need a democratization in political systems, which would prevent usurping the right to make critically important decisions behind the back of the people. A new harmony must be brought into the man-nature system and a conversion to a "nonviolent" attitude toward it. In terms of the realities of today the practical actions and theoretical elaborations in areas such as a revolutionary restructuring, democracy and glasnost in the socialist countries, a struggle for a new economic order and policy of national conciliation in a number of third world countries and the struggle "for the economics and democracy of peace" and profound structural reforms in the area of developed capitalism appear as very promising initiatives in solving the specific problems which face the individual countries and regions, taking global realities into consideration.

The struggle for the implementation of strategic objectives in the course of a systematic and internally necessary development leads to a conflict with some basic features of capitalism, such as militarism, the utilitarian attitude toward nature, unequal international relations and the alienation and disintegration of the individual. It turns out that these facets in the strategic objective—the creation of a nonviolent world—bear within themselves an anticapitalist potential and lead to a new round in the transformation of some basic features of capitalism into their opposites, the possibility of which was mentioned by V.I. Lenin in connection with the appearance of imperialism (see *"Poln. Soch."* [Complete Collected Works], vol 27, p 385).

The struggle for a nonviolent world has also a more distant but no less important significance in terms of the social renovation of mankind.

To begin with, it creates the form of coexistence and interaction within a socially heterogeneous world, which would allow socialism to eliminate structures which are alien to its nature and, in particular, those imposed by the circumstances of international confrontation, and thus to become more consistent with its "own truth," and reach a new level of development.

Second, the logic of this struggle should lead to the formation of a bloc of forces of social progress in the nonsocialist world which, moving from one task to another and, itself experiencing corresponding changes, could become the subject of profound social change.

Third, not only peaceful methods of struggle but also a nonviolent world, as an objective, are consistent to the highest extent with the growth of the activities and organization of the person raised in the age of the scientific and technical revolution. The logic of violence, necessarily triggered by certain historical situations, turns against him, inevitably separating from him the suppression apparatus (which carries within it the

threats of alienation and opposition). This leads to curtailing independent human activities and their replacement with regulations issued "from above."

Let us go back to the question of the likelihood of progress toward a nonviolent world, taking into consideration the gravity of existing contradictions, the dramatic clash among various interests and the durability of the traditions of mistrust and suspicion. Any sort of accurate estimates would be hardly possible here, the more so since the extent of this likelihood is not a constant but a value which changes depending on a number of parameters involved in the sociopolitical struggle. However, in considering this likelihood, two aspects should be born in mind.

The first is the fact that an orientation toward the creation of a nonviolent world is not simply setting new rules for the game, suggested by one of the sides and accepted or rejected by the other. It is a reflection in politics and ideology of a fundamental law governing the development of the contemporary world. Social laws have never appeared in life other than as raging passions and the struggles among ideas, parties, classes and other social groups. Groups which oppose progress toward a nonviolent world are by no means doomed to political failure simply by virtue of their opposition to an objective law. The "coercive power" of this law is not expressed in the automatic predetermination of the outcome of the political struggle but the fact that the only alternative to the implementation of this law is the degradation if not the doom of mankind.

The second aspect is the following: the appearance of this law is impossible without a corresponding political will, without changes in the views and mentality of the people, without the type of high morality which leads man to conceive of himself as a species. That is why questions frequently appear, such as how **objective** is the law of progress toward a nonviolent world, how to understand objectivity itself under conditions in which it is precisely the mind, as embodied in the activities of specific social forces, that is called upon to halt the sliding of mankind toward catastrophe, be it thermonuclear, ecological, or any other, governed by objective laws? These problems demand a more profound philosophical study. In this case, we shall limit ourselves to a single remark.

What is taking place in the contemporary age is not simply an increase in the role of the subjective factor but changes in the correlation and nature of connections between thinking and reality, between subject and object. Awareness and will are increasingly becoming an organic part not only of the mechanism of implementation of social laws in life but in its very structure, as part of its determining elements. One could say that an orientation toward a nonviolent world requires, as a necessary prerequisite, a new type of laws, a new role for the awareness and will in their formulation, and that such a role can be performed only by a new political

thinking. The change in the role and functions of awareness of occurring processes are an objectively determined means of solving the objective contradictions in the development of reality itself. As V.I. Lenin wrote, "the human mind not only reflects but also creates the objective world" (op. cit., vol 29, p 194). It becomes clear that the mind can create an objective world on different levels of organization and that one of the most important manifestations of human progress resides in this penetration by the mind into the thick of life and in animating and subordinating to morality increasingly deeper layers of life.

IV.

The global form. The growing interdependence of the world leads not to the elimination but the intensification of its variety. In any case, this will be helped by the elimination of forms of violence, diktat and subordination which occur in contemporary international relations and have a unifying impact on social processes.

In our view, this also applies to relations between the two different social systems. These systems will have to coexist for a foreseeable period of time. We consider unconvincing the short- and medium-term forecasts which are based on the possibility of the elimination of one of the systems, whatever reasons may be given to substantiate this possibility: revolutionary outbreaks, a victorious war or the process of convergence. The nature of reciprocal relations between these systems and their importance to the progress of mankind, however, should change if the problem of its survival is to be solved positively.

A simple "parallel" coexistence between systems in the interdependent world is, in all likelihood, impossible. To say the least, it would considerably reproduce the threat of confrontation. The competition between the two types of answers which these social systems will provide to the questions raised by reality is inevitable. In a competition, however, it is also the one who uses the best developments of his competitor who wins; he who neglects the best experience is doomed to failure. In practical terms, this means the **reciprocal influence between the systems**. Could we consider as accurate the traditional views according to which this experience is inevitably a negative factor from the viewpoint of one's own development, an evil which should be reduced if possible but which must be tolerated because of the urgent need for coexistence? I believe that such concepts are extremely narrow.

Above all, it is important to bear in mind that the two systems, in the shape in which they approached the turn of the 1980s, were not ready, albeit for different reasons and to a different extent, to engage either in an efficient solution of global problems of mankind or the radical elimination of crisis or pre-crisis phenomena and processes which occurred within them. The survival of mankind and internal dynamism and, above all, the

"harnessing" of the scientific and technical revolution, not only in its technical but also in its social and cultural aspects, demand a transformation in both systems and reaching a new qualitative level. The extent to which they would prove to be capable of accomplishing this is a different matter. However, this also largely depends on the nature of the interaction between the two systems.

For a long time socialism and capitalism were linked essentially through what could conventionally be described as an **antagonistic development mechanism**. Naturally, this did not exclude trade, cultural, political and other contacts and exchanges. It was not they, however, but challenging the very existence of the opposite system that gave socialism and capitalism their external impetus. This impetus must not be underestimated, whatever the negative consequences to the internal development of the systems related to such forms of confrontation may have been. However, this "antagonistic mechanism" existed and functioned in the pre-nuclear age. The revolutionary significance of the movement toward a nonviolent world is that it dictates the need for the breakdown of this mechanism which threatens the existence of mankind and blocks progress. Under the conditions of an interdependent, integral and explosive world, the principle "the worse for you the better for us" no longer fits. One of the most important features of the new formula of world progress is the fact that one's development requires not the destruction of one's opponent nor his disappearance but the ability peacefully to coexist without transferring ideological and social concepts to the area of international relations.

It is entirely obvious that the interaction between the two social systems cannot be simplistically conceived as a conversion of present-day capitalism to present-day socialism, or their "convergence" on that same basis. We are facing a truly serious theoretical problem of radical renovation, of profound change in the socialist and capitalist systems in the course of their long-term development under conditions of rivalry and interaction.

The existing imperatives greatly change the previous and create new ways and means of social renovation of mankind. The shift of a country from one system to another as a result of national revolutionary explosions becomes a "special case." Obviously, the natural change in social systems will take place not only on a broader historical space that was previously assumed, with a significant variety of transitional forms (see KOMMUNIST No. 2, 1988, pp 6-7 and following) but also on a broad global scale, through proof of the advantages of the new forms of social life given to the entire global community and systematic changes in all areas of its existence. This process will develop on the basis of the close interweaving of national with international efforts. The extent of changes in the entire system and the advancement of the forces of democracy and progress in the individual countries become more closely interlinked than ever before.

V.

Criteria of social progress. As we pointed out, the crisis of reproduction of man sums up the civilization crisis. That is why the solution to it should be eliminating dead ends in the development of man himself. Some questions arise today: could mankind survive without being aware of the value of each human life and of every specific individual as a value of the highest order? Could mankind survive without surmounting inhuman conditions under which entire nations exist? Could we consider as progress the tempestuous growth of production forces which improve the level of well-being of society but deprive a significant segment of able-bodied citizens of the possibility to work and have a real impact on all aspects of social life? In other words, could we consider as progress increases in material wealth paralleled by the increased alienation of man?

Marxist-Leninist philosophy has always considered man as the "self-seeking purpose" of social development, based on social justice. That is why, put most simply, we can say that today the decisive criterion for progress can be only man himself, the extent to which all forms of his alienation have been eliminated and the degree of universality he has attained. However, this must be manifested in the specific solution of problems such as the correlation between universal and class, international and national and collective and individual aspects. Traditionally we appear to have greatly preferred the general over the specific and the collective over the individual. However, should we not today consider more profoundly the fact that what is universal, national and collective is the consolidated expression of the individual and that without it it has no meaning? Does the dependence of the general on the individual not increase to an even greater extent than vice-versa?

The key to the answer to such questions should, obviously, be sought by following Marxist tradition, in economic relations above all. There was a time when the production process could function as long as the individual was, as was aptly described in olden times, only an "instrument with the gift of speech," for it was only speech that distinguished him from an instrument with a voice, or a "voiceless instrument" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, p 208). The modern production process increasingly breaks down wherever the person has been reduced to the role of a "cog," and where his possibility of influencing the course of the production process is extremely limited, where the individual is not interested in enriching his knowledge and developing a better attitude toward labor. This becomes even more noticeable because an increasing number of capacities become concentrated in the hands of a single person, capacities which he controls, and increasingly the decision of a single worker may determine the success of any collective undertaking. That is the reason for which big capital, even occasionally surrendering some of its prerogatives, tries to eliminate the alienation of the worker, inherent in hired labor, with the help of various systems

for participation in production management and profit sharing. This logical analysis leads to the conclusion that objectively the successful strengthening of the material foundations of society is impossible without enhancing the public role and the advancement of man. We notice even greater changes in the same direction in the spiritual life of society.

Clearly, today we can say that social progress is manifested in the extent to which man is singled out among all production forces and increasingly brings to light his specifically human—intellectual, moral and creative—qualities, and the extent to which he masters the production process as its ruler, standing above it and acting less as a means than a reason for the production process. The reproduction of man himself in this case is expanded in terms of his possession of knowledge, increased creative capability and morality, and as a comprehensively developed personality. The extent to which man advances along this path and his development as a creator, and the replacement of all previous types of men as “individuals who are **universally historical**, and empirically universal” (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 3, p 34) could and will become the criteria which will enable us to compare the historical advance of socialism and capitalism and their possibilities and contribution to surmounting the civilization crisis.

The deep foundation of the entire process of the development of the universal independence of the individual is combining labor with ownership. Capitalist production, Marx wrote, denies individual ownership but necessarily creates a natural process of its own negation. “It restores not private ownership but individual ownership” (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, p 773) on the basis of cooperation and joint ownership of means of production. Should we not provide a more profound interpretation to the dialectics of the social and the individual in this key as well, as suggested by Marx, the more so since the form of social ownership which prevails under socialism—state ownership—has largely become discredited as being “nobody’s?”

We must also take into consideration the fact that in the contemporary development of societies, albeit in different forms and on a different social basis, decentralization processes develop, a sui generis “dispersal” of ownership, not only and exclusively in the lagging economic sectors but even in the most advanced ones, on the basis of the latest technologies. A search is under way for the type of administrative and organizational forms (taking into consideration their ties with the macroeconomic structures of the respective societies) which would provide new opportunities for independent worker activities.

Increased socialization and decentralization are not two separate and opposite trends in contemporary socioeconomic development. Rather, they are two necessarily interconnected aspects of the transition from an industrial type economy to a scientific and technical type,

from the partial worker-performer, as the main and most widespread production element, to the creative worker, to the subject of universal labor as the new leading production force.

The processes of socialization and decentralization, in their complex interaction, trigger a new variety of socioeconomic forms, a particular complex social system the components of which are products of contemporary development rather than relics of past ages which have adapted to the more advanced social structures.

There are grounds to assume that one of the most important distinctions between an industrial and a scientific and technical economy is the following: the logic of the former leads to the elimination of multiplicity and homogenizing of society, establishing in all its areas and sectors a single model of industrial organization, whereas the logic of the latter triggers a variety, an approach to each separate type of activity not on the basis of a single common yardstick but of its own measure, which ensures forms of organization most acceptable to it (this problem, of exceptional interest methodologically, was raised by the noted Russian economist A. Chayanov: by comparing the possibility of organizing large-scale production in industry and agriculture, he proved the erroneousness of adopting the same approach in both to this problem, noting the significance of a factor such as space within which a production facility is created and the fact that “the nature of agricultural production itself puts a natural limit to growth (the word “strengthening” found in the text appears to be a misprint—editor) of an agricultural enterprise” (A. Chayanov. “*Osnovnyye Idei i Formy Organizatsii Khrestyanskoy Kooperatsii*” [Basic Ideas and Forms of Organization of the Peasant Cooperative], Moscow, 1919, p 12)). Whereas in the case of an industrial economy the way to maturity meant progress from multiplicity to uniformity, in terms of a scientific and technical economy the development is in the opposite direction. It is precisely this that ensures variety not only in the ways of development of a universal active person but also the practical means for his self-realization.

The development of democracy and its highest form—self-government—play a major role in this process

VI.

Overall Subject of Social Progress. Specific social forces become subjects of social progress not simply because of some specific predetermination but thanks to their ability and readiness to solve the specific problems which face mankind at any given stage. The novelty of the historical situation makes it necessary to adopt a new yardstick in assessing the potential of the various social forces, considered in its dynamics, which can be determined in the course of the struggle for the salvation of mankind.

One of the basic stipulations of Marxist-Leninist theory is the conclusion that the working class, the establishment of which was related to the establishment of industrial capitalism, plays a key role in the social renovation of mankind. This conclusion has been confirmed by the entire development of 20th-century world history and the birth of socialism. However, its real theoretical and practical significance becomes apparent only when it is given a specific interpretation applicable to the features of a given historical stage. In turn, this presumes finding answers to a number of important problems, such as how is the structure of the working class changing in connection with the development of production forces, what groups and detachments of workers become the nucleus of the class at a given historical stage, and what changes occur in the needs, interests, cultural standards and sociopolitical forms of activity of the individual detachments of the working class?

It is clear that the scientific and technical revolution, which is gathering strength in the contemporary world, and the profound changes in social priorities, demand a substantial reinterpretation of a great many things. Without getting into the study of all such problems or analyzing the essence of the numerous conflicting concepts, let us note the following: in the process of the scientific and technical revolution there occurs something frequently described as the "expulsion" of live labor from material production. To begin with, however, does this mean an increase or decrease in the role of labor compared with materials? Second, what kind of labor is being taken out of the production process? The answer to such questions allows, in our view, to gain a better understanding not only of the position of the working man in the contemporary production process but his social role as well.

It is clear that the scientific and technical revolution enhances the significance of live labor, for it brings into motion, it rallies around itself an increasing amount of material agents. But what type of labor does this apply to? The manual and unskilled labor which was applied before the scientific and technical revolution is indeed being pushed out of the production process, whereas the role of more intellectual labor, scientific and technical labor, the labor of the creative worker and the transformer of natural and industrial processes which lead to the creation of the necessary social values increases. The working class does not disappear but changes. Does this not broaden today the concept of "overall worker," which includes not only engineers and technicians, but also scientists, people working in a great variety of areas, including those traditionally classified as the "nonproduction sphere?" For today it is they that are exerting an increasingly direct influence on the production process and on all conditions governing human activities and the reproduction of man himself.

If we look at this problem from the viewpoint of the main concern of mankind, its survival, we find, at least in the nonsocialist countries, that the working class of

the pre-scientific and industrial revolution was by no means in the vanguard of the struggle for the implementation of this primary social objective. Taking into consideration that a single class, even the most advanced, would be unable to implement the tremendous comprehensive task of preserving and restructuring human civilization, does this not make obvious the inevitability not simply of changing the subject of social progress but his settling on a broader social foundation?

The overall subject of social progress develops today less on the basis of an opposition to the common enemy than the commonality of positive objectives related to the survival of mankind, for the sake of resolving the civilization crisis and advancing toward a nonviolent world. Naturally, the enemy does not disappear but becomes more specific: he is not the monopoly bourgeoisie in general but its militaristic military-industrial faction. The new overall subjects of social progress cannot be represented as an "alliance for" (implementation of positive objectives) unlike the previous trends of the revolutionary process as an "alliance against" (a specific enemy). However, we can speak of shifting the center of gravity from rejection to construction. This explains the importance today of the problem of having a realistic program of action.

Changes in the objectives and the platform of interaction among the forces of social progress cannot fail to influence the forms of their cooperation. The previous model of "trends" is not entirely suitable in transmitting the new variety of forms of interaction—parallel, joint and autonomous—which are being established currently in the activities of the forces of social progress. On the other hand, many of the previous demarcations among the individual detachments of the forces of progress lose their meaning in the face of the new tasks. The comprehensive rejection of the "arrogance of omniscience," readiness to engage in a dialogue and in the joint search for truth, and the rejection of leadership claims under all conditions and situations and the introduction of more flexible and democratic organizational structures, all lead to the elimination of already established or developing artificial barriers separating progressive forces and the establishment of new forms of their cooperation within the framework of the "alliance of anti-crisis forces."

The need to solve the new problems determined the fact that the line separating progress from reaction has largely stopped coinciding with the boundaries of countries, blocs and even classes and parties as they historically developed. The tasks of surmounting the civilization crisis brought about a new separation among forces in the West, the East and the third world. As M.S. Gorbachev noted, "civilization has approached a line separating less systems and ideologies than common sense and the feeling of self-preservation of mankind, on the one hand, and irresponsibility, national egotism, and prejudices or, in a word, the old way of thinking, on the other" (PRAVDA, 10 December 1987).

The "alliance of anti-crisis forces" includes supporters of perestroika in the socialist countries, the movements and groups in the third world which have interpreted their own interests within the context of the global problems, and a wide range of forces in the West, which are struggling for the survival of the human species. The bearers of the "obstruction mechanism," national egoism and great-power and corporate privileges and the cult of force and profit, all those who are ready to struggle for their objectives and who considering man as a means, as a material, are the many-faced enemy of the overall subject of social progress.

We have considered only a small part of the problems which require urgent study. The fruitful study of the ways and means of social progress in the contemporary world will require the interaction among representatives of all social science sectors. This may also be a practical step toward surmounting departmental barriers among them and a step toward the fuller implementation of the ideal of the **integral social knowledge**, which appeared at the start of the formulation of the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

**Judicial Science and Practice Under Perestroika;
Scientists and Practical Workers Answer
KOMMUNIST Questions**

18020013j Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 7,
May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 91-96

[Text] Continued publication of answers to questions asked by *KOMMUNIST* (see Nos 14, 15, and 18 for 1987 and No 2 for 1988).

M.N. Marchenko, doctor of juridical sciences, professor, head of the Theory of the State and Law Department, Moscow State University Law School dean; and **K.D. Krylov**, candidate of juridical sciences, docent in the same department:

2. Under contemporary conditions we cannot be limited only to streamlining individual regulations and laws or even the entire legislation. It is a question of qualitatively new approaches to legal regulations as a whole. Juridical science must deal not only with already past political-legal decisions but also decisions which it would be expedient to adopt in the future. Furthermore, we must convert to the formulation of a legislative strategy and, hence, the elaboration of concepts for future political decisions affecting the development of the law in Soviet society and in Soviet international-legal relations.

In the past juridical science did not sufficiently fulfill its forecasting function. Frequently "forecasts" were reduced to paraphrasing and commenting on directives.

This situation is explained by circumstantial considerations, the weakness of the empirical foundation, the closed or semi-closed nature of information needed for making scientific summations and conclusions and the virtually total lack of possibility of undertaking social experimentation.

It is quite important today to combine basic with applied research and with the study of practical requirements in the elaboration of an optimal system of legal acts which would lay the necessary legal foundations for the further development of the economy, the social sphere, science and culture and develop the self-government of the people.

In terms of law-making, in particular, sponsoring referendums (nationwide votes), as stipulated in Article 5 of the USSR Constitution, would be of tremendous political-ideological and practical significance. We believe that referendums are obviously necessary in solving problems such as the passing of legislation (constitutional, civil, penal, etc.) which more than anything else affects the prime vital interests of the citizens; the passing of international legal acts leading to direct action and replacing republic with all-Union laws, and solving other problems affecting the overall interests of society. A Law on the Referendum could be passed on the basis of a nationwide vote.

Under the conditions of long-term planning of socioeconomic development (for a 10-15-year period) establishing the duration of the new laws becomes possible. This should not prevent introducing the necessary amendments to a law or extending its effect. However, such a new development would strengthen the juridical obligations of the legislator to consider in advance the question of the life span of one law or another to its fullest extent and to determine whether it should be amended or not or its duration extended, or else whether it should be deleted or replaced by a new law. Such a step should become an essential legal guarantee for the irreversible nature of renovation processes and a flexible reaction to all problems which arise in the course of the implementation of socioeconomic programs and plans.

It is equally important to adopt a thoughtful approach to solving the problems of backing legislative acts with resources. The adoption of such laws is not always accompanied by steps of material, organizational, personnel, scientific and propaganda-educational nature, which require certain resources and expenditures. Hence the exceptionally heavy load carried by the law enforcement authorities and, as a result, the frequently superficial and negligent consideration of legal matters which, again, lead to the additional burdening of legal cadres. The result is that the legislation does not function properly, frequently remaining on the level of declarations, even if legal steps have been contemplated to protect rights and levy penalties for nonfulfillment of obligations or for violating prohibitions. That is why, in

announcing that a law has been enacted, its support must be indicated. At that point the efforts and means which will be required for the implementation of said law will become clear.

The conversion from prohibitions and mandatory norms and intensification and excessive differentiation of juridical responsibilities to recommended standards, supported by corresponding incentives, is a major element in the restructuring of our legal system. The way we see the restructuring of the socialist legal system is from a legal system which includes dozens of various penalties to a system which suggests choices and incentives for active proper behavior.

T.V. Sinyukova, candidate of juridical sciences, assistant professor at the Department of Soviet Law, Saratov Polytechnical Institute, and **V.N. Sinyukov**, candidate of juridical sciences, senior instructor, Saratov Department of the Higher Correspondence Law School, USSR MVD:

1. In assessing the role of the law in restructuring of the economy and other areas of social life it is important to see the limits of its possibilities. This would enable us to avoid both over- and underassessing the legal potential.

The popular view in juridical sciences is that of the extensive social possibilities of the law and its creative role in the establishment of new social relations. Characteristic in this sense is the view held by Professor S.S. Alekseyev (see *KOMMUNIST* No 15, 1987). In his view, organization and discipline, without which profound changes in social life are inconceivable, could be achieved essentially with the help of the law.

However, the idea of the high social value of the law does not lead straight to the conclusion that its functions in the organization of social relations are all that extensive. The concept that "good laws means good social relations" simplifies the situation in which we find ourselves. In our view, what occurs in society is not an underestimating of the law, as many assume, but its overestimating, the result of which is not a shortage but a surplus of juridical norms. In order to solve a given social problem, as a rule we turn to legal instruments. Faith in the magic power of the law, however, coexists, paradoxical though this might seem, with a widespread legal nihilism: if a law fails to solve a problem all faith in the social value of the law is lost.

It is not a question of the lack of good and detailed laws but of the quality and stability of those which are already passed. The law is not an instruction on how to put a toy together or to use it. Its purpose is to assert the principles of legal policy in one area of another on a long-term basis and to provide juridical guarantees of the rights of citizens and organizations. Otherwise the law inevitably loses its stability, which is a major component of its authority and effectiveness. Each new law must become

integrated within the culture of the society, the social groups and the individuals and become a necessary element in their life and activities. This, however, requires time.

2. The problem today consists of the imperfection or even absence of mechanisms which can ensure the implementation of the laws. To a certain extent this is the result of the administrative-arbitrary management style, when the very text of an order indicated its "vital force" which did not require any social support. At the same time, official interpretation became widespread. A critical attitude toward it is today an argument in favor of solving as many problems as possible legislatively. However, this is not a solution but a worsening of the problem, for essentially one set of regulations is replaced by another. But what kind of interpretation could be considered poor? The one which is ignorant, uncontrolled and undemocratic and which is not based on considered legal procedures or, in a word, one which is bureaucratic. For an interpretation, taken in its positive sense, also involves the manifestation of creative initiative, and independence in solving problems. It is only the active and creative socioeconomic efforts that will require a knowledgeable legal practice which presumes a high standard of political and legal knowledge on the part of officials, as well as glasnost and keeping the mechanism of the implementation of the law under the control of the people.

4. One of the most important means of ensuring legality—legal guarantees—has remained undeveloped in our legal system.

It is necessary, above all, to formulate a scientific concept for juridical guarantees, consistent with the nature of the contemporary stage in the development of socialism. But what should the state and society guarantee to its members, and how? How can we see to it that with a high degree of social protection, which is inherent in socialism, guarantees would stimulate initiative, creativity and enterprise, without creating social dependency and passiveness? These are merely some of the problems the legislative solution to which must become a structural component of the legal reform. We must develop the type of efficient guarantee mechanisms which would ensure the implementation of the new democratic standards in our life and, in particular, those which pertain to the development of initiative "from below," the activeness and independent activity of the citizens, the protection of their honor and dignity, the broadening of self-management in labor collectives and at places of residence, ensuring glasnost, etc. Guarantees are the most important essential feature of socialist law, neglect of which lowers the authority of legislation and the efficiency of the new laws. One of the most important trends in the legal reform is strengthening the juridical guarantees of legality and the rights and obligations of the citizens.

Yu.G. Kozlov, candidate of juridical sciences, senior scientific associate, All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Problems of Strengthening Law and Order, and **O.V. Osipenko**, candidate of economic sciences, teacher at the Moscow Higher Militia School, USSR MVD:

2. The main opportunity for progress in juridical science, unused so far is the insufficiently effective interdisciplinary study of the reasons and prerequisites for crime, economic crime above all. It is true that some progress has been made. Thus, whereas in the 1970s and beginning of 1980s cooperation among scientists in the humanities in the study of negative social phenomena and, in particularly, in the economic life of society, was in the hands of enthusiasts, in the past 2 years the ties between criminologists and representatives of the other social sciences, including economists, have become reality. The joint discussion of the problems of struggle against unearned income, the elimination of the "second economy," and adopting an anticrime-generating economic legislation have, as a whole, already yielded substantial results.

Unfortunately, such cooperation is still sporadic. It is clear, nonetheless, that without a knowledgeable economic study of the economic mechanism it would be difficult to predict negative social processes. Such a study is outside the scope of the "strict" criminologists.

In realistically assessing the course charted toward the comprehensive development of the socialist foundation of commodity-monetary relations and the expansion of enterprise autonomy, it is important objectively to interpret the dialectics of this process which, on the one hand, sets prerequisites for the elimination of bureaucratism, departmentalism and parochialism as the most general prerequisites for economic crime and, on the other (as confirmed by the experience of Hungary and China), creates certain grounds for intensifying negative side manifestations. In other words, in making important and necessary economic decisions today, we must predict all of their possible consequences and be prepared for them on the scientific and practical levels. We must create a reliably functioning practical science mechanism for forecasting and efficiently "rendering harmless" and solving arising contradictions. Today traditional criminological theory (as, a matter of fact, economic theory) could hardly be able to cope with this problem alone.

In this light, we believe that priority should be given to a conversion from cooperation to integration of studies of economic crime by representatives of related areas in the humanities and their development on a general methodological and organizational basis. Solving the problem of systems analysis of the economic prerequisites which favor criminality and the formulation of means of fighting it could become the subject of a specialized interdisciplinary branch of knowledge—economic criminology.

L.S. Simkin, candidate of juridical sciences, department head at the All-Union Institute for Perfecting the Knowledge of Legal Workers:

4. What must be done for the laws to be strictly observed in all areas and by every person? As a lecturer, in my search for an answer to this question asked by the editors of *KOMMUNIST* I look to those on whom the solution of the problem depends above all: judges who have come to Moscow to improve their skills. I realize that judicial errors, reports on which have been abundantly carried by the press of late, do not depend exclusively on the level of their training. If such is the case, on what do they depend? According to V.I. Terebilov, president of the USSR Supreme Court, as reported in the press, the main reason lies in violating the principle of the independence of judges.

What has changed after the 1986 CPSU Central Committee resolution on the need for reorganizing the work of the courts and other law enforcement bodies? Has perestroika strengthened the principle of independence of judges and the fact that they must obey exclusively the law? What is the condition in the weakest area of our justice, of which only recently virtually no mention was made whereas now so much has been said that it seems as though the cases themselves of exerting pressure on the courts should be considered a matter of the past? Unfortunately, the answers to these questions are not reassuring. Let me cite the results of my own small sociological survey. Although the survey covered no more than 120 people, or 1 percent of the overall number of people's judges in the country, its results are quite representative, for the respondents included people of different age groups, in different parts of the country and with different degrees of experience.

In 1987 various officials issued advice and turned with petition on the essence of specific cases to 57 percent of the surveyed judges; one out of eight judges was approached on more than 10 different occasions. Half of the "advisors" and "petitioners" were officials working in party and soviet agencies and economic managers. Did the judges take into consideration such "advice" and "recommendations?" One out of five judges answered the question in the negative and 5 percent in the affirmative. According to them, the overwhelming majority listened to advice only when it coincided with their own inner convictions. But here is a less reassuring figure. Here is the essence of a hypothetical situation as presented to a judge: A 17-year old boy has committed two severe crimes and his father, a highly-placed official, would try to influence the court. Only one-half of the surveyed judges were convinced that the high position of the father would not influence the decision of the court in the least. One out of three believed that the effort would be successful and that the liability of the criminal would be reduced; another 12 percent assumed such a possibility. For the sake of fairness, let us say that 5 years ago the percentage of "unbelievers" was nearly double. Nonetheless, this is a poor consolation. When will finally

judges learn self-respect? They are largely to be blamed for the loss of their independence, for they did not oppose any illegal pressure and preferred not to clash with the "bosses." What was it that they feared in this case? The survey indicated that it was precisely in connection with the nonfulfillment of so-called recommendations that hostile steps were taken, harming one out of 10 judges.

The range of such steps could be quite broad, from a "remark issued at the raykom" to postponing the date for obtaining housing, nonelection as deputy in the local soviet and issuing a negative reference in transfers. For example, the executive committee may refuse to issue the court heating fuel or to repair a crumbling building; an economic manager may refuse to provide a car with which, without losing unnecessary time and efforts, the judge could attend the circuit session (as a rule, a court does not have its own means of transportation). But is it a question of transportation only? The judges are constantly complaining of lack of typewriters, paper and duplicating equipment! As we may see, there are things for the judges to worry about should they fail to heed a "guiding opinion."

The list of "chiefs" who can exert pressure on judges is endless: it includes colleagues, mainly working out of the prosecutor's office. It is true that the nature of their petitions is different. Whereas in the former case people are trying to alleviate the fate of the defendant and petition for a "careful consideration of the case," in the latter, usually the request is to "run through" the case in court in order to compensate for insufficient charges supporting the indictment, citing the notorious "good relations" with court colleagues.

Some prosecutors are great amateurs of "sensational" cases and great masters in shaping a supportive public opinion. They are the first to report to the local leadership that severe crimes have been exposed. Occasionally, it becomes clear in court that neither the crime is all that grave nor are the circumstances of its commission all that clear. This occurs with particular frequency in trying economic cases. It is at that point that accusations are poured on the judge for obstructing "the cause of the struggle against crime." Many party and soviet officials tend to trust such declarations: most frequently the prosecutor is a member of the party raykom buro and his authority is much greater than that of the judges who are only rarely seen at the raykom. Usually the labor collective is on the side of the prosecutor, for it has been informed of the crime by the investigator (naturally, in his own interpretation) before it has reached the court. Why is the prosecution given credit for such information and how is it possible to speak of prevention when a person who, according to the law, is considered innocent until proven guilty, is defamed? What can we say in such cases about people who have nothing to do with juridical science and practice and who, taking the words of the investigator on faith, undertake to defame the "criminal?"

The judge feels his dependence on his legal colleagues particularly acutely when exonerating someone. For any acquittal is a "blow" at the prosecutor who is responsible for the quality of the preliminary investigation. It is much simpler to have the case drag, ask for further investigation and, subsequently, close it in the quiet of the office of the investigator. Such a trend, which prevailed in recent practical work, led to a truly unique phenomenon: meting justice without acquittal. Fifty-five percent of the judges I surveyed answered in the affirmative to the question of whether they had occasions to assign a case for further investigation if grounds for acquittal were extant. The most widespread reasons were the aspiration not to let one's colleagues down, unwillingness to spoil relations with the prosecutor, etc.

Yet there also are "judges of the judges," people with the right to revoke or amend a sentence. I fear that without a consideration of that second authority no single judicial decision can be made, for the work of the judges is rated, above all, on the basis of the "percentage of revocations."

Let us ask the following question: What violation of the law is more dangerous: imposing upon the defendant an unwarranted strict punishment or, conversely, an excessively light one? I would say that both are equally bad. The former, however, can only lead to changing the sentence, whereas the second may revoke it altogether. Consequently, it is safer for a judge to err on the side of imposing a harsher rather than lighter penalty for the latter would be considered a more severe violation. As the survey indicated, this circumstance influences the strictness of penalties imposed by one out of three judges. Generally speaking, despite the humanizing of criminal policy in recent years, judges tend to impose strict penalties without any particular need.

Currently a debate has been launched in the press on the expediency of eliminating or limiting the death penalty. What did the judges I surveyed think if this? Sixty-six percent of them agreed with the aphorism quoted in the investigation, to the effect that "the death penalty is humanism applied to society." This aphorism, which provides a distorted interpretation of the principle of humanism, is by no means our cultural and historical legacy. It is the product of the "ethical-legal" way of thinking of our relatively recent past. The death penalty may be a harsh necessity (under extreme circumstances at that) but is by no means a manifestation of humanism.

If the judges avoid unasked advice from outsiders like the plague, they are grateful for such advice if it comes from superior justices. Furthermore, such advice is imposed upon them; 74 percent of the surveyed judges seek on their own initiative the advice of members of a superior court in trying complex cases. Such advice frequently assumes the nature of direct interference in solving the case.

But what about the people with whom, by law, the judge must truly consult, the people's assessors? Strange though it might seem, the judges do not listen to them all that closely. In any case, more than one-half of the surveyed judges answered in the negative to the question of whether the assessors helped them in passing a sentence. Many of those who answered in the positive had in mind only assessors with some specialized knowledge (bookkeeping, educational, etc.). It is not a question merely of underestimating on the part of the judges of the role of the public representatives in meting justice. The trouble is that the judges, who object to their own dependence on various officials, themselves order about (no other word fits) the assessors who depend on them. Surveys of people's assessors have indicated that not only in court but also outside the chambers, where the sentence is passed, they most frequently "trust in the knowledge and experience of the president." This is despite the fact that the laws have not put them alongside the judges for the sake of staring at the judge's mouths, as the saying goes.

What is the reason for this dependence? The law guarantees their rights: the sentence must be passed by the judicial collegium by majority vote. If the president of the court is in the minority, the sentence must be based on the opinion of the assessors. Most frequently, however, they have only vaguely heard of their rights and rare are those among them who have a feeling of their own significance within the temple of justice. In matters of trying cases, it is easier to rely on the opinion of the only jurist in the judicial collegium. If an assessor disagrees with the sentence, he would nonetheless have to sign it. That is what the law says. He has the right subsequently to present his separate opinion in writing. However, by no means is everyone able to draft and substantiate such an opinion and in all likelihood the opinion will remain unwritten. Who invented the stupid rule and for what reason, according to which a document with which one disagrees must be signed? Such "discipline" is entirely out of place in meting justice.

Most frequently the actual status of an assessor in court does not predispose toward manifestations of independence. Suffice it to say that assessors frequently carry out assignments issued by the judges, totally unrelated to their status. For example, they stand guard at the door of the court building, provide information to visitors or deliver subpoenas. After a while, during the trial, they sit on either side of the judge whose instructions they have just finished carrying out. What do they see in the judge: an equal colleague or their immediate judicial superior?

For the judges, whether professional or people's assessors, in Marx's familiar statement, no chief other than the law exists (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "*Soch.*" [Works], vol 1, p 67). This concept must become the foundation for the restructuring of the entire legal system.

Suggestions have been expressed in the press of ensuring the independence of judges by converting to the appointment of people's judges or their appointment by the authorities and extending the term of service to retirement age. In its time, Soviet law rejected the principle of the appointment or nonreplaceability of judges on the basis of the most democratically possible motivations, with a view to upgrading the role of society in the organization of the justice system. Should we take a step backward today? I believe that in order to ensure the independence of judges we need tireless control on the part of the public over legal procedures, which must be based on the full and truthful information on the work of the courts. We must cleanse such work from the formalism of the system of judicial accountability, so that speeches by judges in labor collectives turn from superficial information to reports explaining cases of violations of the law, red tape and bureaucratism. Increasing glasnost through traditional ways has exhausted its possibilities, for trials take place during working time and are usually attended by the retired and by relatives and friends of the defendants. Frequently circuit trials involving cases which are considered important and, consequently, of public interest, take place in half-empty courtrooms.

There is, however, a solution, and that is to restore in all local newspapers a section on judicial chronicles. Court reporters could bring the population closer to events in court by truthfully and promptly informing the public of changes in court policies and on errors and violations of the law, corrected by superior courts. Naturally, the journalists must bear legal responsibility for providing distorted information.

The independence of the people's assessors must be supported by more efficient legal guarantees; the strict sequence of their appearance in court must be observed; the use of assessors in "auxiliary" types of work must be forbidden. The time free from court sessions would be more usefully applied, if justice is to be served, in studying the cases assigned to them. Finally, the question must be raised of abolishing the mandatory signing of a sentence by the entire court, regardless of whether or not a unanimous decision has been reached.

But there is more. We usually say that the judge is at the top of the pyramid in the administration of justice. However, few jurists are in a hurry to reach that peak. At the last elections no outstanding attorney nor experienced prosecutor or legal scientist were among the candidates for judges. An increasing number of such candidates are modest legal council, notaries, court technical workers and even yesterday's university graduates. The reason? Low salary, lack of centralized availability of travel vouchers to sanatoriums and rest homes, no places in kindergartens, etc. As to travel vouchers and other benefits, the judges could obtain them themselves easily but, again, at the cost of losing their independence. The time has come to free them from making the rounds rounds of executive committees and large enterprises,

their hand stretched out, for a variety of material and technical facilities, and to organize supplies of everything they need on a centralized basis.

This would be a modest beginning. It is time, however, seriously to undertake to treat the most severe illness affecting justice, for otherwise the problem of eliminating judicial errors will never be solved.

V.M. Lebedev, doctor of juridical sciences, professor, department head at Zaporozhe State University, and **T.P. Kozlova**, candidate of juridical sciences and docent at the same university:

1. No restructuring is possible without a reliable legal foundation. However, legal regulations based on laws are frequently of a declarative nature. For example, the laws on the state enterprise (association) or on the labor collectives does not include either legal mechanisms for the exercise of the rights granted labor collectives or penalties for their violation. It is clear, therefore, that such laws objectively trigger the need for the promulgation of a number of legal regulations. This frequently leads to distorting the meaning and purpose of the law, about which a great deal is being said and written today.

Usually those affected by a given law take it without a consideration of the legal regulations which make it specific and which are still unsatisfactorily brought to the knowledge not only of the toiling masses but the specialists. As a study we conducted in October-November 1987 indicates, the overwhelming majority of members of administrations and party workers (as many as 90-96 percent) are unfamiliar with the content of the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) or else lack a clear idea of how it should be applied in the labor collective.

Under the conditions of the restructuring of the economic mechanism, we must see to it that the meaning and content of the laws are understood by every working person. One cannot be full master of his enterprise without understanding the legal foundations for one's own activities.

2. 3. On this basis it is difficult not to support the idea of a legal reform. However, such a reform would be justified only if it is not turned into the latest effort to adapt our legal system to current requirements, to the "fashion of the day." Otherwise it would not be worth making it, for one topic of the day would be replaced by another, sooner or later.

The Soviet legal system must be stable. Theory and practice have become tired of endless amendments to existing legislation which, in frequent cases, are difficult to understand and interpret. Yet the system can be stable only if it is based on the law. The number of legal regulations in our economic practice must become minimal. The executive authorities should issue not legal regulations but individual rules and only in order to

ensure the implementation of the law. There simply is no other way to stabilize our legal system. We must see to it that the adoption and amendment of legislation become an extraordinary event, understood by everyone and, above all, exclude any haste, ignorance or controversy.

Today we must use grass-roots regulations, drafted by the labor collectives themselves, instead of the tremendous number of legal regulations issued by ministries and departments, which in frequent cases are not only difficult to understand but are also unknown to the broad toiling masses. For example, a great deal of that which is currently being done by the State Committee for Labor and the AUCCTU can be entirely accomplished on the level of local legislation. The legal standards for the working people, standards they have adopted and ratified themselves, would become more efficient. If necessary, they may have to be amended in accordance with the tasks of the collectives. Many problems of economic law, obviously, could also be solved through contracts.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Petty Corrections Cannot Be Described as Rationalizations; Documents of V.V. Kuybyshev on the Occasion of the Centennial of His Birth

18020013k Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 97-104

[Text] The documents which follow are related to the personality of V.V. Kuybyshev, the noted party and state leader (1888-1935). As head of the Central Control Commission (TsKK) between 1923 and 1926, and the People's Commissariat of Worker-Peasant Inspectorate (NK RKI), Kuybyshev worked extensively on problems of management efficiency. This is no accident. In the mid-1920s, as a result of the gradual conversion from rebuilding to restructuring of the national economy, the need for a reorganization of the management system was particularly pressing. The main topic of Kuybyshev's writings and thoughts at that time was related to finding ways of solving such problems. Many of them are equally relevant today.

The selection also includes two letters to V.V. Kuybyshev, sent by F.E. Dzerzhinskiy. These party leaders shared not only identical party views but also similar tasks. After Dzerzhinskiy's death in 1926, it was precisely Kuybyshev who replaced him as chairman of the USSR VSNKh. Judging by the context, one of the letters sent by Feliks Edmundovich is a direct answer to a note addressed to the Politburo by Kuybyshev. It enables us to determine more fully the nature of the problem under discussion. The second, which Dzerzhinskiy wrote 17 days prior to his death, helps to evaluate the nature of the problems which Kuybyshev encountered after he had recently taken over the management of industry. One

can easily note that this letter briefly earmarks the main problems discussed by Dzerzhinskiy in his well-known speech, delivered shortly before his death at the 20 July 1926 VKP(b) Central Committee Plenum. However, this letter to a like-minded person, which was not scheduled for publication, adds new features to the picture of the situation which existed during the first year of the country's industrialization. Dzerzhinskiy was concerned not only by the attacks mounted by the opposition (which he discussed at the plenum) but also by the obstructions created on the path of industrialization by bureaucratic distortions in the activities of the governmental apparatus.

These materials were prepared for publication by Zh. Adibekova and V. Korovaynikov, CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism scientific associates.

From V.V. Kuybyshev's Report 'n the Work of the Central Control Commission and the NK RKI' at the Expanded Plenum of the Krasnopresnenskiy RKP(b) Raykom, Moscow

4 September 1924

The congress (1) has noted entirely accurately the danger which faces us, that of becoming a purely judicial authority which, as it keeps working, begins to follow a certain routine, to formulate its own penalty codes (2) and, in the final account, alienates itself from the life of the masses, begins to lose its feelings toward the masses and makes a number of errors which, naturally, cannot fail painfully to affect the organization. This spirit of party bureaucratism must be eliminated by the Control Commission. I do not imply that such bureaucratism has become a fact. The danger exists and it must be eliminated at all cost. The control commissions must become a comradely authority for all party members. The party members must not consider the control commissions as some kind of internal party Cheka which only punishes, and which should be avoided and feared. The party collegiums and control commissions must earn the type of reputation which would make every party member consider them an authority which will show a close and attentive attitude not only toward manifestations of ill will but to any painful phenomenon (within) the party. Such an authority must strive toward unity and ethical enhancement of all organizations and must not only pursue the task of exposing those who have committed violations but, as it observes the life of the party organizations, be able to draw certain conclusions worthy of study, which would eliminate the possibility of errors on the part of individual party members. Playing a creative role in the elimination of party criminality is the first task of the party collegiums. Their second task is to educate the party members. The party collegiums must become authorities which would reorganize and educate the party members. This is their most important task. We must not be carried away by punishment or party repressions, converting to a purely judicial authority

which unwittingly separates itself from the mentality of the party organizations and sometimes promotes within the party organizations squabbles or reciprocal intrigues.... We must prevent the possibility of delinquencies by party members. This is the main task of the party collegiums....

TsPA IML, file 79, archive I, case 287, sheets 16-17.

From V.V. Kuybyshev's Notes

3-4 November 1925

1. The required pace for building socialism as well as our poverty **force us** to set the task of rationalization as the most important in industrial management.

2. Importance of rationalizing **management** in production efficiency ("production costs").

3. Management rationalization means the efficient organization of accounting and planning.

4. Minor corrections, although they might be quite important and urgent, must not be described as rationalizations.

5. Rationalization is a planned system of measures covering the entire production process.

6. It is only the enterprise manager who can promote rationalization (with the help of worker initiative).

7. The task of the RKI is to **organize** (in the document, to act as the organizer) of the rationalization movement in all economic sectors and **management** (in the document, act as manager) in the area of the methodology of rationalizing management and production, as experience is acquired and the systematizing (in the document, the systematics) of the material, internal as well as external.

8. The importance of rationalization is not always understood. Once understood, however, interest becomes the best incentive for development and the best guarantee for a proper solution. We shall help.

9. Difficulty of the matter. Danger of hasty decisions. Forms must follow. The conference will accomplish a tremendous deal if it can only urge on, interest and awaken a rationalization urge and the slumbering creative forces (3).

TsPA IML, file 79, archive I, case 64, sheets 8-9 and back.

29 January 1926

"If the law has been tabled by the KZP (4) for the past 2 years, this means that it is not yet timely and that it is not demanded by life." Any type of bureaucratism can be justified this way (5).

TsPA IML, file 79, archive I, case 54, p 31 and back.

**Excerpt From V.V. Kuybyshev's Note to the VKP(b)
Central Committee Politburo on the Work of the
TsKK-RKI in Control and Verification of Execution**

Before 16 March 1926

The plan for the reorganization of the TsKK-RKI, suggested by Comrade Lenin, most clearly indicates the need for the TsKK-RKI to pay particular attention in its work to problems of control and verification. The 3 years which have passed since the publication of the familiar articles by Vladimir Ilich on the TsKK-RKI (6) have not only convinced everyone, it seems to me, of the absolute need for such work but have also made it incumbent upon that same TsKK-RKI to focus exceptional attention on such matters.

This circumstance is related, above all, to the fact that we have entered a period of extreme difficulty in our economic building; we are facing the most difficult tasks which require extreme accuracy in the work, thorough consideration of experience and systematic verification from top to bottom. On the other hand, it is absolutely unquestionable that we find in our state apparatus a great deal of scandal, irresponsibility, red tape and bureaucratism, which at the various mass meetings lead workers and peasants to demand a decisive struggle against such phenomena. Since the party and the government have no other authority for carrying out extensive control-verification work, by virtue of these circumstances the TsKK-RKI were forced to assign a significant percentage of their forces to this task. The 14th Party Congress adopted the same point of view and ratified our corresponding suggestions, pointing out that "as in the past, verification of the execution of decrees and directives of the party and the state and controlling the activities of the crucial parts of the state apparatus remain the most important tasks of the TsKK-RKI" (7).

While systematically implementing the principle of expanding and strengthening this sector of its work, the TsKK-RKI are currently engaged in the organizational restructuring of the RKI apparatus, one of the consequences of which will be a concentration within a special sector (department) of all control-verification work done by the RKI without exception. Such an organizational regrouping will unquestionably provide the necessary stability, planning and proper scope for this part of TsKK-RKI work.

It is self-evident that the RKI can fulfill its role as a merciless scourge for all the scandals within our state apparatus if it is able to harness the attention of the broadest possible worker and peasant masses which are suffering from all the shortcomings in the state apparatus, which demand their elimination and are willing actively to assist in this work. In order to achieve this, control and verification by the RKI must be conducted decisively, quickly yield the necessary results and draw

close general attention. We must note that these basic stipulations, which should determine the nature of control-verification work by the RKI are quite frequently unattainable. For example, if we look at the list of control-verification work considered by the RKI collegium for the period starting with the 14th Party Congress, we can easily see that within that time a number of quite significant projects have been completed. Nonetheless, it is as though no "noise" on this subject has resulted and no attention was paid to these areas. Yet if we trace the significant amount of time which is spent from the time that a study has been completed until the final formulation of resolutions on one problem or another by coordinating matters with the various departments, we can see the amount of most stubborn efforts that must be invested for this purpose by RKI personnel. The result is a sufficiently clear picture of the difficulties which are facing the RKI in the implementation of its control-verification functions.

The main roots of these most grave shortcomings, which distort the very nature of the projects, are found in the regulation which governs RKI activities (8). Their nature may be reduced to two basic features: 1. The RKI suggestion on the elimination of a given shortcoming is implemented only if the departments do not object; this circumstance becomes clear only after a long period of "coordinations." 2. Publications in the press concerning the scandals and crimes committed by individuals are allowed, according to the regulation, only "when the existence of such circumstances is not denied by the heads of departments and establishments" (9). This deprives the RKI of the type of independence which, one would think, should be inherent in an authority with control-verification functions, headed, furthermore, by people who have been especially selected by the party congress (the TsKK); the solution of problems made public in the press, therefore, depends on the existence of coordination with the corresponding departments. One could imagine how this influences the accuracy of the implementation of the assignments entrusted to that TsKK-RKI....

Quite a number of examples of lengthy coordinations could be cited.... However, even isolated cases would indicate that the situation is extremely abnormal. Unquestionably, such coordinations, which take several months, could literally reduce to a minimum the results the most important projects of the RKI and, in any case, deprive them of their urgency and timeliness, which are vitally needed in order properly to develop RKI control-supervisory activities.

This abnormality becomes even clearer if we compare it to the fact that even with already coordinated and final decisions made by the RKI collegium, the departments do not always implement these decisions or, in any case, do not implement them sufficiently willingly and quickly. This circumstance as well can be supported by a number of examples.... and, understandably, inevitably stems from the already pointed out basic stipulations of the regulation on the RKI.

It is entirely clear that in connection with such basic reasons the situation with publishing in the press the results of one or another investigation is even worse.... Let us note that even published materials are rarely satisfactory, for they reveal the fact that a compromise has been reached with one department or establishment or another. The weakness of press coverage is by no means related to any lack on the part of the RKI of the wish to draw the attention of broad public opinion on one most important project or another; the point is that coordination difficulties here are even worse and the opposition is even greater.

This brief description of the state of affairs in terms of control-verification work by the RKI inevitably leads to the following basic conclusion: As in the past, within the framework of the current regulation, the RKI is reduced to the role of an "ordinary" people's commissariat (10) and is in no case able fully to implement its assigned control-verification functions. This situation is entirely clear to us, the TsKK-RKI personnel, and will unquestionably be clear to anyone who makes a thorough study of RKI control-verification work.

How can we ensure the proper implementation of RKI control-verification functions? The only way is to acknowledge as necessary an increase in RKI rights. Vladimir Ilich's concept must be implemented to that end. We must truly see to it that the "ordinary" people's commissariat is set on an "exclusive level," so that "the merger of the most authoritative party leadership" with this people's commissariat be accomplished and so that it may be organizationally provided with the full possibility of functioning "regardless of personalities" (11). Specifically, this must be manifested in the following: 1. Resolutions submitted by the RKI and demanding of departments, establishments or enterprises to carry out one or another suggestion, resulting from control-verification work, must be definitively and immediately implemented. Naturally, the departments have the right to appeal RKI decisions to the Sovnarkom. However, such appeals should by no means halt the immediate implementation of RKI suggestions. 2. The RKI people's commissariat should have the right independently to solve the problem of the possibility of press reports of its decisions and suggestions. 3. Coordination on both such items should amount only to the fact that if departments, establishments or enterprises, should they disagree with RKI suggestions, should immediately submit their objections. Naturally, similar rights should be granted to the people's commissariats (RKI) in Union republics.

The second most important circumstance, which is having a very severe impact on the development of control-verification work, is the absence of sufficient cadres of trained personnel. The implementation of control-verification functions demands particularly firm personnel; the ability rapidly to become oriented in various work sectors must be a necessary feature of such people, for without it in no case could overall control-verification work be suitably developed. Unquestionably, in this area

party members must predominate. In order to describe the difficulties they face in this respect let me mention the fact alone that in our own land inspectorate, which deals with control-verification work, even in its present size (I already pointed out that as a result of the reorganization we have combined within a single department all control-verification work) we have more than 30 percent vacancies for senior inspectors. One must bear in mind that it is impossible to say that even available inspectors fully meet all requirements for their positions. The further development of control-verification work will face even more urgently the RKI with this problem and will force us persistently to demand special attention to be paid to the needs of the RKI in this respect.

TsPA IML, file 79, archive I, case 324, sheets 2-7.

F.E. Dzerzhinskiy's Note

16 March 1926

Not sent. (12)

For Comrade Kuybyshev:

I read your suggestions on broadening the rights of the RKI-TsKK (13). In my view, they are profoundly erroneous and absolutely unacceptable. This would mean not only subordinating all "departments, establishments and enterprises to a single commissariat (RKI) and annulling their constitutional rights but also entrusting a single commissariat, the RKI, with a responsibility which, however strong it may be, it would be unable to carry out. Granting the RKI such rights would mean, naturally, lifting all responsibility from the other commissariats and would become a source of arbitrariness and heavy squabbling.

I believe that no such "exceptional level" is required and nor should the already tremendous powers of the TsKK-RKI be expanded even further. The TsKK-RKI must become a great organizer and rallying force. This does not require greater rights. In my view, the struggle for coordination is or should be the mechanism set precisely for such organizational work. In the case of the TsKK-RKI bare orders would not achieve their objectives. Our main enemy and difficulty is not the fact that we are unable to see shortcomings or unable to **consider** how to eliminate them, but our lack of standards and inability to correct this evil. The main task of the TsKK-RKI in the struggle against this evil is to train and find personnel and to shape leading authorities rather than issue orders on how to correct it.

I thoroughly disagree with your concept. I fear that should your viewpoint prevail it would mark the beginning of the destruction of the entire great idea of the TsKK.

TsPA IML, file 76, archive IV, case 3388, sheet 1.

From V.V. Kuybyshev's Report 'On the Work of the TsKK and the NK RKI on Implementing the Resolutions of the 14th VKP(b) Congress' Submitted at the Second Plenum of the TsKK VKP(b) on Convening the 14th Party Congress

2 April 1926

I must discuss one circumstance which, it seems to me, should be noted by the TsKK Plenum. From the very beginning of our organization, we faced, clearly, a difficult problem: Would we oppose the central organizations, and, in particular, would the TsKK not oppose the party's Central Committee? We earmarked the type of organizational forms of work and relations with the party's Central Committee which prevented this from happening. We have sufficient bolshevik experience and understanding of the fact that only a single center can govern the party, which would prevent us from sliding down such a path. Today this path is blocked to us. It seems to me, however, that both in the center and in the local areas, our control commissions are somewhat leaning toward the other side. We have been able to block and eliminate one dangerous path: we shall not be an authority competing with the party organizations. However, would there not be a breakdown as well, in the sense that we frequently abandon our personality as authorities elected by that same congress or guberniya congress to perform specific party functions? I believe that this has occasionally taken place. We must thoroughly see to it that we do not compromise the very idea of the TsKK-RKI and the local control commissions and the nature of the ways and means which we must apply in order to prevent such a threat which directly and clearly faces our agencies. Simple observations frequently indicate that no one has heard of a control commission in one guberniya or another, that no such commission exists, or that it is essentially nothing other than an auxiliary authority of the respective guberniya committee.... We must consider this in its totality and, at all cost, a certain independence of the control commissions and the RKI, particularly on the part of the local party authorities, should be secured. I believe that we must secure it not with the help of far-fetched plans or fictitious relationships but develop it through the nature of our work. Concentrating the work of the local control commissions on control and verification and organizing such verification as a shock project for the local authorities, on the one hand, and the study by the control commissions of party problems, as authorities which could approach objectively the situation in a given party organization, on the other, would make the control commissions authorities with their own personality, able to perform extremely important and useful tasks for the party as a whole....

TsPA IML, file 79, archive I, case 314, sheets 29-32.

From the Concluding Speech by V.V. Kuybyshev at the Second Plenum of the TsKK VKP(b) on Convening the 14th Party Congress

2 April 1926

We must... improve and expand the work of the control-verification sector and allow it the opportunity to display greater initiative and the possibility of working more energetically. We must issue a directive for this sector to rally around itself the organizations of the working class and their initiative in the struggle against shortcomings. This is neither utopia nor fantasy. The working class and its organizations are rushing into the struggle against existing shortcomings.... In this respect mass initiative exists. It must be organized and rallied around a given center in the struggle against economic disorders. It is our control-verification sector that must become such a center.

Let me say openly and specifically the following: There have been less quarrels on problems of control and verification of the respective agencies; less exigency has been displayed toward the economic authorities; a series of investigations have been dropped, as though scandals which may occur in one area or another are none of our business but the business of the judiciary; if crimes are committed there, let these authorities deal with it.... Nor has there been for some time any desire on the part of the local authorities to engage in control. A liking for such work must be developed. Greater attention and initiative must be shown in selecting targets of investigation and the focal points which must be attacked with all possible energy and decisiveness!....

Something else concerning control and verification. I believe that, in the RKI personnel here, in the center, would confirm and, in all likelihood, so would the local personnel, that of late we are displaying greater conciliation and tolerance in the approach to the state apparatus in the course of our control and verification. The pace of this work has declined significantly and less energy is being applied.... I submitted to the Politburo the suggestion (14) to relieve us from some areas and traps which reduce our control and verification work entirely to zero in many cases. Coordination is an example of this. All of you know that the work on coordinating conclusions and suggestions and, initially, the work programs, involving departments, end up by emasculating the entire essence of any proposal. We engage in extremely protracted red tape. Eventually we nag one or another RKI official and, in the final account, he ends up by surrendering anything essential and central included in his proposals. The result is water, a thin gruel which does not teach or discipline anyone or conceal shortcomings. Why does this happen? This is because the technique followed in dealing with the problems is such that we must coordinate with the various departments all of our suggestions.

Both we and all control commissions have been extremely loyal in this respect. Before enacting a work program we send it to the head of the department. Usually, this is followed by a conference at which a draft program is formulated and then it is followed by several more conferences.

After the work program has been drafted and its study is initiated, we must coordinate the work process with the departments. Eventually, the conclusions are drafted. Before submitting them for ratification by the RKI collegium, they must be coordinated with the departments and establishments. Commissions are set up, meetings are held, amendments are made, etc. Weeks and months pass and when, finally, the problem is considered quite ripe and, in the course of translating it into understandable language, it has been waiting 2, 3 or 4 months in the offices of various departments, and it is in this mature and aged aspect that it is submitted for consideration by the collegium. This indeed becomes an old problem, for meanwhile it has lost its soul and it is only the corpse that remains after such departmental coordinations.

I believe that some changes should be made in such coordination practices. Naturally, we cannot operate without the heads of departments, somehow secretly, away from them, or apply the methods of the judicial authorities. In any case, however, amendments must be made in the practice of coordination. I have described an entire series of coordinations which have been applied and I submit to the Politburo to change our status in such a way that a matter may be considered coordinated whenever a given document has been sent to a department and the department has made certain corrections without conferences and commissions which usually consist not of the heads of departments but of second-level officials. Let the departmental manager himself closely study the work program and make the corrections he considers necessary. Specific deadlines must be set. If no corrections are received within a week, the work program will be considered approved. In the case of suggestions, representatives of departments must submit their corrections in precisely the same manner. It will depend on us whether we deem necessary, depending on such corrections, to set up a conference. I believe, however, that it would be more expedient to submit such corrections for consideration by the RKI collegium, where they will be pitted against suggestions which may be submitted by a given inspector. In this way the procedure for coordination would be simplified. This would make control and verification work faster, more energetic and more flexible. It would become significantly more lively and interesting. It would become the type of work which would rally around itself public opinion and the worker masses.

By its very nature, at the present time control-verification is a more thankful work method applied by the RKI and TsKK authorities, which are able to involve in such work a significantly broader circle of workers and peasants. Therefore, even from this viewpoint alone the control and verification work done by the local authorities must be maximally intensified. Believe me, comrades, that if we can organize verification and control work in a militant way, like a strike force, we would raise the sea of people and draw to ourselves the attention of the masses and be able to assume leadership in the

campaign which is now being mounted by the party in the areas of economy and thrift. At that point it would become unnecessary to raise the questions of relations with party committees, their subordination to the control commissions, etc. In the course of that struggle both the RKI and the local control commissions were able to hammer out their own independence and personality. At this point we may have to quarrel with the party committees or, perhaps, with the Central Committee. Any quarrels and arguments on a specific problem does not mean that one agency becomes pitted against another. Naturally, in the final account the decision is in the hands of the Central Committee or the local committee. However, having mastered in a given rayon the movement for thrift and economy, on the one hand, the control commissions would find their own specific place in the interrelationships which exist among all agencies; on the other, they would acquire a specific identity which would make it impossible to confuse them with any financial department or any department of a party committee. Such are the consequences, in the sense of increasing our influence within the party and among the toiling masses, that the work of the control commissions should have in party problems. If greater attention is paid to such party problems than it is paid now, and if every member of a control commission makes it his prime obligation to study life, the sum total of experience which would be acquired by the control commissions would enable them to act not only as a punitive authority but as an agency which organizes the party and which helps the respective party committee to manage the party organization. At that point the local control commissions would again develop an identity. They will have a specific position and tasks and status in the overall work of the party organizations of a rayon or guberniya....

TsPA IML, file 79, archive I, case 315, sheets 50, 53-54, 55-58, 66-67.

Letter by F.E. Dzerzhinskiy

3 July 1926

To Comrade Kuybyshev:

Dear Valerian! Hereby are my thoughts and suggestions on the management system. The current system is a vestige. Today we already have people who can assume responsibility. Currently they are drowning in various coordinations, accounts, papers and commissions. The capitalists individually handle their own facilities and are responsible for them. In our country now the STO and the Politburo are responsible for everything. We cannot compete in this manner with private owners and capitalism. We are not working but playing. The functional commissariats with their fields of competence are paralyzing both life and the bureaucrats. We shall not cure this paralysis without surgery, without daring, without blows. Everyone is waiting for such surgery. Everyone is waiting for the right words and actions. In terms of

our internal party situation this will indicate a rebirth. The opposition will be overwhelmed by the tasks which the party will set. Currently we are in a swamp. Everywhere we find discontent and expectations. Our external situation is also difficult. Increasingly, England is surrounding us with nets of steel. The revolution in that country is not about to happen soon. We must at all cost rally all forces around the party. The economic managers as well as of great importance. Today they are depressed and confused. I personally and my fellow workers have also become immeasurably "tired" of this situation. There is total helplessness and we are unable to do anything by ourselves. Everything is in the hands of the functional officials—Sheynman (15) and Frumkin (16). This should not be. We keep writing and writing. This should not be either. Meanwhile, we have neither the time nor strength to deal with the most important problems which are facing us.... Our trade unions as well are sleeping. We are failing to find a common language and we keep coordinating. We must fight as much as possible and prepare to defend our positions.

As to our cooperatives, we try to lead them to socialism while it keeps demanding aid, fleecing consumers and industry, preventing us seriously from formulating and solving the problem of the private entrepreneurs, who keeps growing and acquiring more and more things. The cooperatives are rejecting my measures against profiteering and the planned procurements to private entrepreneurs so that they, by lowering their prices, could force the cooperatives to do the same.

In addition to management problems, we must raise and solve the following problems seriously and not as we are doing now:

Labor discipline;

Cooperatives;

Private entrepreneurs and profiteering;

Parochialism.

Today we have neither a single line nor a firm authority. Each commissariat, each deputy or assistant, every member of a people's commissariat, is following its or his own line. Decisions are not made accurately, speedily and promptly.

I most strenuously object to the existing situation and am fighting with everyone, although without results. I realize, however, that only the party and its unity can help us to solve the problem, for I realize that my actions can strengthen those who will most likely lead both the party and the country to their doom, i.e., people like Trotsky, Zinovyev, Pyatakov and Shlyapnikov. What am I to do? I am entirely confident that we shall be able to deal with all the enemies if we can find and chart an

accurate line in the practical administration of the country and the economy, if we regain the pace we have lost and which is now lagging behind the requirements of reality.

Unless we find this line and pace, the opposition will grow and at that point the country will find its dictator, who will be the gravedigger of the revolution, however sumptuous the clothing he dons may be....

I too am tired of such contradictions.

I have repeatedly submitted my resignation. You must make a decision soon. With such thoughts and pains I can not be chairman of the VSNKh. Such feelings emanate and contaminate others as you can obviously see.

Yours, F. Dzerzhinskiy

TsPA IML. file 76, archive IV, case 3543, sheets 1-2.

Footnotes

1. Reference to the 13th RKP(b) Congress (23-31 May 1924).

2. See item 4 of the resolution of the 13th RKP(b) Congress "On the Work of Control Commissions" ("KPSS v Rezolyutsiyakh i Resheniyakh Syezdov, Konferentsiy i Plenumov TsK" [CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses and Conferences and Central Committee Plenums]. 9th edition, vol 3, Moscow, 1984, p 227).

3. Outline of the speech by V.V. Kuybyshev at the First All-Union Conference of VSNKh on Production Rationalization, which was held in Moscow on 4-9 November 1925.

4. Apparently meaning the Commission for Legislative Proposals of USSR SNK.

5. This note reflects V.V. Kuybyshev's reaction to someone's statement. It is no accident that the first part of the note is in quotation marks.

6. Reference to Lenin's articles "How to Reorganize the Rabkrin (Suggestions Submitted at the 12th Party Congress)" and "Better Less But Better" (see V.I. Lenin, "Poln. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], v 45, pp 383-406).

7. "KPSS v Rezolyutsiyakh...." v 3, p 439.

8. See SOBRANIYE UZAKONENIY i RASPORYAZHENIY, Nos 109-110, 1923, pp 1042, 1873-1880.

9. Ibid., 1877.

10. See V.I. Lenin, op. cit., v 45, p 406.

11. See *ibid.*, pp 405-406, 387.
12. Apparently F.E. Dzerzhinskiy had expressed his view to V.V. Kuybyshev verbally, for which reason sending this letter had become unnecessary.
13. See the preceding document.
14. See p 99 of this journal's issue.
15. A.L. Sheynman was deputy people's commissar for foreign and domestic trade, chairman of the board of the USSR Gosbank and deputy people's commissar of finance of the USSR.
16. M.I. Frumkin was deputy people's commissar of finance of the USSR.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Everything Should be Mentioned

180200131 Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian
No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 105-107

[Letter to the editors by Petr Alekseyevich Yankevskiy, born 1944, Moscow]

[Text] I liked very much the articles in *KOMMUNIST* on problems of the history of the first decades of the Soviet system. Of late one can quite frequently read and hear that the methods of naked administration were possible exclusively in the 1930s, that at that time there was no other way of enhancing the work of industry, and so on. With the help of facts and figures, the journal has proved the opposite, quite convincingly in my view. Advise me, please, how better to study economic and political sciences. By this I mean what to read and in what sequence.

The point is that I am extremely short of time: I subscribe to *EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA*, *MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA* and *KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA*; in addition, I have now subscribed to the journals *KOMMUNIST* and *POLITICHESKOYE OBRAZOVANIYE*, not counting *SOVETSKIY EKRAN* and *VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA*. Furthermore, there are also the materials of the 27th CPSU Congress and the latest plenums, the Law on the State Enterprise, and others that must be read. Additionally, today television programs have become much more interesting, including those dealing with economic matters. I have totally stopped reading fiction. Recently I borrowed from the public library a book by V. Bykov. The time I started reading it I received *EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA*, and the book is now pushed aside and, I fear, that it is the way it will remain until I take it back. I feel ashamed to return a book unread. I do not know what to do: I would like to read *EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA* and

KOMMUNIST, as well as Lenin (since June of last year I have been able to read only two of his volumes: No 31 and No 45, as well as some of his individual articles and books such as "The State and Revolution," "The Forthcoming Tasks..." and others, but all this is quite insufficient); furthermore, *MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA* has begun to publish many interesting articles....

Should I go back to school? But where? Here there is no talk whatsoever about any kind of universal economic training. Generally speaking, one could also learn by oneself, the shortcoming being that there is no inter-course although there are some problems that should be discussed and even argued with others. I personally am unable to do this practically, for at work there is no one with whom I could discuss anything. In other words, there are people, of course, but they are interested in entirely different matters: who drank how much, who got a bribe and from whom, etc. I have tried to interest some people about the new law and about cost accounting. Virtually no one (among those I know) has any idea about cost accounting nor wants to know. Infantilism has become so strong that everyone hopes that someone else will make all decisions and do all that is necessary. Occasionally I cannot even believe that I am speaking to adults. Let me cite an example from my practical experience and, at the same time, seek advice from an economist as to what to do.

I work as a joiner in a PMK (mobile mechanized column—which is a rather pretentious name for our office, which should actually be described as a rayon building administration) of the RSFSR Gosagroprom. Essentially my work is to finish cabinets, i.e., to line the walls with pressed hardwood. We also use this material for "built-in" shelves which, incidentally, is almost illegal, for according to some obsolete instructions such "built-in" walls are forbidden. That is why officially they are described as built-in shelves, for example. The people who order such shelves come in a great variety in terms of age, position and character. What unites them, however, is some kind of sensitive attitude to anything prestigious: who has what kind of office, car, and so on. They totally ignore me and discuss in my presence anything they like. It is not a question of the fact that I feel a sense of indignation at their attitude, although I have a reason for that, but the fact that, in hearing people discuss and express themselves entirely freely, I unwittingly become acquainted with their way of thinking and acting. Thus, in the 7 years that I have spent at work for the RSFSR Gosagroprom (MSKh) I have developed an opinion concerning such people. Albeit arguable, it is my own: their cultural and educational standards are low (essentially), not to mention their political and economic standards. Occasionally, looking at my tools, most of which were bought with my own money, the owners of such offices and their visitors remark on their wretchedness, claiming that they have seen elsewhere very good tools (particularly electric-powered, referred to as "minor mechanization"), something which we do not have. I hear this and think that wherever such tools exist there probably are no such managers.

Obviously, the problem here that no superior likes a subordinate to be more intelligent than he is and selects as his assistants people "who are not about to catch a star in the heavens," thus gradually equalizing the standard. And if accidentally an intelligent and knowledgeable person finds himself among them, he will be gradually brought down to their level. Let us consider our economic managements and their work. To begin with, however, I do not know who established the structure of such administrations and when, was this economically substantiated or was it done "at random?" People are many and everyone is a chief, but no one is responsible for anything. How is the work organized? Here is how: a council gathers, consisting of the chief of the KhoZU, the chief of the OKS, the chief of the PMK, and a worker organizer or, sometimes, several. It is they who decide whether a plank must be put here, a little shelf made there, paint something, and so on. After a while, they meet again and everything is repeated all over again. I feel like laughing and crying at the same time. It seems to me that they are not concerned in the least with doing truly knowledgeable work which would make such stupidity unnecessary.

Currently, being a nondrinker, I have been assigned to a plant manufacturing champagne: here as well shelves are being made for the chiefs. Incidentally, I have always wondered as to the origin of such money for finishing these shelves, for they cost several thousand rubles per month, depending on their size. And so, I notice what is being done, and it is virtually indescribable, although on the surface everything, in all likelihood, is presented in a quite seemly manner. In my view, everyone here drinks and anyone has access to wine. I already said that, as a rule, no one notices me, so that people drink entirely freely in my presence. Here I am finishing a shelf. In addition to its owner, there will be two other people present, who would be either drinking or sleeping in their chairs. They have had a sink installed in the office, although right next door there is a washroom and a toilet. I asked the procurement worker why not remove the sink and add more shelves. Her answer was that they were asked that the sink be concealed within a cupboard, for they find it inconvenient, being chiefs, to wash their mugs. But there is more. They receive books from the printing press which they then sell to their associates. Some members of the militia come to drink and party with them.

Incidentally, I would not fine the drunks but make them work off their fines in their leisure time. This way their families would not suffer, their punishment would be of some use, and they would feel it.

I keep being amazed as to how is it possible for such a negligently run plant to have substantial funds for repairing and finishing the offices of its various chiefs. Here the full complement of managers, like that of a very large company may be found: it has a director, chief engineer, chief mechanic, chief power worker, a design bureau, chiefs of shops, laboratories and services, and so on. The

fact that the number of their subordinates is miserably small is unimportant. What matters is that all managerial positions are filled. How can their salaries be paid if the losses are substantial because of the goods which have been consumed at the enterprise instead of going to the customers? Yet it is being said that they have converted to cost accounting. Eventually a woman with her young daughter went to see one of the chiefs and asked that the daughter be hired in an institute or similar establishment. He rang up several enterprises but, apparently, nothing happened, and he said: "These are bad times, everywhere personnel is being reduced and it is very difficult to find a job for someone who is, furthermore, only 16." And all of this is taking place now, when real life is beginning, although, it is true, so far only in an embryonic state.

I am not advocating for this plant to be penalized although this would not be bad, but would like to see all sorts of thefts be stopped and that the administrative apparatus be reduced substantially. To achieve this, however, it is necessary to introduce full cost accounting as soon as possible and to increase the efficiency of self-government in all areas. I think that the ministries themselves should be interested in protecting their fixed capital and reducing personnel and saving on funds allocated for repairs and reconstruction instead of trying, as is sometimes the case now, to develop totally groundless NPO (in my view, such institutions should be urgently created in order to provide new jobs, retrain and, above all, urgently determine the number and type of specialists to be trained in VUZs), create other organizations such as scientific research institutes, and so on.

I am totally unable to understand whether we have converted to cost accounting or not and whether the Law on the Enterprise has been applied or not. No preparations whatsoever are being made here to the best of my knowledge. If we convert to cost accounting we should be acquainted with the nature of our assets, long-term rates and many other facts. In my view, we should change the entire structure of the enterprise. In other words, we should determine how many people should be employed in management, how many in procurements, how many in bookkeeping, and so on. In our section, for example, there are two worker organizers per 10 to 20 workers (the number of workers fluctuates), although one of them has nothing to do other than happily drink vodka. Incidentally, that is probably why the resolution on the struggle against drunkenness is not working: the managers drink no less than their subordinates and this provides for mutual insurance. It is only full cost accounting, in my view, that will create conditions for a sober way of life, for if personnel reductions become inevitable, the people will get rid first of the drunks and the very conditions of the work would make it impossible to drink during working time. Imagine the following: the two worker organizers come to me but not for purposes of work but for drinking free wine. They sit in my little room and, consuming their bottles, solve global problems of, for example, how to pay at my expense the salary of two

other people (this illustrates the system of differentiated wages), and tell me, at that, that I have become entirely wasted, for I do not drink. What kind of pleasure is it to feed such "managers" out of my own pocket? It would be a different matter in the case of teachers and educators, whose salaries could be raised so that more men would become teachers and only if they have a vocation for it. But how to fight "managers" of the kind I have described?

You may think that I am deliberately worsening the situation. It is precisely the opposite. I do not fear to speak out against them at a meeting if, naturally, such a meeting is held. I am afraid, however, that mine would be a voice in the desert, for our people have become thoroughly corrupted by such managers. I am referring not only to our office but to all similar PMK, SMU and RSU of ministries and departments, where the superior organization are also the customers. Our enterprise should either be consolidated in order to set up large specialized brigades and not find ourselves in paradoxical situations in which we are forced to depend on a single superior customer or else, conversely, set up small comprehensive brigades which would be absolutely independent, naturally within the limits of the law, something with which our leadership is either poorly familiar or is simply concealing, for it finds it inconvenient. That was my second question. Here is the third: On 15 and 16 January MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA published the article "On the Ruble and on Conscience." Generally speaking, I liked it up to the point where it described the fact that an automated control system for technical rates had been applied at the Geofizpribor Association, and that although this is a strong enterprise, there are no workers here who outstrip the norms. The article quotes the chief of the labor and wages department of the carburetors plant: "Five, 8 or 10 percent of overfulfillment of the norm proves honest and conscientious labor." What is this? Is it lack of understanding or, perhaps, something worse? Could it be that this is a big flat iron with which some people would like to flatten our society?

Please excuse this chaos. I started writing this letter on four different occasions and each time I started with something entirely different and now I have finally decided to send what I have written although I have been unable to describe anything thoroughly although I would have liked to describe all.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Old Practice?

18020013m Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 107-108

[Letter to the editors by T. Yarushina, candidate of philosophical sciences, docent, Department of Scientific Communism, Moscow Institute of Electronic Technology]

[Text] Under conditions in which the need for ideological support of perestroika becomes categorical, it is entirely inadmissible to erect yet another barrier sepa-

rating students and Marxist theory, in the guise of bureaucratic questions included in the program for state examinations in Marxism-Leninism for the 1987/88 school year, questions which touch neither the heart nor the mind. Issued by superior authorities, they were received in the department as "imperatives." In this case, why is there a collective of the department, why is there a department head?

The main shortcoming of the questions is that they do not provide an overall concept of Marxism. They are not aimed at the main feature: ensuring the individual approach of the students to theory, to the fact that they **themselves**, under the guidance of their teacher, realize the accuracy of the initial postulates and the entire methodology. The worst type of abstraction—metaphysical—imbues all questions both in terms of content and form. The section on scientific communism—those same old "nature, features, structure, laws"—make me fear that the answers as well will have to be given according to the tried method: going down a list, while understanding remains outside. Here are examples: "Radical difference between the social consequences of scientific and technical progress under socialism and capitalism;" and "Ways of surmounting essential differences between town and country and mental and physical labor, and achieving social equality." All of these are presented as though all such ways have long become clear to everyone and that "achieving social homogeneity" is the most vital task of our reforms. The words "acceleration," "perestroika," and "new thinking" have been mechanically added to the old cliches. What about the topical problems? They even include "drug addiction" but not, for example, the history of utopian socialism; problems of surmounting utopian ideology have been ignored.

Although officially the questions asked in the section on "CPSU History" are "accurate," they are nonetheless not aimed at the search for interpretation. There are a great deal of straight declarative cliches (such as "need for high rates of industrialization"), and evaluations rather than analytical formulations (the question of the cult of personality is "tucked under" the topic of "The Victory of Socialism in the USSR"). Above all, the very concept of this section includes that of socialism as a society which develops without contradictions and choices.

What about the section on philosophy? A great deal is being said about the ties linking philosophy with life. Nonetheless, in the topic "Society and Nature" not a word is said about ecology or the noosphere. Or else consider the topic of "Art as a Form of Social Awareness." Lenin's works cited in this topic do not even mention proper excerpts from his "Philosophical Notebooks." The only concepts mentioned in the area of contemporary bourgeois philosophy subject to extensive critical analysis are only the notorious "neopositivism, existentialism and neo-Thomism."

The general impression created by the program is such that it has virtually no topics covering contemporary sociohistorical practices in their entire variety, contradictions and real practical data supporting theoretical categories. This leads to the most terrible consequences in the conversion of socialist and communist ideals into the worst type of dogma. The study of Marxist-Leninist theory, paradoxically, becomes an obstacle to the utilization of its entire potential in the education and molding of the socialist personality.

The questions, however, have been "issued." Again and again such a formulation of the matter leads only to its rejection.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

'Dear and Precious'

18020013n Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian
No 7, May 88 (signed to press 5 Apr 88) pp 108-109

[Letter to the editors by V. Chudov, head of laboratory, USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Machine Studies imeni A.A. Blagonravov, candidate of technical sciences]

[Text] I was impressed by the debate on price setting (*KOMMUNIST* No 1, 1988). However, both T. Khabarova's scholastic article and V. Belkin's realistic answer deal exclusively with the quantitative aspect of the problem, totally ignoring that of quality and its dependence on the price setting method. T. Khabarova writes about objects of "mass consumption with an energetically lowered production cost," as being an achievement of socialism. It obviously did not occur to her how this "energetic reduction" could be achieved and the reason for which for a long time to come we shall be experiencing its consequences. We should remember the Russian sayings of "precious and dear and cheap and rotten" or "better less but better." I was a turner and subsequently became a designer and a scientific worker-metrologist. My entire life has been involved in production work (interrupted by the war and schooling). My total practical experience (46 years) allows me to speak out as an eyewitness.

In life nothing is free. Nor is quality. There is no free quality. Today the cost of state inspection is inevitable. This is like an oxygen cylinder used in emergency aid in terms of the quality of our machine building which, frankly, finds itself in a difficult situation. A person not directly related to the production process would have difficulty imagining for himself the gravity of the situation and realizing the type of legacy we inherited.

Once again the fashionable statement emerges: "Under Stalin prices dropped with every passing year." Yes, prices dropped somewhat but at what cost? Those who say that forget to add that every year valuations declined

substantially. As to what this technological predatory attitude led to, let us consider the example of a plant with which I am familiar, the First State Bearings Plant, in Moscow. Half a century ago, the GPZ-1 reached planned capacity. It employed 25,000 people and used the then latest imported equipment (such as the semiautomatic machines produced by the "Hild" Company used in drilling holes; they were scraped quite recently). During that time some aspects of the work were automated but the number of workers remained virtually the same—over 20,000.

Production output (in pieces) increased by a factor of eight (!). How was this achieved? There was no technological revolution. There was the traditional type of work and a worsened abrasive (the Norton abrasive). With an annual reduction of prices the only solution was to lower the technological standard, work savagely and eliminate operations and stages which would ensure quality. The result? Defective goods. In the 1970s the bearings industry was partially supplied with automatic control systems which were fully operational and tuned in accordance with state standards. Millions of wheels and bearings flowed like a river toward these automated systems out of which came a thin stream of suitable items which were exported, while the rest was left for home use.

For decades the domestic market did not receive adequate bearings. Army orders were the exception. In this case prices were different and so were precision standards; the discarded products (as much as 95 percent) went to the long line of moaning civilian consumers ("we know your kind of output. We cry but we buy it").

Some time ago academician N.G. Bruyevich dug out statistical figures on automotive repairs and found out that when ball bearings break down the cost of dismantling and replacing them increases the cost of the ball bearing itself between a factor of 10 and 1,000. Hence the billions of rubles which we ruinously spend on repairs. The bearings are so inexpensive that even France buys them from us and considers that it is cheaper to discard parts rather than repair them. The conclusion is quite obvious: let the bearings cost five times more but let their quality double (in terms of durability and "usability"). This would pay for itself!

As Ye.I. Taratorkin, a tuner of milling machines, noted at the meeting between the collective of the GPZ-1 and M.S. Gorbachev, "today quality is our main concern and we are doing a great deal in this area. However, this is our common problem and must be solved together by both us and those who supply us with metal and equipment."

Realizing this, the leadership of the Minavtoprom did not stint and in recent years the equipment for abrasive machining has been replaced almost entirely. This alone drastically improved quality. Unfortunately, there was not enough foreign exchange to purchase equipment for

preliminary operations. We are unable to obtain high-grade metal. The prices remain just as low and the plan, the figures of which exceed anything that could be considered sensible, does not allow us to give serious thought to applying a quality technology.

Could appeals and orders help to restore technological violations? In this case even state inspection remains helpless. The personnel would simply go elsewhere and for quite some time now the GPZ has been relying on piece-rate workers, students, soldiers, 15-day workers or simply debauchers who would work for 10 rubles per shift, so long as they can obtain a work card. How long can the new machine tools last with this kind of treatment? And what will happen then? Where shall we find the foreign exchange? State inspection does not produce new machine tools and itself costs money.

Generally speaking, the imposition of control systems is not a solution but a necessary yet a temporary, artificial step. Such systems cannot replace natural control on the part of the consumer, with each purchase. However, such control requires the implementation of the resolutions and suggestions of the 27th Congress on trade in means of production. At that point there will also be price setting (instead of the present price imposition) and self-regulating amounts of capital overflow (Adam Smith's "invisible hand") and that which only competition can provide—quality.

Do not frighten us, for this does not require private ownership, cooperative ownership or a 19th century-type market; computer models developed by Kantorovich have long been at work. We have no reason to abandon socialism but we must abandon illiteracy and weak efforts to cling to power where no such power is needed, where it can only be harmful.

Democracy in the superstructure (elections of directors) becomes meaningful only with democracy at the base (choice of suppliers). This is the feedback without which no complex system can be viable.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

'With Hope for Aid and Support'

*18020013o Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) p 109*

[Text] From the Letters and Social Problems Department:

For several years Orenburg resident A.M. Fursov has tried to find out what happened to his father who vanished during the Great Patriotic War. The son addressed himself to the Main Personnel Administration of the USSR Ministry of Defense, its Central Archives and Military-Medical Museum, the oblast military commissariat in Tambov Oblast and the Orenburg Oblast

veterans' council. He wrote to the oblast newspaper YUZHNY URAL and the all-Union KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. He has now turned to us "with the hope for aid and support" and the request to publish his letter "as an exception."

We have decided to accept this exception and, at the same time, to raise the following question: Where can today a person legitimately address himself, if he cares for the fate of lost relatives and who would like to find out about them all that he can? Newspapers and journals cannot deal with the tremendous flow of such questions, which come into the hundreds of thousands (in its "Search" section KRASNAYA ZVEZDA can publish only letters by war veterans. The archives complain of lack of full-time personnel and of full information. Activists in search detachments themselves must answer the questions asked by those archives. Isolated appeals are directed to the Red Cross. All such efforts are unsystematic and of small use.

An attempt was made to organize special broadcasts, directed by writers Sergey Smirnov on television and Agniya Barto on the radio. Could such efforts be of use today as well? The suggestion has been made to publish a mass bulletin containing such appeals. Should we not study the possibility of organizing such a publication? We believe that today such problems are of major social significance.

For the time being, as an exception we provide data which our reader asked us to publish. His father, who vanished without a trace, was Senior Lt Mikhail Vasilyevich Fursov, born 1912 in Ivanovka Village, Aleksandrovskiy Rayon, Orenburg Oblast; in 1941 and 1942 he fought on the Voronezh front; in 1942-1943 he was treated in a Tambov hospital; in 1943 he served in the 66th Reserve Infantry Regiment. His son begs the comrades who knew his father to write him to the following address: 460036, Orenburg, 102 Karagandinskaya Street, District 66, A.M. Fursov.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Contradictions in the Development of Socialist Self-Governing Democracy in Yugoslavia

*18020013p Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 110-115*

[Article by Najdan Pashich, professor, department of political sciences, Belgrade University. Article written especially for KOMMUNIST, prepared by SOTSIYALIZAM, journal of the Yugoslav League of Communists]

[Text] The history of the establishment of a system of socialist self-government in Yugoslavia is slightly under 40 years old. One can say that this history has had either a direct or indirect influence beyond the country's borders as well.

What is it that makes the Yugoslav experience interesting and, in its own way, unique and which, at the same time, makes it a suitable subject for a comparative political study? Although the results of Yugoslavia's previous development can be assessed differently, a number of undeniable facts remain.

Yugoslavia made the first large-scale effort at shifting self-government from the area of theoretical developments to daily practice and making it an intrinsic part of the way of life of millions of people. To this day this is the only example of a more or less successful peaceful conversion from a system of party-state monopoly to a system based on acknowledging the pluralism of self-governing interests and democratic forms applied in their coordination and harmony.

The process of establishment of the self-governing system in Yugoslavia is one of the most interesting examples of daring and far-reaching "sociopolitical engineering" in our time. The four postwar Yugoslav constitutions, the last two in particular, those of 1963 and 1964, are a comprehensive plan for the new type of socioeconomic and political organization of society. Taking this into consideration, the best way to study the possibilities, limits and consequences of large-scale "political engineering" can be studied on the basis of the Yugoslav experience. This also applies to the gap between law-making and the realities of political life and the consequences which such disparities between laws and reality may have in terms of different political systems and different countries.

The material prerequisite for the development of a new type of socialist democracy in Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav economic and political system is the social ownership of the means of production, which is a specific form of eliminating state ownership monopoly.

Public ownership means that all production forces belong to society as a whole. They are neither the ownership of the state nor of individuals or groups of workers who use and manage them. The workers within the organizations for joint labor have been given the right to handle the publicly owned means of production and to use them. This includes making decisions on problems related to the results of their labor, including the right to an appropriate share of the profits as personal income and for joint consumption together with other workers, on an equal basis. As self-governing, the workers are responsible for the public means of production they use and with which they generate profit and must care for such assets, multiply their yield and use them efficiently in their personal and the public interest.

The main criterion of what has been actually achieved in the development of workers of government is the extent of the real participation of workers in basic and other organizations for joint labor in solving problems of production and distribution and all other social affairs.

Consequently, the concept of worker self-government was developed not simply as a combination of measures the purpose of which is to facilitate and perhaps partially to compensate for the negative consequences of relations based on hiring and the hired status of workers, and not merely as an institutional framework for a broad democratic participation of the people in decision-making in economics and other areas of social life. The objective of the self-government concept is to make a fundamental change in basic production relations which, in turn, is the starting point and foundation for all other social worker rights and freedoms.

The claim that the main contradiction which is at the base of the entire process of the self-governing reorganization of the economic and political structure of society is the clash of interests related to the key question of what group, class or social stratum is truly in a position which enables it to control the distribution of the national income and, particularly, the possibility of determining the amount of "public capital," i.e., the allocation of funds for expanded reproduction, may be found in Yugoslav political and sociological theory and in some major political documents. Does this power belong to the workers in self-governing enterprises or to the professional-political management stratum in the various administrative-territorial units of state power? A great gap and great disparity in relations may be found on this level, between those stipulated in the Constitution and other fundamental laws (such as the Law on Joint Labor) and actual practices. No serious study of Yugoslav reality can ignore such problems or leave unanswered questions related to the reasons or roots of said disparity and the possibility of surmounting it. Particularly important in this context is the question of the social nature and role of the professional political-managerial stratum in Yugoslavia. Unquestionably, this stratum had and still has quite strong positions and enjoys a great deal of prestige and authority. Its origins rest on the victorious outcome of the people's liberation struggle and the socialist revolution, and the successful opposition to rigid political and ideological pressure applied by the Cominform during Stalin's time.

The position held by this political ruling stratum and its internal unity were further strengthened as a result of the fact that it firmly supported the self-governing ideology and the reconstruction of the entire "infrastructure and superstructure" of the society, based on relations of self-government in production. The successful mobilization of the toiling masses through new forms of participation under the conditions of a self-governing democracy in the course of the economic building of the country brought impressive and obvious results (particularly in the first 25 years of development of self-government) and the feeling that Yugoslavia had made great progress, outstripping several other countries which, at the start of the 1950s, were approximately on the same level of economic and cultural development as that of Yugoslavia.

All of these factors contributed to the relatively high trust and moral authority enjoyed by the Yugoslav political leadership and its nucleus, the stratum of the "old fighters" (the political and military leadership during the war). This ensured the peaceful transformation of the party organizations of a state-cadre type, which consisted of several tens of thousands of convinced professional revolutionaries, into a mass party which numbered more than 2 million members and retained a rather high level of ideological unity and internal party discipline.

However, the strong positions held by the professional political-managerial stratum and the decisive influence it had on the process of political decision-making (which explains the relative political stability which, despite the economic crisis, remains dominant, as well as the steady legal development of self-governing system) became, in time, one of the main obstacles to the systematic implementation of planned democratic changes, the purpose of which is to eliminate the monopoly of group interests and strengthen the true self-governing interest of pluralism.

Starting with 1950, as a result of the development of the social self-government system, there were far-reaching consequences in Yugoslavia in the area of revolutionary transformations in all areas of social life. This was a true revolution, but a revolution initiated and guided "from above." And, as is the case with all revolutions "from above," the revolutionary processes in Yugoslavia triggered major contradictions affecting above all the present and future role of the political ruling stratum in the system of the existing and even institutionalized pluralism of interests.

Despite firm support for the line of developing social self-government, inevitably this stratum displayed personal interests related to the preservation of the existing power structure and the privileged status of the political ruling stratum. In terms of its consequences, from the positions of special interests, those of the stratum of professional party and state officials, the ideology of self-government is also the ideology of self-destruction. Simply stated, any more or less significant practical step taken toward the implementation of the proclaimed long-term objectives for the systematically developed self-governing system, capable of self-reproduction without the authoritarian interference of the political forces of the state, inevitably clashed with the positions of the party apparatus, for it remained the integral and most influential segment of the existing power structure. Thus, all radical changes and steps of a more modest order, aimed at the weakening and total elimination of bureaucratic paternalism dominating self-governing relations and institutions inevitably triggered the nonarbitrary or deliberate opposition within the powerful stratum of professional managers, including a segment of the party's leadership. Under the cover of formal ideological and political unity, there were frequent differences in views and interests and a clash between them inside the

individual agencies of state and party leadership, influencing the process of decision-making and its content, related to the many existing conflict situations.

Let us note that despite all efforts the problem of the bureaucratization of the political system and the revolutionary party itself has never been denied or ignored in Yugoslav political theory or political documents. Unquestionably, it is a question of a very important democratic legacy from the period of the elaboration and laying the foundations of a society of socialist self-government.

The 1958 program of the Yugoslav League of Communists, which was not changed or supplemented later, most emphatically stressed the danger of bureaucratic degeneration of the ruling Communist Party. Such degeneration is inevitable if the party implements its leading role in building socialism by relying, above all, on the instruments of state power. It is thus that the party itself becomes practically part of the state machinery of command and coercion.

According to the party program the party's leading role in defining the main trends of social development is historically determined by the laws of the class struggle and limited to the transitional period from capitalism to socialism. As the state withers away the party will also wither away as a specific political organization.

However, more important compared to these general theoretical stipulations and essential concepts, are the democratic principles, organizations, ways and means of activity and political orientation of the party. The most essential among them are the following:

a. The organization and leadership of the League of Communists and the state machinery must be clearly separated from each other on all levels of the political organization, from top to bottom. In the words of the program itself, the party must play an increasingly lesser leading political role or provide necessary influence from the positions of state power and increasingly from within, within the self-governing structures, through the democratic participation of party members in the political solution of problems in agencies such as worker councils, assemblies, self-governing associations based on common interests and sociopolitical organizations.

b. The League of Communists does not claim the monopoly of expression and implementation of the authentic interests of the working class and the socialist development of society as a whole. Freedom of speech, the free struggle of differing opinions and the autonomous role of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People, the trade unions, the union of war veterans, the youth organization and other organizations and party associations must not only be considered as self-evident but also actively supported.

c. Scientific studies and the development of the natural and social sciences must not be subjected to any kind of foreign policy control. "Science is its own judge," the party program stipulates.

At no single period in its history has the ruling party (including the League of Communists) proved to be fully on the level of the great democratic requirements and standards set in its own program. This, however, does not mean that the program of the League of Communists and the programmatic stipulations included in the last two constitutions are fictitious and without any real significance and influence on social and political reality. The open criticism of bureaucratic distortions which these documents contain and the warnings about the bureaucratization of the party itself became inexhaustible sources of a critical mood within the League of Communists and in molding political and public opinion in general.

Throughout the entire period from 1958 to the present, numerous specific steps were taken to close the gap between the lofty ideals and requirements of the party program and the Constitution, on the one hand, and political reality, on the other. The list of such steps would be quite long. Let us cite some of them:

1. The separation of executive functions within the League of Communists and the government; the rule is that the same individual cannot exercise two executive functions simultaneously.
2. The constitution calls for a separation of functions among sociopolitical organizations; the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia and the trade unions have been assigned special obligations in the holding of elections and implementing overall cadre policy.
3. Gradual deprofessionalization of the leadership of the League of Communists and the other sociopolitical organizations.
4. Restricting the possibility of a secondary election to most important political and social positions and a strict limitation on the term of such mandates.
5. Principles and regulations governing collective leadership (collective procedure for decision-making and collective responsibility); regular replacement of individuals holding leading positions (chairmen or heads of all political and state agencies).
6. A political recommendation (which is not the rule) concerning the fact that in elections for any position within the state apparatus or a sociopolitical organization no less than two or more candidates should be nominated.

The extent of the energetic and consistent implementation of the steps aimed at the struggle against bureaucracy and ensuring democratic pluralism in the political system showed tangible differences at different times, which led to different practical results. Unquestionably, a more profound analysis of the reasons for no more than partial successes in the implementation of the antibureaucratic measures we enumerated is of theoretical interest and practical significance.

Under the conditions of the continuing economic crisis and the intensified critical moods of the party membership and a high percentage of the population which is suffering from inflation and unemployment, it is becoming increasingly harder to conceal and tolerate the obvious bureaucratic distortions in the political system and in the League of Communists itself. In the past, under President Tito, professional political leaders enjoyed high authority and prestige. In the past few years both have declined noticeably.

Today the most widespread political demands in Yugoslavia are not only those calling for further institutional changes in the legal structure of the economic and political system and, naturally, are not reduced to a rejection of the fundamental principles of self-government. One of the most frequent is, unquestionably, the demand for radical changes in the structure of the professional political-managerial stratum, which long ago monopolized key political positions in the government and in political life in general. However, these are precisely the changes which are the most difficult to achieve.

It is clear that the professional political-managerial stratum, which has been in power for more than 40 years, shows neither the desire nor readiness to surrender its current status. In the course of a lengthy period of uninterrupted rule, the professional political management became aware of its own interests. The ideological substantiation of such interests is the aspiration to identify them with the values and objectives of socialist self-government. This stratum developed and mastered the mechanism of self-reproduction. The existing mechanism is based more on co-opting than on free elections in sociopolitical organizations and associations.

Despite all the democratic changes which have taken place in Yugoslav society in the past several decades, the monopoly of a "narrow political circle" in the area of "cadre policy" or, in other words, in the choice of political cadres and the allocation of political and other leading positions and functions, remains a sector unaffected by such changes. This monopoly is the main source for the authoritarian bureaucratic system in Yugoslavia. It is only by taking this fact into consideration that we can explain why, behind the broad official mechanism of self-governing institutions and representative authorities, relying on a wide network of elected delegations and delegates, an informal power structure

has taken shape, consisting of small oligarchies of professional political leaders, i.e., individuals heading socio-political organizations and basic state institutions, assemblies and executive authorities. In order for self-governing democracy in Yugoslavia to be able to take a real step forward, a radical reform is needed in the electoral system on all levels of the political organization of society.

Work is currently under way on amending the Yugoslav Constitution and the constitutions of the socialist republics and krais. We are amendments which would provide extensive possibilities for greater democratization and, above all, contribute to the fact that resolutions and laws universally adopted are implemented and, consequently, that democracy become more efficient. Particularly important is the fact that changes are stipulated, aimed at ensuring the greater autonomy of labor collectives and broadening the freedom of action in the use of public funds placed at their disposal while, at the same time, more efficiently linking economic and other social processes through labor. As a result of changing the procedure for electing representatives to the assemblies, ranging from municipalities to the federation, unquestionably the political system will become more social and, therefore, more democratic. An awareness of the need for these and other changes, precisely from the viewpoint of the further and more efficient development of socialism, is already persistently making its way.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Romanian Communist Forum

18020013q Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 116-119

[Article by Mikhail Alekseyevich Muntyan, doctor of historical sciences]

[Text] The Fifth National Conference of the Romanian Communist Party was held in Bucharest at the end of 1987. A total of 3,078 delegates, representing 3.7 million Romanian Communists, attended the plenary sessions and, in the course of the work of eight sections, discussed basic problems of implementation of the strategic tasks earmarked by the 13th RCP Congress for 1986-1990. The report submitted by N. Ceausescu, RCP general secretary, noted that by the end of the present decade the Socialist Republic of Romania should reach the stage of a developing socialist country and enter a new and higher stage of averagely developed socialist state. In this connection, the RCP National Conference was called upon to answer the questions raised by the contemporary stage of the country's socioeconomic development, to analyze all party activities and draw lessons from the past.

The delegates to the party forum noted the major successes achieved by the Romanian people in the period of building socialism. Compared with 1945 Romanian industrial output increased by a factor of 120; agricultural production by a factor of nine and the national income by a factor of 33. In the first 2 years of the current 5-year period the growth of Romanian industrial output averaged 10 percent; that of agriculture, almost 20 percent; some 500 billion lei were invested in the national economy and approximately 450 economic projects were completed.

The efforts of the Romanian people, the creative forces of which were released by the socialist system, the guidance provided by the RCP in building socialism and the allocation of about 30 percent of the national income for development in the course of the last 20 years were cited at the party conference as the sources for such high accomplishments; without this the living standard indicators reached today would have been lower. It was nonetheless noted that the results of the first 2 years of the 5-year period proved to be below the planned indicators and the true possibilities of the Romanian economy. The exigent approach taken to the situation in the Romanian national economy was based on the stipulations of the 13th RCP Congress, which called for relying on the intensive development of the entire industry in the 1986-1990 period, achieving a balance among its different sectors, and surmounting the contradictions which were manifested in the course of the development of the country's economy. As a whole, they are manifested in a number of specific economic problems on the solution of which the efforts of Romanian society are focused.

The most pressing and significant to the Romanian national economy, as the materials of the party conference indicated, remains the contradiction between the needs of the economy and the level of development of the raw material and fuel and energy base. The 13th Party Congress stipulated that by 1990 electric power production must reach 95-97 billion kilowatt hours and that the extraction of coal and bituminous shale must reach 95-100 million tons, so that they may yield 38 billion kilowatt hours of electric power; the nuclear power plants must generate 21-22 billion kilowatt hours of electric power. However, it was precisely in this area that, as stated by Romanian Prime Minister C. Dascalescu, that a number of serious breakdowns took place, as a result of which, instead of 1,600 megawatts of new capacities only 1,200 were commissioned. The building of a nuclear power plant in Cernavoda was not completed; the plan for coal-fueled electric power plants was not fulfilled. The "best and main source of raw material and energy—the rational utilization and reduced expenditure of raw and other materials" per unit of generated national income—was not activated fully.

The delegates to the party conference emphasized that despite the steps which were taken, consumption of raw materials and energy in 1987 not only did not decline but

even increased somewhat. In November 1987 the consumption of natural gas and electric power in the non-production sphere was reduced by 30 percent by presidential decree. Monthly electric power consumption rates of 30 kilowatt hours for the autumn and winter (November-February) and 20 for the balance of the year, were set per urban family of two-three members. These ceilings were even lower for the rural areas, respectively 20 and 15 kilowatt hours.

The disproportions between industry and agriculture, it is believed in Romania, are manifested particularly clearly in the area of technical facilities available in these two basic sectors of the country's economy. In Romania the disparity between the industrial and agrarian sectors in terms of capital-labor ratio, expressed in terms of fixed capital per employed individual, was 4:1 in the first half of the 1980s, as estimated by Romanian economists. The same situation was characteristic of labor productivity. That was precisely why the directives of the 13th RCP Congress earmarked for the eighth 5-year period the task of ensuring an optimal correlation between the industrial and agrarian sectors, the harmonious and balanced development of all economic sectors, increasing capital investments in the development of agricultural production and bringing the average annual growth rates of their output closer to each other. The idea is that the new agrarian revolution will make such "coupling" of agriculture with industry possible, leading to profound revolutionary changes in the overall structure of the national economy and in relations between industry and the agrarian sector in particular.

It was pointed out at the RCP forum that in the past 2 years the rural workers achieved significant successes. The respective harvests for 1986 and 1987 were 30 and 31 million tons of grain (for a population of 23 million). A substantial production increase was noted in the other subsectors as well. Nonetheless, a number of serious critical remarks were made concerning the state of affairs in agriculture which was assigned new difficult tasks: produce 35 million tons of grain, harvest more than 10 million tons of vegetables and drastically increase animal husbandry output in 1988. The implementation of the new agrarian revolution, according to many scientists, should result in the fact that by 1990 in terms of technical facilities agricultural production will be roughly on the same level as industry.

The elimination of disproportions between industry and agriculture in Romania is closely related to the "elimination" of another contradiction: between consumer demand and its satisfaction. According to the specialists, this can be ensured, on the one hand, by increasing agricultural production and, on the other, making consumption consistent with the level of development of material facilities. Consequently, the directives of the 13th RCP Congress for the Eighth 5-Year Plan stipulate an increase in retail trade of no more than 9-10 percent. In terms of the consumption of food products the task is to balance the satisfaction of consumer demand while

eliminating all waste. In the area of industrial commodities the emphasis will be on increasing variety and upgrading production quality.

The national conference of the RCP spoke out in favor of accelerating the development of economic sectors which are directly involved in attaining a scientific population living standard. In his concluding speech, N. Ceausescu especially discussed problems of improving the supply of food and consumer goods to the working people. Having reemphasized that despite the firm rates which had been set for supplies from centralized stocks, the main responsibility for the solution of such problems falling on the local authorities, he called upon the members of the Central Committee, the party aktiv and the working people to do everything possible to provide the best possible conditions for the implementation of the territorial self-support program.

As a whole, the problem of upgrading the living standard of the Romanian population remains closely linked to the faster growth of labor productivity compared to the increased income of the working people. According to the directives of the 13th RCP Congress, by 1990 labor productivity should be more than 60 percent higher than in 1985. Based on the resolutions of the congress on upgrading the real wages over the 5-year period, it was suggested at the party conference that, starting with the second half of 1988, wages of all categories of working people be raised by 10 percent.

At the present stage, the Romanian scientists claim, achieving a complete balance between availability of new equipment and the level of manpower training remains a major prerequisite for economic growth. According to their estimates, as a result of insufficient labor skills, as much as 30 percent of the potential of machines and equipment remains unused. The professional standards of the workers are not always consistent with the complex and highly productive equipment installed in modern enterprises. This influences labor productivity and production quality. The task has been set, therefore, of making the present 5-year period a turning point in the organization of the vocational training of the working people. Programs for upgrading vocational training will apply to 3 million people, i.e., to nearly 25 percent of the active manpower, in such a way that once every 4-5 years every working person will renew his knowledge and improve his labor skills.

Delegates to the RCP conference noted that the development of international economic relations, production cooperation and active participation in the international division of labor are among the decisive factors for the implementation of the program for the country's development and the further growth of the material and spiritual standards of the people's life. Currently Romania exports about 25 percent of its industrial and agricultural commodities, and almost one-half of its national income is related to foreign trade. The socialist countries

hold a central position in Romania's economic cooperation. Their share in Romanian trade is approaching 60 percent. Great importance is ascribed to cooperation within CEMA and to the implementation of long-term programs (until the year 2000).

One of the most topical foreign economic tasks in contemporary Romania, in the view of the party forum, was increasing exports, bearing in mind the aspiration to repay foreign debts within the shortest possible time. As a result of reducing imports by 22 percent between 1981 and 1985, Romania achieved a positive trade balance of \$10 billion over the 5-year period, which allowed it to pay not only the interest but also repay nearly one-half of its principal debt, which was \$10 billion at the start of the 1980s. In the view of Western observers, Romania is one of the few countries which has substantially reduced its foreign indebtedness. However, such a purposeful repayment could not fail to generate a number of factors of domestic economic stress. Industrial and nonindustrial consumption funds had to be reduced and strict conservation of material and financial resources had to be applied. Steps were taken to reduce imports. In particular, imports of consumer goods, paid in dollars, were virtually halted.

By the end of 1987 the industry and financial-economic activities commission of the Romanian Great National Assembly, having considered the question of relations between Romania and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, of which the country had become a member in 1972, reached the conclusion that the conditions under which Romania was given loans in the 1980s had caused serious harm to the country. As it turned out, since 1980 Romania's debts to this international financial organization increased by 50 percent as a result of the bank's arbitrary risk interest which, as the Romanian press noted, was "exorbitantly high," reaching as high as 11.6 percent. In this connection, it was decided that Romania would no longer resort to foreign loans. It is the country's intention to repay its foreign debt in full by the end of the current 5-year period.

Sociopolitical and ideological problems played a special role in the proceedings of the conference. The report submitted by the RCP general secretary contained a number of summations on the Romanian experience in "building socialism with the participation of the people and for the people." It was emphasized that in building a socialist society no single model exists or could exist and that the creative application of the general laws and principles of scientific socialism should be consistent with national specifics and the specific conditions of a country which has taken a new path of development.

The features of said process in Romania include the creation of the type of democratic framework which would ensure the active participation in the conscious building of their future by all population categories. The combination of the agencies of both worker and direct

democracy (agencies of worker self-government, nationwide congresses of working people, peasants, workers in science and education and people working in culture and upbringing) with an improved system of agencies of representative democracy (the Great National Assembly and people's councils) provides a new and democratic framework for managing social affairs. The 15 November 1987 Romanian elections for people's councils indicated that the country has gained some experience in nominating two or more candidates per deputy seat.

The question of the growing role of the state in managing the country's socioeconomic development was raised at the conference. It was noted that the solution of problems in the socioeconomic area cannot be made dependent on the functioning of the law of supply and demand or the laws of the market. According to the Romanian leadership, perfecting the functions of the socialist state at any given stage should be combined with the democratization of the activities of its apparatus and reaching a situation in which the state authorities would truly serve the people and be accountable to them, while the state would be called upon to see to it that all citizens obey the country's laws and prevent even a single violation of the constitution.

The party conference paid great attention to problems of the further strengthening of the leading role of the RCP. The contribution made by the party organizations and party members to the successes achieved by the Romanian people was given a high rating. Nonetheless, it was pointed out that the shortcomings and faults in various areas are reflecting shortcomings and faults in the activities of party authorities and party members. The critical discussion on the style and methods of work and responsibility for assignments, initiated at the extraordinary county party conferences in connection with the expulsion from the party of the first secretary of the Dolj County RCP Committee for gross violations of statutory stipulations, as well as of several other senior officials, was continued at the conference and reflected in its documents. "We must openly say," said, among others, the RCP general secretary in his report, "that an atmosphere of complacency and relaxation has developed in a number of party organizations and in party cadres in various areas of activity." This has had a negative impact on the way they have acted in the face of a variety of negative aspects, N. Ceausescu noted further. At the same time, tolerance and even cover-ups of negative situations, and a spirit of nepotism and improperly interpreted friendships have become rooted, which has repeatedly led to covering up various shortcomings and to the lack of criticism of violators of party and government resolutions and the country's laws, and manifested in the failure to take energetic steps against party and state officials who have carried out their assignments poorly. In a number of areas an attitude of indifference has been adopted toward shortcomings and an unwillingness to act most decisively in correcting and eliminating them. A weakening of responsibility, combativeness, aspiration toward a good organization, discipline and

order, a weakening, one could say, of the party spirit and of the revolutionary attitude toward labor have been manifested in the activities of the party and in state work.

The party conference called for holding accountable anyone who violates the party statutes, norms and ethics of party work and the laws of the country. It called for intensifying party control over the implementation of all decisions related to the fulfillment of programs for socioeconomic development. The forum of the Romanian communists formulated a number of new approaches in the field of cadre policy. In particular, it suggested the application of the principle of replacing officials in various socioeconomic areas of activity on a competitive basis, applying this also to the party, while retaining the practice of periodical rotation of leading personnel.

The INF Treaty, concluded between the leaders of the USSR and the United States, was given a high rating at the conference. This document was described as "an event of universal-historical importance." Along with the general formulation of problems related to the need to intensify the struggle waged by the peoples for the total elimination of nuclear weapons in the world, the creation of a unified Europe of peace and cooperation, eliminating in international relations the policy of force or threat of force, achieving a peaceful solution of all international conflicts, establishing a new international economic order and eliminating underdevelopment, as a necessary prerequisite for achieving political detente and surmounting the crisis in the global economy, a number of other specific initiatives were formulated at the conference.

The delegates paid considerable attention to problems of the international situation and Romanian foreign policy. The contemporary international situation was characterized in the conference's resolutions as being exceptionally difficult and complex. Proceeding from the fact that the arms race on earth is threatening the very existence of mankind, the conference spoke out in favor of a new political thinking and new approach to the problems of war and peace.

A high rating was given to Romanian foreign policy and to the country's contribution to the struggle for the preservation of peace on earth, disarmament, elimination of underdevelopment, establishment of a new international economic order, ensuring the peaceful solution of regional conflicts, creation of zones of peace and good neighborly relations in the Balkans and strengthening universal security. The truth, noted N. Ceausescu in his report, "is that Romanian international activities have not always met with understanding, sometimes even on the part of its friends. We have frequently been blamed for one action or another taken by Romania in the international arena. However, we have always proceeded

from what we considered consistent with the interests of the Romanian people and, at the same time, those of peace and cooperation among all nations and all mankind."

The Romanian communists expressed their optimistic conviction that the joint struggle waged by the peoples of Europe and of the rest of the world can change the course of events and offer clear prospects for the solution of the major problems which are facing mankind and ensure the victory of the policy of disarmament, elimination of nuclear weapons, cooperation and friendship, and guarantee that mankind will enter the third millennium in its history under conditions of peace and the free development, independence and progress of all nations.

The Fifth National Conference of the Romanian Communist Party comprehensively analyzed the current stage of building socialism in Romania and defined the decisive areas for improving the organization and management of society in all aspects of its economic and sociopolitical life. It formulated specific steps to surmount identified shortcomings in order to ensure favorable conditions for the implementation of the Eighth 5-Year Plan and the resolutions of the 13th RCP Congress as a whole. The documents adopted at the conference reflect the party's tasks in solving problems of an economic nature in the area of upgrading the people's living standards and the intention of the RCP and Romania to continue to make a contribution to strengthening peace and security on earth.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

'The Soviet Challenge.' Book by West German Social Democrats on Perestroika in the USSR
18020013r Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 120-123

[Review of the book "*Es gibt kein Zuruck*". Gorbatschows Reformen—Chancen fur Europa ["There Is no Way Back." Gorbachev's Reform Is an Opportunity for Europe], by Michael Muller, Gerhard Heiman, Hans-Ulrich Klose and Karl-Heinz Maldaner. Verlag J.H.W. Dietz Nachf, GmbH, Berlin (West)-Bonn, 1987, 160 pp]

[Text] The book under review is yet another confirmation of the growing interest shown in the West in perestroika in the USSR. It was written by four noted social democratic politicians: Michael Muller (deputy chairman of the task force on the study of the Soviet Union in the GSDP); Gerhard Heiman (deputy chairman of the GSDP in the Bundestag Commission on Intra-German Relations); Hans-Ulrich Klose (member of the GSDP Presidium and party treasurer); and Karl-Heinz Maldaner, economist and sociologist.

"Today the Soviet Union is experiencing an age of most profound changes. It is engaged in giving a new face to socialist society." These are the words with which the authors open the first chapter, "Gorbachev's 'Radical Reform'." The noted leaders of the GSDP point out the scale and radical nature of the changes being made in our country. "The new generation in the USSR," they write, "are trying to break bureaucratic ossification and the conservative stagnation of the system in order to redefine priorities in Soviet society. No single party leader since the time of Vladimir Ilich Lenin has given soviet politics such dynamism as Mikhail Gorbachev... Today Soviet politics amazes us with concepts such as 'democratization' and 'glasnost,' related to 'perestroyka' and 'new thinking.' These are the key concepts governing the further development of the policy of the Soviet leadership. Is the Soviet Union at the start of its 'second revolution'?"

The question with which this excerpt ends will be frequently raised in that book, and on each occasion the authors will attempt to provide an increasingly complete answer. "The country is seeking its own way to reform," they note. "And although no comprehensive and universal concept has been developed as yet in the USSR, as the political leadership keeps emphasizing, although a great deal should become clear in the course of the various experiments, the trend has become quite clear. It is a question of creating conditions in which the people will work on restructuring Soviet society actively and with a feeling of total responsibility. Furthermore, for quite some time it has no longer been a case of turning the reform into an obligation formulated exclusively 'from above.' By emphasizing that 'man is the main factor,' the political system should include a limited social pluralism and a significant strengthening of the self-regulating mechanisms of 'socialist democracy.' This is the purpose of the practical steps aimed at the politization and democratization of the system, manifested in 'glasnost,' changing the system for electing party, state and economic managers, expanding social and cultural economy, surmounting the past and strengthening the legal security of the citizens. The purpose of the initiated reforms is to change the nature of the socialist society but not in the least to eliminate it."

In recalling that in the past many reforms launched in our country remained on paper only, the authors justifiably raise questions which, in the USSR as well, are topics of stormy debates. What will be the future of the rights of the central planning organizations? What will be the scale of self-government of enterprises and, in this connection, what kind of agreements will be made among production collectives, administrations and planning agencies? Finally, what will be the role of the market?

One way or another, despite all unclear details and the significance of the opposition, the authors emphasize, two lines of development in the Soviet radical reform can be traced clearly: On the one hand, the new link

between socialism and contemporary technology, a more efficient economy and changes in the allocation of economic resources, on a new and qualitatively higher level; on the other, a renovation of the economic and social system through the development of socialist self-government.

The "reviewers" of our perestroyka also quite logically consider the fact that the most important instruments of the radical reform are the creative activeness of the masses and their increased responsibility, although attachment for ideological stereotypes ("political control of society," "party monopoly," etc.) frequently violate the logic of thought, impartiality of analysis and realism of conclusions. The USSR, the authors claim, "is facing an almost insoluble problem: on the one hand, the power of the party apparatus is the main obstacle to the implementation of social reforms; on the other, the party alone can lay the beginning of real change." Reality itself, however, takes the authors back to the objective admission that no such "insoluble conflict" exists: "The party leadership is increasingly enhancing the experimentation process in the political arena as well. The need for such reforms is still being questioned and the demand for their implementation is encountering substantial opposition in the CPSU and in the ranks of public and trade union organizations. The leadership, however, leaves no doubt as to its aspiration to renovate the party... Intraparty life in the CPSU is no longer a forbidden press topic."

Under the heading "The Courage to Tell the Truth," the authors review the most noteworthy changes in Soviet cultural life, including in the mass information media. "With the start of the new political course, problems of morality, justice tolerance and constructive creativity find themselves once again in the center of attention. Culture must play the role of yeast in the leavened bread of renovation." Such is the way the new situation in Soviet society is described.

The content of the second chapter in the book is revealed in its title: "The Economic reform as a reform of the System." On the basis of the documents of the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the authors write of the "dramatic nature" of this event in the life of the party and the country and of the "most radical criticism of the Soviet system" contained in the general secretary's speech. The previous CPSU leadership, the authors note, hindered by its policies the development of production relations in the country, i.e., the material base of socialism, could not develop comprehensively in the face of the severe lag in production relations. The impression increasingly develops that this is the first time in the history of the Soviet Union that the change in the economic mechanism is planned also as a **reform of the system** and thus is aimed at making a radical change in the appearance of "real socialism."

In describing the present economic reform in the USSR as "crossing the Rubicon," the FRG authors ascribe to it three main features:

1. The reform is conceived as a long-term process, which will take more than a single decade; the following stages may be distinguished in its implementation: the stage of experimentation in individual sectors and enterprises; the stage of conversion of the entire industry, including transportation and communications, to the new economic management methods; a process of legal codification of the new economic management methods has been undertaken alongside the first two with the passing of the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) and other broad legislative acts.

2. The reform is being carried out on the basis of a general concept which may not be reduced to partial isolated steps, but which influences the entire course of economic development. In this manner the reform is being implemented on different levels: it affects not only enterprises but also the methods of overall economic management.

3. The economic reform is conceived as a reorganization of the system, for unlike previous "improvements" of the national economy, today's perestroika is not limited to the area of economics. The Soviet leadership acknowledges that the fundamental improvement of the economic system is possible only if it goes hand in hand and simultaneously with renovation in noneconomic areas of life. This, actually, is what sets the scale of the "new thinking" in domestic policy, the authors conclude.

Actually, to the question of whether the Soviet Union will be able to implement this plan they prefer to give neither a positive nor a negative answer. "The fact," they write, "that so far similar objectives proved impossible to implement does not mean at all that this time as well the reform will yield no results; conversely, the acknowledged seriousness and great competence of the Soviet reformers do not indicate that their objectives will be attained in full in the area of economics as well. However, as the history of economic reforms in the socialist countries teaches us, success is predetermined as the 'new thinking' makes its way..." But why is it that, nonetheless, the FRG authors would rather not dot all of their i's in this case? In their view, "the most exciting question" lies elsewhere, namely: If the leading country of "real socialism" is making a first attempt at introducing in its system an entirely new management mechanism and **at the same time** enhancing the political activeness of the population and broadening its rights in all areas of life, what do do with the system itself, "the ideology of which is based on the primacy of the party?" Is it possible that the USSR is prepared to subject to a reform the party itself? the West German social democrats wonder.

It is easy to note that in asking such "extremely pointed" questions, which they consider "inconceivable for the USSR," in each case the authors erect, consciously or not, a bridge of comparison with the political systems in bourgeois countries, as they consider pluralism in its Western interpretation. However, to their credit they do not engage in open promotional praise of the West. "The

historical experience of Western economic systems," they write, "do not prove in the least that Marx's criticism of a one-sided market economic system has become obsolete. The contemporary capitalist industrial society is dominated by division. A wide gap separates the social and ecological interests of society from those of individual production units. Here the market does not operate in the least as a neutral instrument in equalizing the social interests and relations between production and consumption and in the defense of nature. On the contrary, the general decline in the growth rates of output in recent years has once again aggravated social problems and raised new ones. The conclusion is that the market is unavoidable. However, it has its limits and, left to its own devices, it triggers social and economic conflicts. This indicates that at least some democratic control over market relations, planning within stipulated limits and responsibility for the development of society have not become unnecessary. In our view, largely in the interest of the West and, to an even greater extent, of the socialist system (in order to test its viability and ability to renovate itself) it would pay to raise the question of a possible interaction between public control and the market, and giving both a democratic content."

Returning to their assessment of the situation in the USSR, the authors emphasize that "Today the most serious obstruction to perestroika is the still insufficient support 'from the bottom' of reforms instituted 'from the top.' This does not indicate in the least a criticism of the nature or aim of the reforms themselves but is a critique of the methods used by the political system which for decades promoted an apolitical attitude among its citizens... Matters are further complicated by the fact that the traditional and more or less coercive methods used in mobilizing the masses in the implementation of reforms are today totally unsuitable and could even trigger opposite results, for they can neither accelerate scientific and technical progress nor enhance the responsibility and independence of the member of a socialist society." In this connection, the authors analyze the familiar CPSU concept of "More socialism, more democracy!" The chapter ends as follows: "The revolutionary perestroika proclaimed by Gorbachev refutes all those who endlessly emphasize the inability of the Soviet system to reform itself. The question is still open, but one thing today is clear to us: the idea of socialism is gaining in the USSR new opportunities for its implementation."

The chapter which follows, "Reciprocal Influences and Interrelationships Between Economics and Ecology," raises one of the most crucial universal problems, based on a concept equally important to West and East: "Problems of ecology do not stop at the borders of a country, whatever its social system. They demand changes in production methods and ways of life and call for closer international cooperation." The authors note that in recent years the USSR and the other socialist countries have developed a new view on the environmental protection problem, because of the significant harm caused to nature as result of the inefficient use of

the ground and the ecologically unsubstantiated extensive irrigation projects. The authors describe the discussions taking place in the USSR on this subject and the initial results of glasnost in this area (protecting the ecological purity of Lake Baykal and abandoning the project of changing the course of northern rivers).

The authors' conclusion is that "More than any other area, ecology demands increased international cooperation. The USSR is showing great interest in contemporary technology used in environmental production and in industrial methods which conserve power and raw materials. This area offers tremendous opportunities for intensified cooperation between East and West... Actually, this should not be merely a question of such opportunities. Could we, in the West, not draw useful conclusions from the reforms being implemented in the USSR? In this case arrogance would be misplaced."

The concluding chapter is entitled "Are We on the Eve of a Revival of a European Governmental System? Opportunities for a Second State in Eastern Policy." "Starting with the nomination of Mikhail Gorbachev as general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, interest in the political development of the USSR has increased in Western Europe," the authors write. "The initiatives taken by the new Soviet leadership have drawn to themselves considerable attention. Interest is also shown in the impressive plans for internal political reforms. Most frequently, however, the observations made are superficial. Nonetheless, should it succeed, the 'radical reform' would be of historical significance not only for the Soviet Union. It could also contribute to ascribing a new quality to the cooperation between West and East, which benefits the people and goes beyond the various systems... This, however, presumes that the West Europeans, the Germans (in the FRG) in particular, would show greater interest in the changes taking place in Eastern Europe, in the USSR above all. In this case a realistic assessment of motive forces and obstacles on the path of the reforms is needed. The speculations which have prevailed so far, mostly based on personality changes in the Kremlin, in no way provide a reliable foundation for this. In our opinion, the time has come to undertake the second stage of the policy toward the East, which will be 100 percent European."

The preceding parts of the book as well deal extensively with the international aspects of the Soviet perestroika. As a whole the work provides an idea of the alternative to the present conservative policy in the FRG and in the other Western countries, suggested by the social democrats in the FRG. "Western Europe," the authors emphasize, "must jointly find the strength to make independent decisions regarding its political future. This presumes a will for self-assertion. In the future, the second stage of the Eastern policy could be focused on the self-Assertion of Europe and the close intertwining of Eastern and Western interests on the continent. This stage could be based on the realization by the different countries and systems of the growing interdependence of

their development in their 'common European home.' Opportunities for such a political future have improved thanks to the policies of the Soviet leadership. However, although it should be precisely Western Europe which should be greatly interested in that second stage of Eastern policy, so far not a single Western European government has had the necessary courage, authority and spiritual outlook to set into motion this political process in Western Europe... Unquestionably, both domestic and foreign Soviet policy has been activated. This provides political opportunities which must be realized and utilized above all by the Western Europeans."

The further frankness and self-critical attitude of the authors are also noteworthy: "In the new phase of European cooperation, the second stage of Eastern policy needs partners, both Eastern and Western. The question of whether it will be possible to broaden and deepen the Eastern policy of the 1970s will decisively depend on the internal political development of our most important partners... Both East and West are under the strong pressure of the need for renewal, for ecological problems are becoming increasingly pressing, economic problems are becoming aggravated, and there has been a new outbreak of social conflicts. It is obvious that the ideas of Ronald Reagan, Jacques Chirac, Margaret Thatcher and Helmut Kohl are clearly incapable of providing society with new answers leading to the future. Their straight-line policy of economic diktat is leading to an impasse and to a growing uncertainty among the masses. In areas in which a conservative spirit is prevalent in the West the East strikes us with its new political dynamism." The conclusion is that "the opportunity for change is clear. However, a prerequisite for such change must be a new quality of politics in the East and in Western Europe and in their attitude toward each other. This requires the lifting of the barriers of ignorance, half-truths and prejudices and making our concepts of the East consistent with present-day reality."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

In the Interest of Peace and Progress

18020013s Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian
No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 May 88) pp 124-126

[Review by G. Seleznev, doctor of historical sciences, professor, of the book "Istoriya Mezhdunarodnykh Otnosheniy i Vneshney Politiki SSSR" [History of USSR International Relations and Foreign Policy]. In three volumes. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1986-1987]

[Text] This is a basic work on the history of Soviet international relations and foreign policy from 1917 to the present. This work, timed for the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution will unquestionably be welcomed with interest by Soviet and foreign readers.

With the help of a huge number of historical facts and documents the authors have attempted to bring to light the patterns, nature and trends of development of international politics. In addition to providing a study of our country's foreign policy, they discuss problems of the establishment and strengthening of the world socialist system, disarmament and development of international relations in western Europe, the Middle and Near East, Africa, the Far East and other areas. They concentrate on the fundamental problems of Soviet foreign policy and the implementation of the Leninist ideas of peace and disarmament.

V.I. Lenin, who formulated and scientifically substantiated the principles and main objectives of the international activities of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, was the creator of Soviet foreign policy and diplomacy. The authors emphasize the profound historical meaning of the Decree on Peace, which embodied the principle of peaceful coexistence between countries belonging to different social systems. However complex and conflicting the domestic and foreign political conditions may have been, the land of the Soviets invariably maintained its support of the noble Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence and struggled systematically and purposefully to exclude war from the life of the human community and to assert lasting, just and democratic peace. Step by step, on the basis of extensive factual data, the authors trace the stages of establishment and development of Soviet diplomacy.

They provide us with a many-faceted picture of the struggle waged by the USSR for peace and international security at the present stage. In the broad set of problems related to contemporary international relations no problem is more important than the prevention of nuclear war. Restraining the arms race was, and remains, the key aspect of this problem. The authors describe in detail the contribution which the Soviet Union has made to the struggle against a nuclear catastrophe. The nuclear century demands a new type of political thinking, a new approach to international relations and the unification of the efforts of countries with different social systems for the sake of halting the fatal arms race and ensuring radical improvements in the global political climate.

The materials included in this three-volume work eloquently prove that the socialist world is a decisive proponent of taking immediate and specific steps in the field of disarmament. As convincingly proved in the conclusion of the INF Treaty at the 8 December 1987 Washington summit, the Soviet Union is agreeable to taking the strictest possible verification measures (including on-site inspection) in the course of the implementation of disarmament agreements, providing that the West, the United States above all, would abandon efforts to impose unequal agreements and obtain unilateral concessions.

The book includes facts and documents proving that the foreign policy activities of the Soviet government contribute to the development of the struggle for peace and

disarmament and that the bold Soviet program for the creation of a nuclear-free world and the development of peaceful cooperation among the members of the global community is consistent with the interests of all countries and peoples.

The historical facts mentioned in the book remind us of the fact that nothing happens by itself. One must struggle for peace, persistently and purposefully, making use of even the slightest opportunities in lifting the threat of nuclear catastrophe and strengthening international security. The contemporary world is one, for it is linked by a common fate. As was emphasized at the 27th CPSU Congress, "the course of history and social progress require ever more persistently a **constructive and creative interaction among countries and peoples on a global scale...** The true dialectics of modern development is found in the combination of the competition, the rivalry between the two systems and the growing trend of interdependence among the members of the global community."

Unquestionably, Soviet international-affairs scientists, who are the authors of this work, have unquestionably made a contribution to the interpretation of such dialectics. This book will be a useful aid to VUZ undergraduate and graduate students and teachers, and to lecturers and propagandists.

Despite its unquestionable qualities, this work has some shortcomings. To some extent they reflect the situation in historical science: During the period of stagnation simplistic concepts concerning some events and the study of difficult and sharp problems became widespread. Some noted party and state personalities and Soviet diplomats became "nonpersons."

The authors of this work as well have not been able to avoid this fault. Let us note their simplistic approach in the interpretation of complex problems which, however, include important and topical problems, such as the existence of nonantagonistic contradictions among socialist countries, the development of commercial relations and even cooperation in the humanities between East and West, consideration of the reciprocal interests of partners and the extent of efficient aid provided by the USSR to the liberated countries, the search of ways of increasing the role of neutral and nonaligned countries in eliminating the threat of nuclear war and the failure of the aggressive plans of right-wing circles in the United States and other NATO countries.

In our opinion, one of the shortcomings of the book is the one-sided assessments of some Soviet foreign policy actions. Unquestionably, over a period of 70 years our diplomacy was able to gain valuable positive experience. However, the interests of scientific development under the conditions of a revolutionary perestroika demand a serious reinterpretation of previous accomplishments of Soviet historians, including research in foreign policy. Such work is part of the huge project of renovation of the

entire Soviet society. It presumes not only the identification of opportunities and enhanced qualities of foreign policy activities in the future but also a critical study of accomplishments. Naturally, Soviet diplomats are not guaranteed against efforts and blunders. This too should be a topic in the works of international-affairs historians.

In his 23 May 1986 address at the USSR MFA, M.S. Gorbachev emphasized that Soviet diplomacy must be in step with the times, energetically getting rid of past clichés and stereotypes. In order to convert to a new quality of relations with the socialist countries, he said, some of our representatives must eliminate from their minds prejudices, complacency, inertia and the erroneous view that we can teach everyone else. In the past shortcomings caused by mental inertia occurred in Soviet foreign policy toward Europe.

Critical analysis and the interpretation of acquired experience are major prerequisites for upgrading the quality and efficiency of Soviet diplomacy. In speaking of the need radically to improve the results of the entire arsenal of ways and means used in Soviet diplomacy, M.S. Gorbachev emphasized that "We must adopt a more realistic approach to international affairs... Talks are one of the decisive forms of diplomacy. They must be held with proper knowledge of what we want, avoiding impasses for our and the other side. It is unforgivable to think that our partner may be stupider than we. We must not allow for persistence in the defense of a given viewpoint to grow into senseless stubbornness and for soviet representatives to be known as 'Mister Nyet'."

Today historical publications face stricter requirements: a truthful analysis of the past should help us to solve current problems. Soviet diplomacy is justifiably proud of many brilliant accomplishments. None of this, however, means that we must ignore actions which should not be assessed one-dimensionally. The Soviet people have the right to know not only about the successes but also the errors made by Soviet diplomacy. A reinterpretation of past experience is necessary not for the sake of passing judgment on it but of identifying within it actions and trends which should either be applied in today's practices or excluded from them. Naturally, the solution of this problem will demand time and the collective efforts of Soviet scientists. The authors of this work, unfortunately, have not deemed possible (or else were were restrained by rigid deadlines) to lay the beginning of such a useful project.

Another feature which could hardly be counted as one of the merits of this work is the fact that in their interpretation of the history of foreign policy, as a rule the authors avoid mentioning the names of participants in talks and other foreign policy actions. This is regrettable. For familiar reasons, the activities of many Soviet diplomats, who were Lenin's fellow-workers, were not mentioned. Unquestionably, the elimination of "blank

spots" in history would not only make its presentation more vivid and lively but would also contribute to the assertion of the principles of historical justice and communist morality.

Meanwhile, the reader will be searching in vain in this work the answer to the role which noted diplomats, such as V.A. Antonov-Ovseyenko, Ya.A. Berzin, Ya.Kh. Davtyan, A.A. Yoffe, L.M. Karakhan, N.N. Krestinskiy, A.M. Kollontay, M.M. Litvinov, F.F. Raskolnikov, F.A. Rotshteyn and B.S. Stomonyakov played in strengthening the international positions of the USSR and in establishing and developing bilateral relations between the USSR, on the one hand, and Britain, France, Germany, the United States, Bulgaria, Afghanistan and other countries, on the other. Assessing their work would not have taken too much space, for a few lines per person would have been adequate. Unfortunately, the work suffers from "absence of people," for the majority of diplomats are not even named.

The principle of chronological sequence has been violated in the third volume (unlike the first two): the volume begins with a description of the foreign political situation of the CPSU, as it had developed by 1986, the time of the 27th Party Congress, followed by the description of the state of relations between the USSR and other countries during the 1970s and the foreign policy programs formulated at the 24th to the 26th CPSU congresses. Such a violation of the principle of historicism is puzzling, to say the least. This type of approach hardly contributes to the knowledge and determination of the dialectics of development of Soviet foreign policy as affected by changes in the world's circumstances and the country's economic and sociopolitical life.

The authors virtually ignore aspects of the domestic situation of the Soviet Union: the situation with the economy and the anomalous phenomena in the social and spiritual-moral areas, although the close connection between foreign policy and domestic situation is obvious. In mentioning the difficulties experienced by our country in the economic area, M.S. Gorbachev noted that "they could not fail to affect the country's foreign policy."

These shortcomings do not raise in the least any question as to the overall positive rating of this work. On the basis of Marxist-Leninist positions, the authors have analyzed the most important laws, nature and trend in the development of the system of contemporary international policy and studied the complex problems of the history of Soviet foreign policy.

The history of international relations convincingly proves that with its specific actions and entire policy the Soviet state is laying a path to strengthening peace and international security and making a decisive contribution to mankind's social progress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1988.

05003

The Light of Truth

18020013t Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) pp 126-127

[Review by I. Mints, academician, of the book "*Mir o Strane Sovetov*" [The World on the Land of the Soviets]. Academician B. N. Ponomarev, responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1987, 359 pp]

[Text] During all of the 7 decades of the existence of the Soviet system, year after year pages have been added to a book which could bear the title "Our Friends About Us." Today such a book is not merely the fruit of a creative imagination. It has been published, and it contains more than 400 articles and statements about the land of the soviets throughout all stages in its history.

The authors trace the way in which the political thinking of people has changed and is continuing to do so throughout the world, under the influence of building a socialist society in the SSR, the victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War, the systematic implementation of the Leninist policy of peace and international security, the initiated restructuring and comprehensive renovation of life in our country. The truth about the land of the soviets and its political course, which was initially accepted and realized essentially by communists and major activists and simple participants in the international and revolutionary movements, eventually became obvious to an increasing number of realistically thinking members of the ruling class in the capitalist west. Here, for instance, is the viewpoint of George Gibbons, chairman of the board of a British bank, voiced at the start of the 1930s: "Let me make clear that I am neither a communist nor a bolshevik, but clearly a capitalist and an industrialist.... Russia is moving ahead while many of our factories are idling and some 3 million of our people are desperately seeking work... The most important thing, perhaps, is the fact that in Russia all young people and workers have today one thing which, unfortunately is lacking in the capitalist countries: hope" (pp 83-84).

The words of Romain Rolland, the French writer and one of the first Western writers to stand up in the defense of the Soviet Union during the early period of foreign intervention and civil war in Russia, may serve as an epigraph to this book: "I believe the date 7 November 1917 to be the greatest date in the history of human society since the famous days of the French Revolution; here again mankind has taken a new step forward, a step even more important than the one which separated the French revolution from the Ancien Regime" (p 24). It was thus that the great French humanist writer clearly and accurately defined the October Socialist Revolution, the turning point in world history.

Naturally, it would be impossible to describe even a minute part of the reactions to our country's events, included in this book. Their selection has been quite careful and their sincerity and excitement cannot leave us indifferent.

The new collection is a good reference work for propagandists, lecturers and teachers. It is also quite relevant in the study of the way awareness of the new political realities and the need to dedicate all of one's efforts to the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe and the salvation of mankind developed and is developing today throughout the world. We, the entire earth's population find ourselves today in the same boat and it is our common duty to see to it that this boat does not capsize.

This was fully and convincingly stated by Yugoslav writer O. Davicho: "I do not know whether the Almighty created our world in six days, but I am certain that it could be destroyed in one second. People in various corners of the globe are united in the aspiration to learn, create, love, raise their children, live and survive. By joining forces we could hope that the will to live will prevail over the insanity of the nuclear maniacs" (p 301).

It is possible to ensure the survival of mankind only jointly, by turning from confrontation to peaceful coexistence and cooperation. Naturally, this does in no way eliminate differences between the two social systems. Unquestionably, such differences will remain as will, in all likelihood and within the foreseeable future, aggressive and militaristic groups of the ruling class in the west, people who have still not abandoned futile dreams of social revenge. Life itself, however, the circumstances of the nuclear missile age and the salvation of mankind will urgently require the resolution of existing contradictions and powerfully dictate the need for a nuclear-free and noncoercive peace, equal security for all peoples and mastery of the new style of political thinking.

These are precisely the objectives consistent with the interests of mankind, that are pursued by the policies of the land of the soviets which is continuing under present-day circumstances the great cause of the October Revolution and the struggle for the elimination of wars and achieving social progress throughout the earth. The assessment of this policy by outstanding representatives of the revolutionary and democratic movements and state and public personalities in dozens of countries throughout the world helps to identify the profound origins of the new way of thinking, which is capturing today the minds of millions of people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1988.

05003

The Perestroyka Experience Must Be Shared by All
18020013u Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) p 127

[Text] Recently the journal KOMMUNIST UKRAINY started a new section entitled "Experience of the Fraternal Republics." The section carried two selections: "We Can Learn Something From Our Friends" (No 9, 1987) and "Life Asks" (No 3, 1988). They help the Ukrainian readers acquaint themselves with a number of interesting materials published in the journals of the central committees of communist parties of the other fraternal republics. The inauguration of this new section is a useful accomplishment of this journal.

Last year KOMMUNIST UKRAINY published a selection of articles from six republic party journals on various aspects of mass political work done by the party organizations. The specific experience in international and patriotic upbringing and activities of party committees among young people, women and the scientific and technical intelligentsia and at places of residence was described. A second selection dealt with problems of perestroyka of intraparty work. Some of the abridged materials include topics for discussion, reflecting many aspects of the activities of the party organizations in Moldavia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Belorussia and Lithuania, relevant to the Ukrainian party members as well. The problems included in the selections include the elimination of the gross-output approach and formalism in party work, ways of promoting democracy in the activities of party authorities and primary organizations and the importance of moral criteria in rating leading cadres.

The editors of KOMMUNIST UKRAINY asked the readers for their views on the pressing partywide problems included in the sections. The active discussion of the entire set of problems of the revolutionary renovation of Soviet society and the interpretation and use of acquired experience in restructuring are particularly important today, on the eve of the 19th All-Union Party Conference. All that remains is to wish KOMMUNIST UKRAINY fruitful continuation of this initiative.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Meetings With the Editors. Chronicle
18020013v Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 7, May 88 (signed to press 22 Apr 88) p 127

[Text] A meeting between the editors in chief of the republic party journals and the KOMMUNIST editors was held. The discussion dealt with the work of the journals in covering the course of perestroyka, upgrading the level of its ideological support, and the tasks of party publications in the preparations for the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

In accordance with the plan for interparty relations, P. Dzhordzhov, responsible associate of NOVO VREME, journal of the BCP Central Committee visited Moscow. He held talks with the editors of KOMMUNIST on cooperation between the two journals and, in particular, covering the activities of joint enterprises. The representatives of NOVO VREME and KOMMUNIST were received by A.K. Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and permanent representative of the USSR to CEMA.

An exchange of views on problems of the economic reform, democratization of the party and society and development of Soviet historical science took place at a meeting between the editors and the faculty of the Air force Engineering Academy imeni N. Ye. Zhukovskiy.

Guisepe Boffa, member of the Italian Communist Party Central Committee and president of the Center for the Study of International Politics (CESPI), and Guiliano Procacci, member of the ICP Central Control Commission and member of the CESPI Presidium visited the editorial premises. They were interested in the course of perestroyka, its problems and long-range development. Problems of the international situation were discussed as well. The shared wish was expressed of broadening business relations and exchange materials for publication.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Publication Data
18020013w Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 7, Apr 88

English Title: KOMMUNIST, No 7, May 1988

Russian title: KOMMUNIST, No 7 (1323), May 1988

Editors: N.B. Bikkenin (editor-in-chief), A.I. Antipov, E.A. Arab-Ogly, B.S. Arkhipov, K.N. Brutents, I.A. Dedkov, V.I. Kadulin, S.V. Kolesnikov, O.R. Latsis, Yu.L. Molchanov, Ye.Z. Razumov, V.F. Rubtsov, N.N. Sibiryakov, Yu.A. Sklyarov, V.P. Trubnikov, P.N. Fedoseyev, S.F. Yarmolyuk.

Publishing House: Izdatelstvo "Pravda"

Place of Publication: Moscow

Date of Publication: Aril 1988

Signed to Press: 22 April 1988

Copies: 1,025,000

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

END

10

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names which are rendered phonetically or transliterated by FBIS/JPRS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Africa (Sub-Sahara), Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically. Current JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcovers or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate

command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.