

350056

JPRS 81985

14 October 1982

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 10, July 1982

19980914 076

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release:
Distribution Unlimited

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

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

4
155
A08

NOTE

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

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

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

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

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

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

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

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

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 10, July 1982

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

CONTENTS

Further Improvement of Economic Education and Upbringing of the Workers....	1
The Food Program and Tasks in Its Implementation (M. Gorbachev).....	5
Great Force of Friendship and Fraternity (D. Kunayev).....	119
Spiritual Renewal in the Transbaykal (A. Modogoyev).....	31
Checking the Coordinates of the Road (V. Korotich).....	45
The Soviet System of Certification of Cadres at the Present Stage (V. Kirillov-Ugryumov).....	58
New Documents of the Great Patriotic War.....	71
From the Home Front to the Fighting Front (G. Kumanev).....	91
On Socialist Statehood and the Futility of Its Criticism (A. Sobolev).....	105
The Iranian Revolution and Its Special Characteristics (R. Ulyanovskiy).....	118
The CPSU and Military Construction (N. Kuz'min).....	127
Atheistic Literature: Searches and Problems (M. Novikov and Yu. Pishchik).....	132

Foreign Policy and Ideology
 (A. Dubinin) 143

Bookshelf 148

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 10,
Jul 1982

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : Jul 82

Signed to press : 6 Jul 82

Copies : 794,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1982

FURTHER IMPROVEMENT OF ECONOMIC EDUCATION AND UPBRINGING OF THE WORKERS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 82 pp 3-5

[Text] In the adopted decree it is noted that the system of economic education created after the 24th party congress has occupied an important place in ideological-upbringing and economic work. At the same time, the quality and resultativeness of the economic training of the workers do not yet correspond to the strategic directive of the 26th CPSU Congress--that of completing the conversion of the economy to the path of intensive development, making it genuinely economical.

The tasks of communist construction put forth by the 26th party congress and the November 1981 and May 1982 CC CPSU plenums require improved party supervision of economic education, inculcation in each Soviet citizen of a sense of being master of the country, high economic culture and a communist attitude toward labor.

Economic education is called upon to actively promote the formation of contemporary economic thinking, socialist resourcefulness and efficiency, broad worker participation in the administration of production, strengthened discipline and elaboration of general efforts to increase the effectiveness of production.

The CC CPSU, the Council of Ministers of the USSR, the AUCCTU and the CC Komsomol advised the central committees of the communist parties of the union republics, the kraykoms, obkoms, ministries and departments, councils of ministers of the union republics, party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol and economic organs to map out and implement concrete measures to enhance the role of economic education and upbringing of the workers in converting the economy to the intensive path of development, in implementing the USSR's Food Program, strengthening the material and spiritual foundations of the socialist way of life and forming the new man.

To ensure a high scientific level of economic education, profound study of Marxist-Leninist theory and the economic policies of the CPSU, the works of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and other party leaders. To focus primary attention on problems of the country's economic development in the 1980's, intensification of the economy, more effective utilization of the productive, scientific-technical potential, material and labor resources, improvement of planning,

administration and organization of production, and the adoption of advanced experience in management. A task of great importance is that of substantial improvement of the economic education and upbringing of workers of the agro-industrial complex, of mastering new techniques of management.

It is recommended to decisively strengthen the practical thrust of economic education. To bring the study of theory and economic policies into close contact with life, with the concrete tasks of the collectives, to exploit more fully the advantages and capabilities of developed socialism. Economic training, in the words of L. I. Brezhnev, should provide answers to the question: "How to organize the work best and most effectively in each concrete sector? How to utilize the advances of scientific-technical progress--again, not just in general but concretely, with application to a given workplace? What should be done to boost labor productivity and ensure strict economizing of material and labor resources in a given facility or a given sector?"

The following structure of economic education is approved:

schools of communist labor;

schools of concrete economics;

economics seminars.

Enrollees of schools and seminars must gain a good grasp of ways of accelerating scientific-technical and social progress, boosting labor productivity, improving work effectiveness and quality, increasing economy and conservation and adopting advanced experience, and they must take active part in administering production, and learn to live and work in the Leninist manner, in the communist manner.

To comprehensively develop the workers' independent study of economic questions. To enhance the quality of lecture propaganda of the party's economic and social policies, the Food Program and advanced techniques of management. To raise to a new level the work of the people's universities of economic and agricultural knowledge.

It is essential to focus more attention on the study of economic theory and party policies in all forms of party and Komsomol training. Party and Komsomol members, officials of all links of administration, must set an example in mastering contemporary economic skills and the ability to use them in practice.

It is necessary to enhance the responsibility of party committees, ministries and departments, as well as soviet, trade union and Komsomol organs for the quality and resultativeness of economic education and upbringing. To view economic training as an organic part of work with cadres, to conduct it during off hours, consistently and in a goal-directed, differentiated manner, taking account of the level of preparation and interests of the enrollees, the nature of their production activities and complying with voluntary principles.

Ministries, departments and economic officials are directed to activate the efforts of the Councils for Economic Education, to strengthen the material base

and outfit auditoriums and offices with technical equipment. To strengthen the economic preparation of the workers in institutes, faculties and refresher courses. To take account of the level of economic training in upgrading ranks and ratings, certifying specialists and promoting cadres.

The decree spells out the basic directions of activities of soviet, trade union and Komsomol organs with respect to improving the inculcation in all groups of the population of a proprietary attitude toward the people's wealth, the development of creative initiative in the struggle for an economical economy and implementation of the Food Program.

It is important to improve work with propagandists, to assign the propaganda of economic skills to leadership cadres, economists and scientific and engineering-technical personnel. It is planned to expand the training of propagandists in the universities of Marxism-Leninism, sector institutes and refresher course faculties, on the base of VUZ's, technicums and production associations. The refresher course institutes are assigned the duties of sector training-methodological centers for economic education and upbringing of the workers.

It is essential to strengthen theoretical and methodological aid to propagandists, to provide them with prime information concerning current questions of economic life as well as advanced Soviet and foreign experience.

The Central Methodological Council for Economic Education of the Workers (EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA), the CC CPSU Academy of Social Sciences, the USSR Academy of the National Economy, the Higher School of Trade Union Movement imeni N. M. Shvernik and CC Komsomol Higher Komsomol School are directed to organize the preparation of standard curricula, programs and textbooks. A competition for the development of textbooks for the basic courses will be held in 1983-1985. The output of economic literature, instruction and methods aids, training films and aural and visual materials for economic training will be expanded.

The task is set of strengthening the economic training of pupils and young students, instilling in them a proprietary attitude toward socialist property, the ability to work effectively and in a cultured and conscientious manner. The USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences is directed to prepare popular texts dealing with problems of economic upbringing in the home and in the school.

The decree emphasizes that newspaper and journal editorial boards, USSR State Committee for Television and Radio, USSR State Committee for Cinematography, the USSR Ministry of Culture and the creative unions must focus more attention on problems of the economic upbringing of the workers, clearly elucidate the historic accomplishments of the Soviet people, and labor heroism, and promote the all-out national movement for economy and conservation. It sets forth the task of creating meaningful, interesting and attractive television and radio programs dealing with economic and social questions, imparting to them a more profoundly analytic and problematic character.

The CC CPSU, the USSR Council of Ministers, the AUCCTU and the CC Komsomol express confidence that party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations as well as economic organs will ensure further improvement of the economic education and upbringing of the Soviet people, directing their creative energies and excellent strength of knowledge toward implementing the plans of communist construction.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/16

THE FOOD PROGRAM AND TASKS IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION

PM051551 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 82 pp 6-21

[Article by M. Gorbachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee]

[Text] Soviet people greeted with deep satisfaction the results of the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) plenum. That is understandable: The plenum examined a vitally important question -- the food question. Its successful resolution is of tremendous political, economic and social significance. It opens up new opportunities for the implementation of an active domestic and foreign policy -- a policy of communist creation, peace and progress.

The report of Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was the basic platform for detailed, all-round discussion of the food problem in the country. It is a fundamental guidance document for understanding the results of the May plenum, the nature of its program and the complexity and scale of the work ahead to implement the tasks set. The report and the USSR Food Program for the period through 1990 approved by the plenum, and the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions express the essence of the party's agrarian policy for the eighties, provide scientific substantiation for it and define its fundamental directions.

The high standard at which the plenum was held and its fruitful results were ensured by the profound study of the questions submitted for discussion. In the course of many months of collective labor, documents were prepared on the basis of the opinions and proposals of practical workers, scientists, party, soviet and economic organs in republics, krays, oblasts and rayons, and central departments. The multifaceted experience of work in agriculture and other sectors of the economy was comprehensively analyzed and taken into account.

In the course of discussion of the Central Committee May plenum's results, communists and all the country's working people rightly note the outstanding role of Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, on whose initiative and under whose leadership the USSR Food Program was elaborated. Leonid Ilich invested tremendous labor in the resolution of problems of agricultural development and defined the strategy and tactics of the struggle on the food front with Leninist wisdom.

The materials of the Central Committee May plenum are permeated with concern for man. "The satisfaction of Soviet people's vital needs..." Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said, "has been and remains our party's most important program requirement." The plenum decisions give new impetus to the upsurge in agriculture and will actively influence the progress of the country's economy as a whole. As a result reliable foundations will be laid for the formation of a food stock that will remove the acute situation with supplies, ensure a significant growth in the consumption of food products, guarantee the country against all eventualities and weaken the influence of world market forces.

The results of the CPSU Central Committee May plenum and Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's report at the plenum aroused a tremendous international response. The progressive public notes that at a time when, through the fault of aggressive imperialist circles, tension is being stepped up and the arms race is being spurred on, the world's first socialist state is adopting a food program, thereby demonstrating its peaceful aspirations and its concern for the people's good.

The warm approval and unanimous support for the results of the Central Committee May plenum and the Food Program in party organizations and labor collectives create confidence that the great goals set by the party on the food front will be successfully achieved. The May plenum decisions are aimed at further increasing the well-being of millions of Soviet people. That is why the struggle for their implementation is a vital cause for millions of working people in cities and villages. All sectors of material production, all republics, krais, oblasts and rayons, every kolkhoz and sovkhoz and every labor collective must make their contribution to the implementation of the Food Program.

I.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism attached great significance to the food problem, because food products were and remain the first condition of human life. V.I. Lenin believed that the socialist state stands firmly on its own feet in economic terms only if it is "the processor in practice of an adequate food stock" (Complete Collected Works, Vol 44, p 9).

The party's agrarian policy has always been oriented toward the creation of a reliable food stock with a view to the fuller satisfaction of Soviet people's growing demands. Of course, the ways and methods of resolving this problem at various stages of the socialist society's development have been determined by specific conditions. They have depended on the historical legacy bequeathed to the young socialist state, the economic potential and the need for industrialization and the resolution of other socioeconomic tasks.

Contemporary agrarian policy dates from the CPSU Central Committee March (1965) plenum. It has been developed at the 23d, 24th, 25th and 26th party congresses and Central Committee plenums and in Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's works. The main directions of this policy lie in the creation of a modern material and technical base for agriculture, the further strengthening of the economy of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, the enhancement of rural workers' material interest, the improvement of reduction organization and administration, the deepening of specialization and concentration on the basis of interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration and the social transformation of the countryside.

Experience has shown the viability of this policy. As a result of the implementation of the course of the Central Committee March (1965) plenum, in the last three 5-year plans there has been a radical change in the material and technical base of agriculture. The power-worker ratio has increased more than threefold and the capital-labor ratio fourfold. Agriculture has become more intensive and productive and opportunities for the wide introduction of industrial techniques have opened up in most of its sectors.

All this has made it possible to strengthen the economy of kolkhozes and sovkhozes and increase production of agricultural products. The average annual volume of output has increased 50 percent over the three 5-year plans. The average per capita output per year in the 10th 5-Year Plan was R470 (at comparable prices) compared with R369 in the 7th 5-Year Plan. Over the 15 years the average annual rate of growth in agricultural output was higher than in many highly developed Western countries and almost 150 percent higher than the rate of population growth in our country.

On this basis the working people's diet improved. Per capita consumption of meat, for instance, increased 41 percent over the three 5-year plans; that of milk increased 25 percent, that of eggs nearly doubled; and that of vegetables increased 35 percent. And this at a time when our population was increasing by 35 million. In terms of the calorie

content of the diet our country is now among the world's most developed states. Its share of world production of agricultural products is considerable. With 6 percent of the globe's population, the Soviet Union produces 31 percent of the world's grain, 20 percent of the cotton and milk, 10 percent of the meat and 12 percent of the eggs.

Despite the indisputable achievements in the development of the agrarian sector of the economy and the increase in the volume of production of agricultural products, the food situation has still deteriorated. This is the result of a number of factors. The present-day food problem is above all qualitative and structural in nature. Its essence lies to a large extent in the lack of correlation which has arisen between the growth in the population's financial income and the increase in the production of agricultural products -- which, where state retail prices are stable for the main types of such products, leads to enhanced demand for the most valuable products. Moreover, there has been a sharp increase in the number of purchasers. Whereas the total population increased 15 percent over the three 5-year plans, the increase in the number of regular purchasers of food products was much greater. This is explained by both the reduction in the rural population and the fall in the share of food production accounted for by personal subsidiary plots and also by the transfer of a significant proportion of rural dwellers to an urban way of life. It should also be borne in mind that there has recently been a fall in the rate of increase in the production of agricultural products. This happened both because of shortcomings in the functioning of the economic machinery and as a result of extremely unfavorable weather conditions in the last 3 years.

The situation which had arisen gave rise to the need to elaborate and adopt the Food Program. Its implementation is possible on the basis of consistent implementation of the decisions of the Central Committee May plenum, which constitute a logical continuation of the line elaborated at the March (1965) plenum. The May plenum is a new stage in the further creative development of the party's modern agrarian policy and takes into account the profound changes taking place both in the agroindustrial complex and in the country's economy as a whole.

In view of society's urgent needs and increased potential, the party puts forward more substantial tasks in the development of agriculture. The main idea of the Central Committee May plenum decisions is to more rapidly transform agriculture into a highly developed sector of the economy. This is one of the main conditions of a radical solution to the food problem and successful progress along the path of communist building.

The major role played by the agrarian sector of the economy arises from the party's general line of increasing the people's well-being. The increase in the proportion of the national income accounted for by the consumption fund, which was 75.3 percent in 1980 and will reach 78 percent by the end of the 11th 5-Year Plan, also accords with this line.

Agricultural products and goods made from agricultural raw materials account for approximately 70 percent of the personal consumption fund.

The experience of economic and cultural building in our country shows convincingly that major strategic tasks are resolved most successfully on the basis of targeted comprehensive programs. This approach makes it possible to utilize more fully the increased economic, scientific and technical potential, cadres' skills and the reserves of all sectors and regions of the country. It reflects the objective necessity of the present stage of development of production that is characterized by the increasingly integrated nature and organic interrelationships of all spheres of the economy and forms a unified national economic complex.

In these conditions the dependence of the overall level and dynamics of socioeconomic progress in the country on the degree of development of each sector of the national economy and the intensiveness and efficiency of its operation becomes increasingly perceptible. This dependence increases as the division of labor is deepened and intra- and intersector ties become more complex. It was particularly intensified in connection with the growth in the industrialization of agricultural production and the formation of the agroindustrial complex. Today more than 4/5 of the fixed production capital of kolkhozes and sovkhoses is created on the basis of supplies from socialist industry. The countryside, in turn, supplies the raw material base for approximately 1/3 of industrial output.

In present conditions the agrarian sector's influence on the development of other sectors of the economy is objectively increasing. So the reduction in the rate of agricultural production growth observed in recent years was one factor causing formation of a number of disproportions in the national economy and an imbalance between its individual components. That is why the accelerated development of the sector and the formation and organizational consolidation of the entire agroindustrial complex is an urgent process, governed by natural law.

The comprehensive approach to the resolution of the tasks set is characteristic of the entire Food Program. It plans to link in a single organism all the components of agriculture and the sectors which service it, to improve the management and stimulation of production growth and to ensure correct proportions and balance in the development of sectors of the agroindustrial complex.

On this basis agricultural production efficiency will increase and growth rates will improve. The end result of the implementation of the plenum decisions must be not only the creation of a reliable food stock, but a significant improvement in the functioning of the country's entire economy.

The Central Committee May plenum further developed the 26th CPSU Congress's conclusion to the effect that kolkhozes and sovkhoses remain the basis of socialist agriculture and the main component in the agroindustrial complex at the present stage and for the future. This is a fundamental tenet. It indicates that in the conditions of deepening specialization, strengthening cooperation and integration and with the emergence of interfarm enterprises and agroindustrial associations, kolkhozes and sovkhoses still have the leading role. They have been and will remain the basic form of organization of agricultural production and the main source of the creation of the food stock.

Kolkhozes and sovkhoses ensure the necessary opportunities for the efficient utilization of land and other production resources and create favorable conditions for the work, life and spiritual development of rural workers. Kolkhozes and sovkhoses, having substantial reserves at their disposal, can fight increasingly actively for the Food Program's implementation. In this connection increasing significance is attached to the comprehensive approach to further strengthening the material and technical base of farms and extending the democratic principles of their activity. The work of kolkhozes and sovkhoses must remain a focus of attention for party, soviet and economic organs.

A major role is also played by the subsidiary farms of plants, factories, construction sites and organizations. They supply the public catering system of workers' collectives and also, partly, the local market with hundreds of thousands of tons of meat, milk, vegetables and potatoes. The development of these enterprises will continue to receive all-round support. They must become highly efficient, mechanized farms utilizing the manpower and material reserves of the main production facility.

At the same time the Central Committee plenum devoted attention to personal subsidiary plots as an organic, integral part of socialist agriculture at the present stage. The significance of this sector is not confined to the economic aspect of the matter. It plays a considerable social and educational role. The main duty is to ensure that personal subsidiary plots make it possible to utilize more fully the manpower reserves and other potentials available and to add substantially to the food stock. It is now important to extend the integration of personal subsidiary plots with social production and to create the necessary organizational and economic preconditions for their efficient functioning.

For practical activity, great significance is attached to the Central Committee May plenum's conclusions on stepping up the role of intensive factors of economic development. Intensification on the basis of scientific and technical progress is the main way of developing agriculture and other sectors of the agroindustrial complex and increasing their efficiency. The Food Program defines major measures of a scientific and technical nature making it possible to significantly increase the level of

intensiveness of production. Their implementation will make possible an increase in the output per unit area, an increase in the return on capital investments and an improvement in the efficiency of the economy. With the growing volume of capital investment and the growing scale of production, the significance of the return per unit of resources is increasing immeasurably.

The development of the material and technical base of kolkhozes and sovkhoses and other enterprises servicing agriculture, the deepening of the division of labor and the strengthening of cooperation and intersector integration in recent years have brought the agroindustrial complex's production forces up to a new, higher level. This objectively requires an improvement in production relations. The resolutions approved by the Central Committee plenum define a system of measures intended to ensure the planning and management of the agroindustrial complex as a single entity. Questions of improving the economic machinery, material labor incentives, strengthening autonomous financing and maintaining price parity in intersector exchange are resolved in organic integration with management.

The resolution of such major tasks presupposes a further improvement in the standard of work by party, soviet and economic organs, the assimilation by them and also by all working people in the agroindustrial complex of the achievements of modern science and leading experience, and the ability to utilize intensive factors for increasing production. These are necessary conditions of fulfillment of the CPSU Central Committee May plenum decisions.

II.

The Food Program sets itself the main aim of ensuring steady supplies of all types of food to the population. By the end of the eighties, it is planned to increase per capita meat consumption by 30-39 percent and fruit and berry consumption by 74-84 percent. The structure of nutrition will be qualitatively improved by increasing the consumption of animal proteins, fats, vegetables and fruit.

This restructuring of the diet requires high rates of growth in the production of the most valuable products. Thus, in the 12th 5-Year Plan, in terms of the yearly average, the country must receive 45-50 million tons more grain than in the 10th 5-Year Plan, 11.3-13.3 million tons more milk, 5.2-5.7 million tons more meat, 7-9 million tons more vegetables and melon crops and 4.6-5.6 million tons more fruit and berries. For all these types of produce the increases that the program envisages for the eighties exceeds the actual increases over the last two 5-year plans.

The attainment of the targets planned is only possible on the basis of balanced, dynamic development of sectors in the agroindustrial complex. This is of fundamental significance. It is a question of strengthening each link in the complex and the chain as a whole because weakness in just one link leads to the weakening of the entire system. Attaching great significance to the comprehensive approach, Lenin wrote: "If an iron chain is needed to take a weight of, say, 100 poods, what will happen if just one link of that chain is replaced with a wooden link? The chain will break. The strength or safety of all the remaining links in the chain apart from that one will not help" (Complete Collected Works, vol 32, p 201).

The Food Program provides for a comprehensive approach to the resolution of problems and the elimination of existing disproportions in the material and technical base and technological level of agriculture and related sectors. Investment policy is oriented toward this. Capital-producing sectors and also the production and social infrastructure will develop at higher rates. Thus, with an increase in capital investments in the whole agroindustrial complex of approximately 30 percent in the current decade, capital investment in tractor and agricultural machine building and in machine building for livestock raising and fodder production will more than double, investment in food machine building will almost treble, investment in road building will increase 90 percent, and investment in municipal services will increase 230 percent. There will be an increase in investments in the sphere of the storage and processing of output.

The new approach to distributing capital investments will make it possible to strengthen those components in the agroindustrial complex which have fallen appreciably behind and have become one of the main causes of losses of produce grown and the slowing down of rates of growth in the production of foodstuffs. This will help meet the demands of proportional development of the entire agroindustrial sector of the economy.

The acceleration of the rate of growth of capital investments in the capital-producing sectors will make it possible to improve the supply of resources to agriculture, supply mineral fertilizers that are balanced in terms of structure and nutrients, other chemicals and more productive machinery, and qualitatively improve the makeup of the farms' machine and tractor pool. Here the main avenue is to move from the production of individual items of equipment to the production of sets of machinery and make it possible to ensure flow techniques in production. The increase in kolkhozes' and sovkhoses' technical potential in the eighties will take place through the creation of modern tractor-mounted and trailer machines and implements adapted to fit high-powered tractors. There will be an increase in deliveries of other machinery and equipment for livestock units and processing enterprises. This will go a long way toward eliminating gaps in comprehensive mechanization and ensuring that operations are carried out at the optimum time. Improved machinery will form the basis of the use of resource-saving techniques.

The development and introduction of new machinery and techniques will make it possible to obtain a greater final output from the same quantity of agricultural raw material and also reduce losses at all stages -- production, processing and storage. Thus, according to calculations, in the food industry alone, as a result of the use of new equipment and progressive techniques, in 10 years meat and meat produce resources will increase by more than 3 million tons, milk by 8 million tons, vegetable oil by 200,000 tons and sugar by 2.5 million tons. A considerable saving will be achieved on this basis in other sectors of the agroindustrial complex too.

The structural reform of the capital-producing sectors will ensure that kolkhozes and sovkhoses are more fully provided with power machinery. The end of the eighties should see the general completion of the creation of a modern, developed material and technical base for agriculture. This is not only of great production and social significance but also incorporates a tremendous economic saving which goes far beyond the bounds of one sector. Theory and practice indicate that at a certain stage of intensification, when the structure of capital is balanced, return on capital begins to increase.

On farms that are fully provided with capital and have been able to implement a comprehensive approach to the development of the material and technical base, production efficiency increases sharply. This is indicated by many examples, including the experience of 452 specialized sovkhoses under the direct jurisdiction of the USSR Ministry of Agriculture. They are sited in all the country's soil and climatic zones and in any year they harvest, say, grain crops per hectare and produce milk per cow on a scale which is nearly 50 percent greater than the average for the country's kolkhozes and sovkhoses. The main reasons for the success lie in the higher level of intensification and organization of production. Suffice it to say that 58 percent more mineral fertilizers are used per hectare on those farms and the power-worker and capital-labor ratios are nearly 50 percent higher than on other farms.

This trend is confirmed by analysis of activity on other farms in the country. On kolkhozes and sovkhoses where the capital-labor ratio is higher, the volume of gross output per 100 hectares of agricultural land is significantly greater. That is why it is so important to complete more quickly the process of equipping farms with modern, highly efficient means of production and ensuring their rational utilization.

The siting of production must also be approached in a new way, taking into account the final economic effect and in close linkage with all sectors in the single complex. This applies not only to agriculture but also to the processing industry. Concern for increasing efficiency dictates the need to site processing enterprises as close as possible to the places where raw material is produced. Thus, rational siting of meat

combines will exclude the delivery of livestock over a distance of more than 150 km. In practice, in a number of zones in the country, livestock is transported over distances of up to 2,000 km. The state suffers great losses as a result. In the butter, cheese and dairy industry the number of plants has been halved over the last 15 years, while the average radius of milk delivery has nearly doubled. The situation is similar in the oil, fats and canning industries. This practice, which is aimed at narrow, sector results, leads to an increase in transport expenses, a fall in quality and ultimately losses of output. In order to rectify the situation it is necessary to significantly extend the network of processing enterprises and bring them closer to where the products are produced. At the same time the actual processing of agricultural raw materials on the kolkhozes and sovkhozes will be further developed. This will provide an additional source of strength for their economy and make it possible to use manpower and raw material resources more productively.

Major structural changes must be carried out throughout the sphere of production services. This applies particularly to warehousing and transport. Appropriations for these purposes are increasing sharply in the 11th and 12th 5-Year Plans. Storehouse and refrigerator capacities will be increased significantly and their siting improved. In the eighties, kolkhozes, sovkhozes and trade and industrial enterprises and organizations must carry out large-scale construction of well-equipped warehouses for the storage of potatoes, vegetables, fruit, fodder and fertilizers. It is envisaged that by the end of the decade all the arable and livestock products procured will be transported directly from the fields and livestock units to plants and stores by procurement organizations' transport facilities. This will enable the farms to concentrate more fully on the production of output without dispersing their manpower and resources.

There will also be a substantial structural reform in the central component of the agroindustrial complex -- agriculture. This is dictated by the need to speed up the rate of increase in the output of the most valuable products and to utilize resources more fully. The emphasis is on the comprehensive approach to intensification, whereby the more rational utilization of all production resources, above all the land, is ensured. The expediency of this method is indicated by the experience of the country's leading kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Their work methods demonstrate first and foremost the ability to comprehensively resolve questions of agricultural development, correctly determine priorities and achieve the greatest possible production efficiency.

The main thing today, as practice shows, is concern for developing arable farming and increasing soil fertility. The Food Program is oriented toward the all-round strengthening of arable sectors and other production spheres on which the growth of the land's productivity depends. This is backed up by capital investments policy and material resources. Improving the structure of the sown areas and crop rotations, increasing and ensuring the efficient utilization of reclaimed land, making wide use of organic and mineral fertilizers and industrial techniques, protecting soil against erosion, introducing more productive varieties of plants, increasing the workers' material interest in increasing yield -- these are the main elements in our work in the sphere of arable farming in the current decade. All these factors are summed up ultimately in increased yield and improved product quality.

In livestock raising, there will also be a turn toward improving the structure of capital and intensifying production. In a number of parts of the country intensive factors for developing livestock raising have not been fully utilized. Most kolkhozes and sovkhozes have the necessary livestock population and it is now only a question of substantially improving its productivity. According to calculations, over 10 years 3/4 of the increased output of livestock products must be ensured on the basis of increased weight gains, milk yields and laying capacity.

Here, a reliable fodder base plays a most important role. Experience indicates that the productivity of fodder lands can be increased on the basis of a system of measures including land reclamation, the application of chemicals, improvements in seed production, the use of progressive techniques and an improvement in the overall standard of production. And this is achieved most successfully when fodder production

is regarded as a separate sector. In recent years such work has been done on a large scale, but major increases in fodder production must still be achieved by means of the resolute transfer of all fodder production onto a footing of intensification. To this end it is necessary to make substantial structural changes in sowing areas: increasing the area of feed grain crops, in particular barley, corn, oats and pulses and also expanding the cultivation of alfalfa and clover.

The comprehensive approach to the intensification of livestock production dictates the need to resolve at the same time questions on which animal productivity and the sector's efficiency depend. In recent years hundreds of large, specialized livestock units have been constructed on kolkhozes and sovkhozes. It has not always been possible to supply them in good time with sufficient highly productive livestock, to ensure a stable fodder base and to elaborate rational techniques. Much work still lies ahead here. Large-scale livestock units must be brought more rapidly up to the standard of intensive, profitable units, so that they can justifiably be called complexes. In the next few years it is important to place the emphasis on the modernization of existing livestock premises and on providing them with all they need for efficient production.

The Food Program devotes great attention to strengthening foreign economic ties with the socialist countries in the sphere of agriculture. On the basis of long-term targeted programs, it is proposed to develop cooperation in the production, processing and rational utilization of agricultural raw material and in the production of machinery and equipment.

The decisions of the Central Committee May (1982) plenum and the Food Program are based on the creative generalization of practical experience and scientific data. They direct party, soviet and economic cadres to be guided by the demands of the comprehensive approach, balance, proportionality and dynamic development. Only on this basis can a high end result be achieved.

III.

The complexity and scale of the tasks put forward in the Food Program make fundamentally new demands on the management system and the economic machinery of management, which must operate in socialist conditions, as Lenin demanded, "with the precision of clock-work" (Complete Collected Works, vol 36, p 157).

Today this means: the orientation of the management system toward the end results of economic activity; the optimum combination of the territorial and sector principles of management, of the advantages of centralization with the independence and initiative of labor collectives; the all-round strengthening of economic methods of management; the elimination of duplication in production and the greatest possible encouragement for creative initiative and enterprise.

The concept put forward by the 26th CPSU Congress of the agroindustrial complex as a single entity is formulated in organizational terms in the decisions adopted by the CPSU Central Committee May plenum on creating special administrative organs at the level of the rayon, oblast, kray, republic and country. The new administrative organs are called upon to ensure the implementation of this concept and to carry out in practice the planning, financing and material and technical supply of the entire agroindustrial complex as an integrated system.

Above all, planning will be raised to a qualitatively new level. It is to coordinate the plans of individual sectors and departments, ensure the balanced development of all components of the agroindustrial complex and create conditions for its efficient functioning at all levels. Plan targets are backed by a corresponding distribution of resources.

Special attention is devoted to the rayon component. Many years of experience show that the rayon agroindustrial associations set up in a number of republics have proved their worth. It is therefore deemed necessary to use this form of management everywhere. These organs will not only coordinate the activity of kolkhozes, sovkhoses and other enterprises and organizations linked to agriculture, but will also manage them, distribute capital investments and form relevant funds. They have to eliminate narrow departmental tendencies and make conditions as favorable as possible for strengthening the kolkhoz and sovkhos economy. Meanwhile, all the components of the agroindustrial complex remain legally and economically independent. In this way the territorial-sectorial principle of management will ensure the solution of the dual task of coordinating and integrating the activity of enterprises under different departments on the one hand, and ensuring their maximum independence and initiative on the other.

Major capital investments are being made in the development of agriculture and other sectors of the agroindustrial complex. Purchase prices for agricultural products are being substantially raised and favorable conditions are being created for farms' profitable activity. This will enable kolkhozes and sovkhoses to carry out production in accordance with the principles of financial autonomy. Profitability, profits, credit and other economic levers will become important factors in the improvement of production efficiency. At the same time, it is not simply a matter of envisaging a single increase in purchase prices to bring them in line with actual production costs: The main thing is to create the kind of economic mechanism which is capable of maintaining price parity in intersectorial and also in intrasectorial exchange, while ensuring the profitability of kolkhoz and sovkhos production on a par with other sectors of physical production.

These measures are very vital. The point is that purchase prices have been raised before. It enabled kolkhozes and sovkhoses, for example, in the Eighth 5-Year Plan to implement expanded reproduction chiefly on the basis of their own accumulations. Subsequently, however, the equivalence of intersectorial exchange was upset. Release prices for industrial production facilities used in agriculture and also for services to kolkhozes and sovkhoses rose more quickly than purchase prices for agricultural products. This fact, along with several other factors, led to a reduction in the effectiveness of financial autonomy principles. Therefore, guaranteed equivalence of exchange between sectors is a very important condition of the successful functioning of the economic mechanism, of effective financial autonomy and of the effective development of agricultural production.

At the same time, it is important to be well aware of the fact that the raising of purchase prices and the adoption of other measures to improve the economic mechanism have other purposes aside from making up for kolkhoz and sovkhos inefficiency. Their task is to strengthen farms' financial and economic position, create conditions for employing financial autonomy methods, and increase labor collectives' material interest in agricultural production growth and efficiency. This is the way to approach the utilization of the large funds the state is making available for agricultural development.

Any large-scale program can only be implemented if the people implementing it are well aware of the aims and task and have a personal interest in the achievement of high results. The plenum approved a number of practical steps to increase rural workers' material interests. Basically, the main thing is to link pay to actual output. This is not easy but many rayons have now found ways of solving the tasks facing them.

Life has confirmed, for example, the high effectiveness of the collective (team, link) contract in agriculture as well as in industry and construction. Practice shows that the introduction of the contract method of work makes it possible to raise labor productivity by 15-20 percent, increase output, lower the cost of output, strengthen financial autonomy and increase production profitability. But it must be borne in mind that efficient team labor organization depends largely on the support of farm leaders, specialists and party committees. That is why it is very important to devote constant attention to this area of work and to create the requisite conditions for the widespread employment of progressive forms of production and labor organization.

The plenum devoted much attention to payment in kind. It is envisaged that team and link workers will receive free of charge up to 15 percent of grain grown in excess of the plan. It is also planned to issue certain types of products as payment to people working permanently in agriculture and also to citizens who have played an active part in growing and harvesting a crop. All this is bound to contribute to an increase in labor activeness and initiative on the part of agricultural workers in the struggle to obtain above-plan yields and high gross harvests and will aid the development of personal subsidiary farming.

The planned economic incentives also substantially change relationships between kolkhozes and sovkhozes on the one hand, and the organizations providing services for them on the other. The evaluation of the latter's activity will be based on the results of production on farms as well as on the carrying out of services. This will permit closer coordination of the interests of all those participating in agricultural production and procurement work and allow more concern to be shown for the attainment of high final indicators.

The measures approved by the Central Committee plenum on improving the economic mechanism and strengthening the kolkhoz and sovkhoz economy create a substantially new situation in agriculture. It demands an improvement in management methods and overall work style. And this means not only organizational measures but also the need for an appropriate psychological restructuring. The time is past when one could use bank credit without worrying too much about paying it back; now funds for the development of enterprises and formation of incentive funds must be earned. Leaders, specialists and all agricultural workers are now required to have a profound understanding of economic matters and to display initiative and enterprise.

The new tasks set forth by the CPSU Central Committee May plenum mean a colossal enhancement of the role of science. This means above all the kind of production intensification which is possible only on the basis of scientific and technical progress. That is why the all-round development of the natural and, above all, biological, agricultural and technical sciences is so important. The consistent integration of agriculture with other sectors of the agroindustrial complex and the improvement of labor activity and technological discipline demand deeper research and development in the sphere of economics, production organization and management and the social development of the countryside.

Our country possesses great scientific potential. In the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences (VASKHNIL) system and the ministries which comprise the agro-industrial complex, there are hundreds of scientific research institutes and VUZes and tens of thousands of scientists. They have done a lot to boost agriculture and other economic sectors, but that is no longer enough. Science must make a bigger contribution to the implementation of the Food Program and its influence on production must be more effective.

Scientific institutions' work should be based on the principles of close integration, and integration must be established in all spheres: basic with applied science, agronomic with technical, VUZ with academic. The strengthening of the link between science and practice is of special significance. The links with production are of many kinds -- from the creation of science and production associations to the introduction of scientists' achievements on a financial autonomy basis.

In these conditions the role of USSR Academy of Sciences and, especially, VASKHNIL institutes is considerably enhanced. As a higher scientific institution for agriculture, forestry and water resources, VASKHNIL must act as the coordinating center for the whole range of research and development within the framework of the agricultural complex. Only then is it possible to overcome narrow departmental interests and isolation and ensure scientific developments in line with comprehensive targeted programs.

IV.

The solution of economic building tasks is associated with the improvement of working people's well-being. People have been and still are society's main production force. Therefore, questions relating to the social transformation of the countryside were widely reflected in the documents of the CPSU Central Committee May plenum.

Over the years of socialist building much has been done in the sphere of the social development of the countryside. Material circumstances and cultural and technical standards for rural working people improved. It is characteristic that 3/4 of the rural working population now has higher or secondary (complete or incomplete) education, whereas in 1939 this figure was only 6 percent. Kolkhozes and sovkhoses have produced highly skilled cadres in many spheres. The very nature of agrarian labor is changing: It is acquiring a greater and greater resemblance to industrial labor.

The social development of the countryside has undergone a particularly marked acceleration in the last three 5-year plans. Pay has risen and pensions for kolkhoz and sovkhos workers have improved and their real incomes have increased. Housing and cultural and consumer premises are being constructed on a grand scale. Virtually 50 percent of families were rehoused during the period from 1966 through 1980.

At the same time, there is still much work to be done in this sphere. Although the gulf between the city and the countryside in terms of cultural and consumer facilities is narrowing, it remains appreciable. For a number of years a substantial proportion of the income generated in agriculture has gone to resolve tasks relating to all the people. Per capita aggregate expenditure on the urban social and consumer infrastructure was considerably in excess of similar expenditure in the countryside. The countryside is short of the kindergartens and creches, schools, hospitals and health centers, cultural establishments and consumer and municipal service enterprises. A considerable number of rural settlements have inadequate amenities and few roads.

This situation swells the migration from countryside to city and makes it more difficult to put together labor collectives in kolkhozes and sovkhoses. In the last three 5-year plans the rural population has fallen by nearly 11 million, and analysis has shown that it was predominantly able-bodied people who left, mainly young people and highly skilled personnel. The reduction in the number of people employed in the countryside is basically a natural process, but it can only be the objective consequence of the replacement of manual labor by machinery and it should not affect the normal staffing of kolkhozes and sovkhoses or make the utilization of production facilities less efficient. The mass migration of country dwellers from areas where there are poor social and consumer conditions to the city upsets the natural reproduction of the rural population and inhibits the development of agriculture.

On the basis of a profound analysis of the changes taking place in society's economic and social life, the 26th party congress worked out a new approach to the solution of the countryside's social problems. Fundamentally it amounts to ensuring the priority construction in the countryside of well-appointed housing with buildings for economic activity, children's preschool establishments, clubs and other cultural and consumer premises.

All these fundamental assignments are specifically stated in the documents of the CPSU Central Committee May Plenum and the USSR Food Program. The purpose of the measures adopted is to substantially improve working and everyday living conditions for agricultural workers and create the requisite social infrastructure on kolkhozes and sovkhoses. Capital investments of unprecedented size have been put into this. Over a 10-year period they will amount to R160 billion. But the money must be used. The capacities of the construction organizations which agriculture possesses today are not big enough. That is why it is necessary to increase the contribution of construction organizations in cities and industrial centers to housing and cultural and consumer construction in the countryside.

In the eighties at least 378 million square meters of housing, or 40 percent more than in the previous 10-year period, will be constructed on kolkhozes and sovkhozes. The commissioning of children's preschool establishments will more than double and the network of clubs, schools, culture centers and water-, gas- and heat-supply and drainage systems will expand. It is planned to build approximately 130,000 km of highways in the countryside and 150,000 km of farm roads. This is twice as much as in the previous two 5-year periods. Roads have both economic and social significance. They will strengthen farms' links with industrial centers, bring the countryside nearer to the city and enable the inhabitants of small settlements to take advantage of cultural and consumer establishments. A good road system creates conditions for increasing production intensification and saving manpower and materials. Highway construction is a very important sphere of the socioeconomic development of the countryside and party, soviet and economic organs must focus attention on it.

Thus, the Food Program includes major social as well as economic and technical measures. This, Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said at the CPSU Central Committee May plenum, expresses a major policy geared to erasing social differences between city and countryside and, consequently, to implementing one of our program demands scientifically substantiated by Marxism-Leninism.

V.

In terms of their scale and complexity, the tasks set by the Central Committee May plenum surpass all that working people of the countryside and other sectors of the agroindustrial complex have had to do in the past. It is perfectly clear that for them to be successfully fulfilled we need a higher level of organization and responsibility in party committees and all components of the economic apparatus, and persistence and consistency, enterprise and activeness on the part of every Communist and every citizen of our country.

The Food Program defines the tasks within timeframes -- long-term, medium-term and immediate. We must be concentrating our attention on the last two, zeroing in on them and uniting the efforts of all enterprise collectives in the agroindustrial complex to solve them. The work must be organized in such a way that the first results of the fulfillment of the May plenum decisions are obtained this very year.

First of all we have the struggle for this year's harvest. It must be a weighty contribution to the formation of the 11th 5-Year Plan food stock. It is important, therefore, to make every effort to harvest more grain, potatoes, vegetables and other food and industrial crops and ensure the fulfillment of plans for production and sale to the state of arable and livestock products. Special attention must be given to fodder production; all plant resources must be used to swell fodder stocks and all livestock units must be supplied.

Equal attention must be paid to the struggle against losses at all stages of production, transportation, storage and processing of grain, vegetables, potatoes, sugar beet, cotton, fruit and other products. All spheres of the agroindustrial complex must wage a determined struggle against mismanagement and strengthen the weak links in the process of getting the produce from the field and livestock unit to the consumer. These are our immediate reserves and they must be fully exploited.

At the same time, the efforts of party, soviet and economic organs must be geared to developing the Food Program in every republic, kray, oblast and rayon, developing comprehensive plans for agricultural development and increasing output on every kolkhoz and sovkhoz. And it must be borne in mind that the established indicators for the production of the various types of foodstuffs are minimum indicators. Creative thought and organizational work in every collective must be directed toward substantially exceeding the planned targets. All resources must be taken into account, extra sources and reserves must be sought, and potential must be calculated for increasing purchases of products and supplying the maximum amount of food to the population. This is also an urgent task which must be solved immediately.

It is essential to accelerate the commissioning of agroindustrial complex premises. This applies primarily to machine building and chemical plants and also to enterprises in the processing and storage sphere. The facts, however, show that many of these facilities are being constructed or modernized too slowly. There have been delays in the construction of the Aktybunskselmash and Umanselmash plants, the Poltava food machine building plant and the Neftekamsk agricultural machinery plant. The capital investments plan for January-May 1982 was fulfilled at only 20 of the 53 Ministry for the Production of Mineral Fertilizers projects nearing completion. Party, soviet and economic organs must take a firm hold of the other projects and make them nationwide shock projects.

The implementation of the Food Program is a matter for all the people and every Soviet person. In the first place it is the job of the agricultural workers producing the grain, potatoes, vegetable, fruit, milk and meat. It is an equally important task for the working class, for the collectives which provide the countryside with production facilities -- machine builders, chemical workers, highway workers and others. It is the job of every citizen, especially those who live in the countryside and are able to grow potatoes and vegetables, berries and fruit, and keep livestock and poultry.

The fulfillment of the Central Committee May plenum decisions on strengthening the material and technical base of the agroindustrial complex is of special significance. The only permissible departures from the plan are those in the direction of seeking additional capital investments and material resources to strengthen the economy of the agricultural sphere and related sectors and increase foodstuffs production. Comrade L.I. Brezhnev drew attention to this in his report at the Central Committee plenum.

The successful solution of the food problem demands a more responsible attitude to food resources. At home, at school and in party, Komsomol, Pioneer and trade union organizations all citizens must be taught to treat bread and other products with care and respect because every kilogram of grain, meat and milk embodies the colossal labor of people employed in the fields and livestock units, plants and factories, transport organizations and scientific laboratories. A wasteful and negligent attitude to foodstuffs can only be described as plundering the national wealth.

The scale, depth and complexity of the problems advanced by the Food Program demand a further improvement in the standard of party leadership of agriculture and other sectors of the agroindustrial complex and the intensification of political work in labor collectives. The country has accumulated vast experience of party leadership of the economy's agrarian sector. A large detachment of Communists is working on kolkhozes and sovkhozes and in other related enterprises. They must be the leading, organizing link of all work on the implementation of the Central Committee May plenum decisions. It is important to ensure a profound awareness of the fact that the adoption of the Food Program does not automatically blunt the acuteness of the food problem. The question can only be resolved through active work by party organizations and all urban and rural workers. We must ensure that all enterprise collectives know the contribution they have to make to the implementation of the Food Program and actively struggle to fulfill the plan.

In the process of preparation for the plenum, party, soviet and economic organs analyzed the work of hundreds of farms and many rayons and oblasts. In virtually every oblast, kray and republic there are leading rayons and in every rayon there are kolkhozes and sovkhozes whose agricultural production level substantially exceeds average indicators. They have accumulated vast experience of the rational utilization of resources. This experience is a great asset for the people. It has the answers to the questions that farms must solve in the current decade. It must be fully exploited. The growing material and technical resources are enabling kolkhozes and sovkhozes to catch up to and surpass the leaders.

Work with people was and still is the key problem of party leadership. The decisions of the Central Committee May plenum make heightened demands on the cadres of all components of the agroindustrial complex. They must have higher professional skills and a deeper grasp of economics and modern management methods. It is necessary to encourage and develop initiative and socialist enterprise, support the creative endeavors of specialists and promote the introduction into practice of everything progressive.

Party organizations are expected to help cadres eliminate shortcomings such as inertia and bureaucratism. We cannot tolerate instances of administrative meddling, replacement of specialists and economic leaders and fascination with conferences and with generating paperwork. No one must be allowed to harass leaders and specialists, demand that they fulfill targets that are not stipulated in the plan or request information other than that which they are required to report. And no exceptions can be made.

Throughout the period of socialist building our party has sent to the countryside its best representatives, able specialists, organizers and educators. These traditions must continue. It is important, above all, to supply kolkhozes and sovkhozes with more skilled cadres. The decisions of the Central Committee May plenum create favorable organizational and material prerequisites for this.

This year sees the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation. It must be a shock year in the development of agriculture, in increasing the country's food stock. Inspired by the decisions of the Central Committee May plenum, all agroindustrial complex workers are seeking to mark the glorious jubilee of the multinational Soviet state with new labor successes. Party organizations are called upon to head this work and make every effort to ensure that the current year's results serve as a good basis for the implementation of the country's Food Program and create conditions for the further improvement of the people's well-being.

CSO: 1802/16

GREAT FORCE OF FRIENDSHIP AND FRATERNITY

PM061243 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 82 pp 22-35

[Article by D. Kunayev, Politburo member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Kazakh CP Central Committee]

[Text] I.

Our great socialist motherland is advancing toward the glorious 60th anniversary of the USSR in the full flower of its might. The Soviet people, armed with the historic decisions of the 26th party congress and the Central Committee May (1982) plenum, are launching socialist competition increasingly widely, seeking to mark the jubilee with new labor achievements for the triumph of communism.

As the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the 60th Anniversary of the Formation of the USSR" notes, the birth of the USSR was the result of the victory of Great October and the living embodiment of the ideas of Vladimir Ilich Lenin and Lenin's nationalities policy. This is to the very great credit of the Bolshevik Party. In terms of its political significance and socioeconomic consequences the formation of the USSR occupies an outstanding place in the history of the Soviet state. It has been one of the decisive factors ensuring favorable conditions for rebuilding society on the basis of socialist principles.

The need to create a very close alliance of Soviet republics was substantiated by Lenin when scientifically elaborating the theoretical principles of the Soviet multinational state. Vladimir Ilich considered total mutual trust, voluntary consent and the exclusion of any form of inequality in relations between nations to be the guarantee of the solidity of this union. He wrote: "Let Russia be a union of free republics" (Complete Collected Works vol 32 p 286).

The formation of the USSR was dictated by the objective course of our country's historical development. On the basis of a profound scientific analysis of social processes Lenin showed that life itself urgently demanded the Soviet Republics' unification into a single union state capable of ensuring external security, economic progress and freedom for the peoples' national development. Practice has fully confirmed Lenin's conclusion that "the advantages of large-scale states from the viewpoint of economic progress and the viewpoint of the interests of the masses are undoubted...." (Complete Collected Works vol 27 p 255).

V.I. Lenin believed that the idea of soviet set-up was close to the working masses of all peoples of Russia and simple and applicable to the most diverse conditions of their life. The RSFSR played a decisive part in creating a single union state. All the Soviet Republics rallied around it on a voluntary basis. As the first multinational Soviet state, the RSFSR was the prototype of the USSR.

On 30 December 1922 in Moscow through the will of the country's peoples the First All-Union Congress of Soviets adopted a declaration and approved a treaty on the formation of the USSR. The declaration stressed that the union is a voluntary

association of equal peoples, that the new union state would be a worthy crown to the foundations of the peoples' peaceful coexistence and fraternal cooperation laid in October 1917 and that it would serve as a reliable bulwark against world capitalism. "In the formation, consolidation and development of this mighty union of equal peoples who have embarked on the path of socialism," Comrade L.I. Brezhnev has noted, "all our country's nations and ethnic groups and primarily the great Russian people have played their part.... Their revolutionary energy, selflessness, industry and profound internationalism have rightly won them the sincere respect of all peoples of our socialist motherland."

History knows of no other state which has done so much so rapidly for the all-around development of the nations and ethnic groups comprising it. The decades which have elapsed since the formation of the USSR have been marked by our country's rapid socioeconomic growth. The national income produced in 1981 was 167 times the 1922 level. The USSR's share of world industrial production has increased from 1 percent in 1922 to its present 20 percent.

The Soviet land now has enormous national wealth approaching R2.9 trillion (not counting the value of land and forest). The fixed capital in the national economy totals R1,852 billion. In the USSR there are over 44,000 industrial enterprises, 21,600 sovkhozes and over 26,000 kolkhozes. In 1981 the country generated 3.6 billion kilowatt hours of electricity, extracted 1.7 million tons of oil (including gas condensate) and almost 1.3 billion cubic meters of natural gas, smelted over 400,000 tons of steel and about 300,000 tons of pig iron, produced about 600 metal cutting machine tools and manufactured over 6,000 motor vehicles, 1,500 tractors and 30 million square meters of textiles in one day.

In terms of total industrial production the USSR ranks first in Europe and second in the world and produces more cement, oil, steel, pig iron, tractors, agricultural machinery, metal cutting machine tools, diesel engines, domestic refrigerators, sugar and other types of industrial output than any other state.

The economies of all the Soviet republics are growing dynamically in the friendly family of the peoples. The 26th CPSU Congress particularly stressed that from the first years of Soviet power our economic and social policy has been structured to raise former national backwaters of Russia up to the level of development of its center as rapidly as possible. And this task has been successfully resolved. A very important part here has been played by close cooperation between all the country's nations and above all by the selfless aid of the great Russian people.

Now any of our union and autonomous republics, krays or oblasts is characterized by modern industry, developing agriculture and high levels of science and culture. Alongside the dynamic development of each union republic a process of reciprocal equalization of economic levels is taking place between all the union and autonomous republics. This natural law of socialist and communist building is manifested fully in the USSR and is exerting an increasing influence in many countries of the world as an example of fraternal, selfless, mutually advantageous cooperation.

"There is no country or group of countries, no ideological or political movement which has not experienced to some extent or other the influence of socialism. That is the reality of the late 20th century," the CPSU Central Committee report to the 26th party congress stresses.

From the moment of its emergence the world's first socialist state began to oppose the forces of world imperialism and international reaction. Imperialism's tendency to oppress and plunder ever new countries came up against a powerful trend toward the liberation of the peoples it had oppressed.

The democratic gains for which the Soviet Union has been persistently struggling from the first days of its existence and which it is asserting in practice in the content and forms of present-day international relations are also becoming the possession of other peoples.

The strengthening community of socialist countries has been formed. Within this fraternal alliance a new type of international relations has now been asserted -- relations based on the equality, cooperation and friendship of the peoples belonging to it. This in turn has affected the entire structure of international relations -- they are being increasingly influenced by the Warsaw Pact and CEMA states.

In the sphere of international ideological relations a fundamentally new force has also emerged -- the ideas of a society free from man's exploitation of man, the exploitation of some nations and nationalities by others and the division of nations and races into "higher" and "lower" ones have been implemented. Keen confrontation has developed in the world between two different systems of spiritual and moral values. Lenin's prediction has come true: "The example of the socialist Soviet republic in Russia will stand as a living example for the peoples of all countries and the propaganda and revolutionizing impact of this model will be gigantic (Complete Collected Works vol 35 p. 250).

The young states and primarily those that have chosen a socialist orientation have a lively interest in Soviet experience of national state building and the transition of a number of USSR peoples to socialism bypassing the capitalist stage. Hundreds of millions of people in various countries of Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America are marching with the peoples of the Soviet Union along the path opened up by Great October. There is not and cannot be a road to socialism bypassing the common natural laws revealed by Marxism-Leninism and confirmed by the experience of the USSR and the countries of real socialism and by the international practice of the revolutionary struggle and socialist creation, just as there can be no successful advance along this path without comprehensive consideration of each country's national features. Soviet experience of building a developed socialist society and resolving the very complex nationalities question has met with world recognition and is rendering invaluable aid to all fighters for social and national liberation.

II.

The Kazakh SSR, like any of the fraternal union republics comprising the great Soviet Union, is a graphic embodiment of Lenin's nationalities policy. In the 60 years of the USSR's existence industrial production in the republic has increased 938 times over. Giant enterprises in power engineering, ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy, machine building and the coal, oil, chemical, light and food industries have sprung up and unique territorial production complexes have emerged and are developing confidently. In a week Kazakhstan produces as much industrial output as it did for the entire year of 1937 and in a year it produces five times more than in all the prewar 5-year plans taken together. Lenin's dream of complete electrification, which has become the fundamental basis for the national economy's rapid development, has come true.

Modern canals and water pipelines, roads, railroads and air routes have crisscrossed the expanses of Kazakhstan. This unprecedented scale of industrial, transport and communications growth attests to very great transformations, the exceptional fruitfulness of the CPSU's Leninist nationalities policy and the greatness of the fraternal friendship, cooperation and mutual aid of the peoples of the USSR.

The front of the specialization and concentration of the republic's agricultural production is broad. The scale of mechanization and chemicalization of agriculture, land reclamation and pasture irrigation is growing. Large-scale stockraising complexes, poultry factories and interfarm organizations and associations have been created and are operating. The republic's share in the production of agricultural products, particularly grain, has become more highly substantial than ever before. In the 10th 5-Year Plan alone Kazakhstan sold the state an annual average of almost 1 billion poods of high-quality grain. The remarkable fruit of the party's Leninist agrarian policy and the fundamental revolutionary transformations in the country's agriculture can be seen in all this.

Kazakhstan's economic development today is inconceivable without close and diverse ties with the other republics, krays and oblasts of our boundless motherland. In turn our republic, as an organic part of the country's national economic complex, makes a marked contribution to the all-union division of labor and takes part in its socialist integration.

Under the conditions of mature socialism unprecedented opportunities have emerged for implementing the party slogan "everything for the sake of man, everything for man's welfare." The party does everything for Soviet people to live better. In the past 10 years alone per capita incomes have increased almost 50 percent in the republic. It is indicative that about 70 percent of Kazakhstan's utilized national income is spent on consumption. Every year over 1/3 of the budget is channeled into the working people's social needs.

There is perhaps no country in the world which can vie with the Soviet Union in terms of the scale of its housing construction. Housing construction on an enormous scale is also characteristic of Kazakhstan. In the past 15 years two-thirds of the republic's population have improved their housing conditions. The network of schools, kindergartens, health institutions, preventive clinics, rest homes, clubs, libraries, tourist areas and sports installations is constantly expanding.

The transforming force of developed socialism and Lenin's nationalities policy have been graphically expressed in an unprecedented upsurge in the people's education and in science and culture. In a region where before the revolution literacy among the local population did not exceed 2 percent there are now 55 higher and hundreds of secondary specialized educational establishments and thousands of schools. Every third inhabitant in the republic is being educated.

Kazakhstan science, whose contribution to the economy and culture is becoming increasingly appreciable, has advanced a long way. Research is conducted in the republic in virtually all the avenues of modern science -- from the microscopic world to space -- and the range of its institutions' ties covers the entire Soviet Union and many countries of the world.

"...There are few states in Asia which could be compared with present-day Kazakhstan in terms of the level of scientific development," Leonid Ilich Brezhnev said at the ceremonial session in Alma Ata devoted to the 60th anniversary of the Kazakh SSR and the Kazakh CP. "There is a sort of symbolism in the fact that space ships are now taking off from the expanses of your land. Figuratively speaking the republic itself has taken off into space." Leonid Ilich is profoundly right. Two particular names have been inscribed alongside each other forever in the history of mankind: the Kazakh name of Baykonur and the Russian name of Yuri Gagarin. They also symbolize the greatness of the friendship of our peoples and their aspiration toward the cosmic heights of a new life, the path to which was signposted by Great October, the party and Lenin.

The foundations of this friendship were formed long ago. Kazakhstan's voluntary association with Russia, the foundation for which was laid 250 years ago, was an event of historic importance. The working people of Soviet Kazakhstan celebrated this notable jubilee as a great and brilliant festival of indestructible friendship with all the peoples of the land of the soviets. That is why the warm words of greeting from the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers are very dear to the Kazakh people. This greeting is a manifestation of our dear Leninist party's renewed concern for the all-round flourishing of the Kazakh SSR.

It was with deep emotion that the Kazakh people accepted the award of a third Order of Lenin to the republic. This award is particularly dear to us since it was the great Lenin who signposted the only correct path for all the peoples of our country -- the path toward a just union, toward a new socialist civilization, the path along which we are being confidently led from victory to victory by our dear party and its combat staff -- the Leninist Central Committee. We address the most profound thanks to dear Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, whose warm words about the workers of Soviet Kazakhstan give them

new strength. For all of us every word from Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, that outstanding politician and statesman of the present day, a man closely linked with Kazakhstan, is valued for its respectful sincerity, wonderful simplicity and Leninist concern and exactingness.

On behalf of all the working people of the republic, on whose banner five lofty awards of the fatherland now shine, I should like to assure the CPSU Central Committee that we will all work even better to implement the historic decisions of the 26th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) plenum and the advice and instructions of Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, that loyal continuer of Lenin's great cause.

The country's public is celebrating with us the glorious 250th anniversary of Kazakhstan's voluntary association with Russia. The events devoted to this date, which have met with an all-union response, have become graphic manifestations of the Soviet peoples' indestructible friendship. Among them I should particularly like to note the all-union scientific theory conference in Alma Ata with the participation of eminent Soviet scientists -- "the progressive role of Russia in the historical destiny of the peoples of Kazakhstan" -- the performances by leading creative collectives from Kazakhstan in Moscow, Leningrad and Yaroslavl and also the meetings in Moscow, Ulyanovsk, Orenburg, Novosibirsk and other cities within the framework of the days of Kazakh literature and art in the RSFSR.

III.

Only in progressive Russia did the Kazakh people see reliable defense and a loyal ally. Only Russia, as Chokan Valikhanov put it, could render the Kazakhs real "aid and patronage."

The motives and entire complex process of Kazakhstan's voluntary association with Russia, which was not accomplished in a day or even a year, must not be treated simplistically. There were many who supported it but there were also many enemies in the form of the reactionary feudal aristocracy, the Muslim clergy and other opponents of Kazakhstan's rapprochement with Russia. However, the course of indissoluble friendship with Russia, warmly supported by the people's masses, prevailed and gained the upper hand. The most far-sighted minds of Kazakh society realized that without union with the powerful Russian people there would be no future for the Kazakhs.

In the first one-third of the 18th century the foundation was laid for the gradual assimilation of Kazakh lands into Russia and the very important historical process of Kazakhstan's voluntary association with Russia accelerated. Despite the selfish goals of czarism and the local feudal aristocracy, this association accorded with the fundamental interests of the Kazakh working people and was of tremendous progressive significance because it was this association which merged the historical destinies of peoples -- the Russian and Kazakh peoples -- together for centuries.

This timely and socially conditioned association saved the Kazakh people when the terrible threat of bloody foreign enslavement and extermination loomed over them. An end was put to the internecine wars which had ravaged the Kazakh people. Conditions were created for the development of the economy, trade, artisan trades, transport communications and diverse links between the Kazakh and Russian population and for the transition of the Kazakh peasants (Sharua) to a settled way of life and arable farming.

Kazakhstan's voluntary association with Russia was of progressive significance for the Kazakh people's economic, political and cultural life. It opened up opportunities here for the penetration of a more progressive economy and culture into Kazakhstan and for the development of production forces and production relations. The prophetic prediction of the founders of scientific communism to the effect that Russia would play a civilizing, progressive role with respect to the eastern peoples, "for the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea and Central Asia...." came true (K. Marx and F. Engels, Works vol 27 p 241).

Kazakhstan's gradual entry into the Russian state accelerated the break-up of the old patriarchal-feudal foundations of Kazakh society, intensified the process of class stratification and prepared the ground for the development of an antifeudal and anticolonial movement.

In the mid-19th century commodity-money relations began to develop in Kazakhstan. The Kazakhs' subsistence economy disintegrated. The Bai [Central Asian landowner] economy gradually adapted to market requirements and acquired the features of a commodity economy. Hired labor began to be used. As a result of the establishment of a single state, power conditions were formed for safe and more extensive commodity exchange. Thanks to the growth of commodity relations production of stockraising, hunting and fishing products for the market expanded, as did salt mining and the manufacture of woollen articles. On the basis of social division of labor artisans emerged in close connection with the development of exchange. In the second half of the 19th century the growth of the settled population and the transition of some Kazakhs from stockraising to arable farming continued.

Kazakhstan emerged from its former economic isolation and, merging economically with the more developed Russia, was drawn into the orbit of the progressive economic and revolutionary process. Leading representatives of Russian society studied the Kazakh people's history and culture with great interest and were deeply sympathetic toward their struggle against the czarist colonialists and local feudalists.

The Decembrists were profoundly indignant at the Kazakhs' poverty and lack of rights, blaming them on czarism and the local feudalists. The warning tidings of Herzen's Kolokol were also heard in Kazakhstan. The influence of the ideas of V.G. Belinskiy, N.G. Chernyshevskiy and other Russian revolutionary democrats was felt by the outstanding Kazakh enlighteners Chokan Valikhanov, Ibray Antynsarin and Abay Kunanbayev. The Decembrist P.I. Pestel wrote in RUSSKAYA PRAVDA of the Kazakhs: "They will be our brothers and cease to stagnate in their pitiful plight."

Many brilliant minds of Russia -- from A.S. Pushkin, V.I. Dal and F.M. Dostoyevskiy to P.P. Semenov-Tyan-Shanskiy, V.V. Radlov and G.N. Potanin -- asserted the idea of the Kazakh people as a worthy brother of the Russian and other peoples of Russia and acted as the defenders of the nomadic peoples' flouted rights. When gathering material on the history of the Pugachev uprising Pushkin visited the Orenburg steppe. Here he familiarized himself closely with the life of the Kazakh people, admiring their oral traditions. A version of the poem "Kozy-Korpesh and Bayan-Sulu," which he spoke of as a masterpiece of folk art, was found in his archives.

In 1850 the great Ukrainian poet Taras Grigoryevich Shevchenko was sent to Mangyshlak. He was the first artist to record the Kazakhs' life in numerous drawings imbued with profound sympathy for ordinary people. Forming a close acquaintance with the exiled Russian revolutionary democrats Mikhaelis and Dolgoplov, Abay devoted the last years of his life entirely to the study and extensive propagation of the Russian language and Russian literature. He translated into the Kazakh language a number of the works of A.S. Pushkin, I.A. Krylov, M.Yu. Lermontov, V.G. Korolenko and others. Abay Kunanbayev's translations became so popular among the Kazakh working masses that they were transcribed and passed from hand to hand over the entire enormous territory of Kazakhstan and Central Asia. The Kazakh steppe heard the words of the great Abay: "The main thing is to learn Russian science.... To avoid vices and achieve good it is essential to know the Russian language and Russian culture. The Russians can see the world.... Study the Russians' culture and art -- that is the key to life."

And finally, the most important thing confirmed by history is that as part of Russia the Kazakh working people had access not only to progressive Russian democratic culture but also to the revolutionary movement and the ideas of Marxism, and they received them without inquisitive minds and warm hearts.

The revolutionary events of 1905 in Petersburg, Moscow and other Russian cities rocked the entire country. The Kazakh workers and poor villagers together with the Russian

workers and peasants opposed czarism and the local oppressors. The first Russian revolution gave rise to a powerful liberation movement in the outlying national regions of czarist Russia. "World capitalism and the 1905 Russian movement," Lenin wrote, "finally awakened Asia. Hundreds of millions of members of a downtrodden population that had become barbarized in its medieval stagnation awoke to a new life and to the struggle for elementary human rights and democracy" (Complete Collected Works vol 23 p 146).

The revolutionary activeness and class awareness of the working people of Kazakhstan was shown by the 1916 popular uprising against czarist autocracy under the leadership of the national hero Amangelda Imanov. The uprising, which covered the entire steppe with the awesome flames of liberation on the eve of Great October, naturally merged with the all-Russian revolutionary movement.

The Great October socialist revolution -- the main event of the 20th century -- became for the Kazakhs too the dawn of a new, communist era, put an end forever to all types of exploitation and opened up for the Kazakh people, together with the other peoples of Russia, a new, truly happy chapter in their centuries-long history.

History has recorded forever how furiously the Black Hundreds, exploiters of the most varied stripes, clung to the old ways with extensive support from world reaction. But the feeble attempts of the ideologists of "Alash-Orda" and other nationalists to mislead and entice the Kazakh people proved futile. Despite incredible difficulties the Kazakh people held out and triumphed in this fierce struggle, displaying unbending courage which became, as for instance at the defense of Ural and Cherkassy, a heroic symbol of loyalty to the ideals of the new world.

Here is what Dilnuz Asetovna Utepova, member of the Komsomol since 1924, a member of the CPSU since 1928, an active participant in the Kazakhstan women's movement and now a personal pensioner, has to say of the events of those heroic years: "The civil war began. I remember that time clearly. The day when the Whites broke into Karakalinsk is engraved in my memory in particular. They committed bloody atrocities. Those who did not manage to hide were captured, killed and laid in rows by fences. But people could not be frightened, the hour of awakening had struck, the aspiration for freedom that had gripped the oppressed could not be stopped for anything. After the victory of the revolution we, the first women Komsomol members, waged a hard struggle for Kazakh woman's liberation from centuries-old oppression. Once, I remember, a girl of about 15, thin and not very tall, came to our cell in tears. She had been forcibly given in marriage to a rich old man. The very fact that she had turned for help to representatives of Soviet power said a lot. We were trusted, people sought support from us and found it."

Our people held out because they trusted the Bolshevik Party. They withstood because they were fighting for their own native Soviet power. They triumphed because they went into battle under the all-conquering banner of the great Lenin.

IV.

All questions of the region's economic, sociopolitical and cultural development were kept in sight by Vladimir Ilich and his comrades in arms. Over 400 of Lenin's works and documents are directly linked with Kazakhstan.

The All-Russian Central Executive Committee and RSFSR Soviet of People's Commissars decree on the formation of the Kazakh Republic signed by V.I. Lenin and M.I. Kalinin and published on 26 August 1920 was the result of all-round concern for our people. Lenin frequently stressed that genuine equality of nations was impossible unless their equality in the economic and cultural sphere was achieved. Many instances are known where the bourgeoisie, while verbally proclaiming states to be unions of equal peoples, in fact retained their colonial nature.

The formation in 1922 under Lenin's leadership of the unified multinational Soviet state -- the USSR -- was of inestimable significance in achieving the actual equality of our country's peoples and asserting fraternal friendship and all-round cooperation between them. This can be seen graphically in the example of Soviet Kazakhstan. An invaluable contribution to the pursuit of Lenin's nationalities policy in the republic was made by eminent party and state figures A.A. Andreyev, F.E. Dzerzhinskiy, M.I. Kalinin, S.M. Kirov, V.V. Kuybyshev, G.K. Ordzhonikidze, V.A. Ratus-Zenkovich, Ya.E. Rudzutak, M.V. Frunze, Ye.M. Yaroslavskiy and many others.

Party organizations and worker collectives in Moscow, Leningrad and other cities assumed patronage of the republic. It was rendered tremendous aid by Donbass and Kuzbass miners, of Baku and Groznyy oil workers, Kharkov and Sverdlovsk machine builders and Magnitogorsk and Kuznetsk metallurgical workers. Thousands of Russian workers, technicians and engineers took part in the construction of enterprises in Balkhash, Karaganda, Chimkent and Ridder and the laying of the steel track of the Turkestan-Siberian railroad. Dozens of new cities and workers settlements and hundreds of industrial enterprises, mines and pits have become symbols of those unforgettable years on the Kazakh steppes. The republic's industrial development was accompanied by the rapid growth of its working class and technical intelligentsia. The joint labor of people of different ethnic groups at industrial enterprises and construction sites and their close communication and mutual aid eliminated the former alienation and previous reserve of yesterday's nomads and altered their mentality.

Alongside industrialization, in the thirties the hardest task after the taking of power by the proletariat -- the restructuring of agriculture on the basis of socialist principles -- was resolved. Mass collectivization in Kazakhstan took place at the same time as the transition of the nomadic and seminomadic Kazakh population to a settled way of life. Over 1 million peasant farms were rapidly amalgamated into kolkhozes and firmly embarked on the path of socialism. An important part here was played by the envoys of the RSFSR -- the glorious twenty-five thousanders [those sent to carry out mass collectivization in 1930].

Cultural revolution was a component of Lenin's plan for building socialism. In an historically brief period illiteracy was eliminated. A literature and art national in form, socialist in content and internationalist in spirit took shape, and a Kazakh creative intelligentsia emerged. The Soviet way of life born in the process of revolutionary creation and based on the laws of socialist society changed people out of all recognition. National and class hatred and the enslavement of the Kazakh woman disappeared into the past forever.

For every Kazakh, as the great bard Dzhabayev said, it became clear that in embarking on a path with the sons of Russia he had chosen the correct road and sun -- the road of Lenin and the never-setting sun of communism. The truth about this road and this sun were brought with great passion to the country and the whole world, together with the eminent founders of Soviet Kazakh culture, Saken Seyfullin, Beimbet Maylin, Amre Kashaubayev, Dina Nurpeisova, Ilyas Dzhanugurov, Mukhtar Auezov and other glorious sons and daughters of Kazakhstan, by their Russian friends, the well-known writers and public figures Leonid Sobolev, Ivan Shukhov, Nikolay Anov, Sergey Markov, Nikolay Khludov, Aleksandr Zatayevich, Vladimir Lugovskiy, Anna Nikolskaya and their colleagues, who did a very great deal for our great friendship.

Soviet people's loyalty to the sacred ties of friendship and fraternity was frequently verified at sharp turning points in history and withstood many harsh trials. The hardest was the war against fascism, when the question of whether the world's first worker and peasant state would survive was resolved. But the indestructible friendship of our peoples was the monolith against which the shock force of world imperialism was smashed.

The Kazakh people also honorably fulfilled their patriotic and international duty to the motherland in this war. Every 4th Kazakh went to the front and every 12th frontline

soldier received combat awards. About 500 Kazakhs became Heroes of the Soviet Union. In defending the capital of our motherland the heroes from the division led by General Panfilov covered themselves with unfading glory. The words of the Kazakh Vasilii Klyuchkov have gone down in history forever: "Russia is great and there is nowhere to retreat -- Moscow is behind us."

The Kazakhs fought the Hitlerites on decisive sectors of the fronts from the White Sea to the Black Sea, at the walls of Leningrad, in the fighting on the Volga and at the Kursk bulge and in the ranks of the partisan movement and took part in the liberation of the Ukraine, Belorussia, the Baltic republics, Moldavia and European states, the storming of Berlin and the defeat of militarist Japan.

When the savage enemy had been expelled from our country's territory Kazakhs assumed patronage of rayons and cities that had suffered from the barbarous onslaught and helped them in every way they could at that unprecedentedly hard and harsh time. It was not for nothing that Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, speaking on behalf of the entire people of the land of the soviets, particularly stressed: "We will always remember the Kazakhstan of the war years as a reliable rearguard where Red Army combat units were formed, a powerful arsenal and an important grain area for the country."

Any stage in the new history of our republic and the entire country convincingly attests that the peoples' fraternal friendship has always been, is and will be a powerful accelerator and most reliable guarantee of all our achievements. So it was in the postwar years when Kazakhstan again became a gigantic construction site. The names of the new socialist cities resounded loudly -- Temirtau and Rudnyy, Shevchenko, Balkhash and Yermak, Karatau and Lisakovsk, Kentau and Leninogorsk.

The party assigned Soviet Kazakhstan a new task of unprecedented scope which has gone down in the annals of the socialist community as a symbol of a nationwide exploit, of the unity of action of all nations and ethnic groups of the USSR. That was what the unforgettable Virgin Land epic became. As Leonid Ilich Brezhnev rightly pointed out in his remarkable book "The Virgin Lands," the development of the new lands gave a powerful impetus to the development of Kazakhstan's production forces and the growth of its economy, science and culture. And indeed the Virgin Lands now mean more than just the gold of excellent grain. They mean confidently developing stockraising, unique industrial giants, new cities and workers settlements, VUZes and schools, culture centers and sports installations. They mean a broad panorama of new construction sites developed in once unpopulated steppes. Finally they mean a skilled and conscientious worker of a totally new type, a zealous owner of the land which has been radically renewed by his labor and the labor of his sons and daughters for whom the Virgin Lands are also an inspired symbol of valor and honor.

Only through the efforts of the entire country and the persistence of Soviet people rallied by the party did it become possible to fulfill such an imposing task of unprecedented scale. It has been successfully resolved, and this success was secured by the combat staff of the Virgin Land front headed by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, that glorious son of the great Russian people. Many of us have learned and are continuing to learn from him a Leninist style, a Leninist ability to work with people, among people and for people. In the strenuous period of the Virgin Land exploit Leonid Ilich set an example of unprecedented industry, high principle, spiritual warmth and a solicitous, demanding attitude toward cadres.

The Marxist-Leninist dialectic of nations' socialist development is such that the more fully and graphically the best, most progressive features of a nation are manifested, then the fewer differences there will be between peoples. At the same time the process of our culture's internationalization is increasingly enriching national features with general Soviet traits, which determines the multinational Soviet people as a single whole.

True cultural progress has always been linked most directly with the development of language. Socialism has provided everything for the free development of the languages

of the peoples of our country, the Kazakh people included. Having joined their destiny with the destiny of Russia, the Kazakh people understood even more profoundly the Russian people's fine souls, and their rich and powerful language became a second native language for the Kazakhs. And if today a Kazakh poet writes in Russian while a Russian poetess writes her verses in the Kazakh language then this is also testimony to the bright flowering of the multigenre literature and art of Soviet Kazakhstan where Uygur, German and Korean writers, poets, artists and painters, architects and builders are working fruitfully with Kazakh and Russian figures of art.

By mastering the Russian language the Kazakh people can confidently communicate with the peoples of other countries as worthy and full representatives of the society born of real socialism, thanks to which Soviet Kazakhstan, with economic and scientific and cultural ties with 97 countries, communicates out loud with the world.

The Kazakh people's dizzying, truly cosmic take-off seems a paradox to our ideological opponents: The nation's prosperity is leading not to its isolation but on the contrary to rapprochement with other nations and in the long term to their communist fusion. Unable and unwilling to understand this truth, they try by every means to discredit the path we have traveled and shed bitter tears for the past, to which there can be no return.

Kazakhstan's achievements are convincing testimony to the life-giving strength of the ideas of the great Lenin's party. Only thanks to the leadership of the CPSU -- a party of genuine internationalists -- have the fraternal Soviet peoples been able to travel their glorious path.

The Kazakh CP -- a militant and tested detachment of the CPSU -- acts as the leading force in the struggle to resolve political, economic and social tasks in the republic. It unites in its ranks 750,000 Communists representing over 100 nations and ethnic groups. Every passing year sees the growth of the vanguard role and creative initiative of the Communists of our republic, whose land has become the motherland of the entire Soviet people's exploits on the Virgin Lands and in space.

"Kazakhstan's Communists are the organizers of all the republic's glorious deeds," Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said. "During the years of the establishment of Soviet power they led the soldiers of the revolution into the struggle against the working people's enemies, the landowners and rich peasants. Their labor exploits during the first 5-year plans were the banner under which thousands and thousands of workers and peasants rose up. Kazakhstan's Communists set examples of courage and valor at the front and labor bravery in the rear during the harsh years of the Great Patriotic War.... From all their trials, all their battles -- both labor and military battles -- the Communists emerged even stronger, even more tempered."

As they advance to greet the 60th anniversary of the USSR the Communists and all the republic's working people are augmenting their efforts for the successful implementation of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the 15th Kazakh CP Congress. This is borne out by the results of the first year of the 11th 5-Year Plan, which have been assessed at their worth by the party and government and Leonid Ilich Brezhnev personally.

Here are some features of what has been done. Over 100 new production enterprises were commissioned. Over 10,000 km of power line was laid. About 700 oil and gas boreholes were commissioned. The plan for the sale of grain, vegetables, grapes and other crops to the state was successfully overfulfilled. There were positive advances in stock-raising. The cattle, sheep, goat and poultry population increased. The working people's prosperity increased. Over 100,000 new well-appointed apartments were commissioned. More schools, hospitals and trade and consumer services establishments are being built. People's education, science and culture have been further developed.

Fulfillment of the plan for the second year of the 5-year plan is also proceeding well.

However, what has been achieved is not the limit; to be more precise, it is just the beginning of a new stage of comprehensive growth and of a sure ascent toward new heights. Kazakhstan's unique Karaganda, Kusrany, Pavlodar-Ekibastuz, Alma Ata, Karatau-Dzhambul, Mangyshlak and east Kazakhstan territorial-production complexes and others which are firm components of the country's industrial might are to develop at a fast pace in the 11th 5-Year Plan and in the foreseeable future. It is extremely important to ensure the intensive development of nonferrous and ferrous metallurgy, machine building and the coal, chemical, petrochemical, light and food industries. The task of further developing the republic's energy potential in the new 5-year plan has been earmarked as of special importance. In this context it is important to accelerate the construction of the Ekibastuz thermal power stations, to create a major new oil refining area in west Kazakhstan and to increase the efficiency of all energy sources.

New cities, worker settlements and production, social, cultural and consumer projects are growing rapidly throughout our republic now. But the main thing is the return from this growth in terms of the economic potential of all of the republic's 19 oblasts. In the light of the exceptional importance of the tasks in industry, capital construction, transport and communications, party organizations should comprehensively gear workers' efforts toward the unconditional and high-quality fulfillment and overfulfillment of plans, the fullest assimilation of commissioned capacities, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the improvement of the management mechanism.

An important milestone in the life of the party and country was the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) plenum where an exceptionally profound and pointed report was delivered by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, who convincingly illustrated the scale of the tremendous work done by our party and the entire people since the Central Committee March (1965) plenum, the main result of which has been a steady increase in Soviet people's prosperity. As the report rightly noted, the material and technical base of sovkhozes and kolkhozes has been radically renewed during this period and there have been important changes in the character of rural workers' labor and living conditions. In all the major positive changes in the rural economy which have become reality thanks to the course formulated by the March plenum and developed at the 24th and 25th party congresses there is no doubt about the tremendous services of Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and his tireless and multifaceted activity, which have always been at one with our party's will and the entire Soviet people's thoughts.

It can be said with complete confidence that never before in our country have such stimulating specific measures to resolve the most vital problem -- food -- been defined in such a long-term, radical way. The USSR Food Program assigns a crucial place to Kazakhstan, which possesses an ever-increasing agrarian potential. It must be a matter of honor for all Kazakhstanis to participate actively in fulfilling all the Food Program's provisions. Proceeding from the supreme interests of the entire country, grain and livestock production should be particularly highlighted among them. And in this context we are pinning considerable hopes on our illustrious Virgin-Landers and the strength and prestige of the soviets, our trade unions, the illustrious Komsomol and all labor collectives on whom the further consolidation of the republic's role as one of the country's major grain and livestock bases depends.

The fulfillment of first and foremost grain production targets for this year and the entire 5-year plan must be an important element of the Food Program. Kazakhstan must ensure an average harvest of 28-29 million tons of grain annually during 1981-1985. For this it is necessary to make the utmost use of all our reserves and potential, to steadily raise the standard of arable farming and to reliably guard against all manifestations of negligence and mismanagement. In short, to do our utmost so as once again to please the beloved motherland with a large quantity of Kazakh grain in this special year for the whole country, the year of the USSR's glorious 60th anniversary. There is much to be done for the accelerated development of public stockraising, which the party has declared a rural shock front. The republic is on the right track in the development of stockraising. However, it is too soon to rest on our laurels.

As the Fifth Kazakh CP Central Committee plenum noted, in some oblasts the standard of stockraising does not meet the requirements of the time. Practical conclusions must be drawn from this.

The republic has a great wealth of strength and potential to sharply develop the rural economy. They include high-powered equipment, innovative working methods and a strengthening alliance between practice and science. Ultimately the most decisive factor is our remarkable cadres. Over 400 Heroes of Socialist Labor and thousands of advanced workers and talented and skillful organizers of agricultural production are working in the countryside alone. Everyone must emulate them, and their experience must be relied on more fully and effectively and increased tirelessly and productively.

While successfully resolving the none too simple tasks of further developing the rural economy, it is necessary to strive to steadily improve transport and communications, the people's health protection, education, trade, the services sphere and cultural institutions. The main aim of all these actions is working people's prosperity and the comprehensive development of the individual. To live better it is necessary to work more efficiently -- the party puts particular stress on this interconnection. This applies fully to people of all ages employed in social production. As our society becomes more mature it is necessary to pay greater attention to everything that affects working people's feelings, to increase our achievements and to comprehensively develop the gains of socialist democracy sealed by the USSR Constitution.

In the context of the jubilee of the great unification between Russia and Kazakhstan, special meaning is acquired by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's words at the 19th Komsomol Congress: "This year the Soviet people will be celebrating the 65th anniversary of the Great October Revolution and the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation. These have been glorious even if occasionally very difficult decades. We have endured burdens and deprivation, learned on the way while overcoming mistakes and omissions and achieved successes which have stunned the world."

We derive great strength from the friendship of the peoples -- the supreme manifestation of their creative will. Bearing this in mind, Leninist internationalists do not forget that nationalism is the final refuge of baseness and dishonor and that everything directed by our enemies against our system, our ideals and our progress is directed primarily against this friendship. This is why it must be strengthened and cherished like the apple of our eye.

Together with all Soviet people, the people of Kazakhstan angrily condemn the adventurist policy of international reaction which has gambled with the vital interests of peace for its own mercenary aims. And Leonid Ilich is right a thousand times over: Humanity now has no task more important than to avert a thermonuclear holocaust and establish a lasting and just peace on earth. Soviet Kazakhstan's working people unanimously support the Leninist foreign policy course of the CPSU and the Soviet Government. Peace will be maintained and consolidated so long as the great fraternity of the Soviet peoples, the peoples of the socialist community countries and all progressive forces in the world becomes firmer.

Soviet Kazakhstan has traveled a path equal to whole eras with the great Russian people and under the wise leadership of Lenin's party. This is why the grateful soul of the Kazakh people and of all our multinational republic's working people must never lose the sacred sense of profound gratitude to and respect for the dear party and its Leninist Central Committee headed by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, that outstanding politician and statesman of the present day and ardent fighter for world peace who is confidently leading the Soviet people along the path of supreme achievements mapped out by the historic 26th CPSU Congress.

CSO: 1802/16

SPIRITUAL RENEWAL IN THE TRANSBAYKAL

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 82 pp 36-47

[Article by A. Modogoyev, first secretary of the Buryatskiy Obkom of the CPSU]

[Text] Along with all the Soviet people the workers, kolkhozniks and intelligentsia of Soviet Buryatia are working to implement the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress. A new upsurge in their political and labor efforts was evoked by the May plenum of the CC CPSU and the report delivered there by General Secretary of the CC CPSU Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, also by preparations for a worthy greeting to such an important event in the country's political life as the 60th anniversary of the formation of the USSR.

The creation of the USSR was a direct continuation of the cause of Great October, which opened a new era in mankind's development, and a practical realization of Lenin's ideas concerning the voluntary union of free nations. It was one of the decisive factors which ensured favorable conditions for the restructuring of society on socialist principles, for enhancement of the economy and culture of all the Soviet republics, strengthening of the defensive might and the international positions of the multinational workers state.

In the fraternal family of Soviet peoples, the 60th anniversary of the formation of which we are preparing to observe, the Buryat people found happiness and accomplished impressive successes in economic and cultural development. Our people's spiritual rebirth during the years of Soviet rule is a bright example of the life-affirming power of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the socialist structure evoking an upsurge in the people's creative energies. The Great October Socialist Revolution liberated the Buryat people from centuries of national and social oppression and created genuine possibilities for liquidating its political, economic and sociocultural backwardness.

As a result of the consistent implementation of the Leninist nationalities policy of the communist party, and with the constant help of the Soviet state, the great Russian people and the other fraternal peoples, Buryatia in a short historical time overcame centuries of backwardness and made the transition to socialism, bypassing the capitalist stage of development, and along with all the Soviet people entered the period of mature socialism. The land of the soviets has successfully resolved the historic task of equalizing the levels of economic and cultural development of all nations and nationalities. "From the

first years of Soviet rule," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the accountability report of the CC CPSU to the 26th party congress, "our economic and social policies have been structured so as to raise the former national backwaters of Russia as quickly as possible to the level of development of the center. And this task has been successfully resolved. A most important role in this was played by the close cooperation of all the country's nations, primarily the selfless aid of the Russian people....Backward national backwaters, comrades, no longer exist!"

Buryatia serves as a convincing demonstration of these words. In the past, Buryatia was a backward national backwater in the fullest sense: the vast Transbaykal, an uninhabited land, a place of political exile and penal servitude. "A formidable wilderness, the Transbaykal..." was the way it was characterized by the great Russian poet N. A. Nekrasov.

Frightful scenes of national misery were played out against a background of an astonishingly picturesque eastern Siberian landscape of inexhaustible riches. Traveling through Buryatia, A. P. Chekhov wrote emotionally: "...Selenga is sheer beauty, and in the Transbaykal I found everything I wished: the Caucasus, the Psel Valley, Zvenigorodskiy Uyezd, the Don. By day you gallop through the Caucasus, by night along the Don steppes, and at dawn when you wake up from sleep--why, you find yourself in Poltavskaya Guberniya, and so it goes for a thousand versts....The Transbaykal is magnificent. It is a blend of Switzerland, the Don and Finland."

Years have gone by, and social contrasts, want and oppression are irretrievably a thing of the past. The Soviet Transbaykal, upon whose expanses the Buryat ASSR is broadly spread, has become a land of all-union construction projects, advanced agriculture, powerful industry and a multifaceted socialist culture.

The Buryat ASSR is a major industrial region of the eastern part of the country. Its industrial profile is determined by machine building, power engineering, coal mining, light industry, minerals, timber, woodworking and pulp and paper. Large-scale capital construction is under way. Already operational, for example, is the Gusinozerskaya GRES, the largest in Siberia and the Far East, and the Kholbol'dzhinskiy Coal Pit. Also under construction at an accelerated pace is the Buryat section of the BAM [Baykal Amur Mainline]. The BAM's route crosses 524 km of the republic's territory. Already laid are about 330 km of main and stationyard track. The first working train has arrived at Uoyan Station. The finishing work on the Baykal Tunnel is nearing completion, and one of the world's longest tunnels--the 16-km Severomuyskiy Tunnel--is being built successfully.

During the 10th Five-Year Plan 1.6 million square meters of housing went into operation in the republic, and large-scale residential construction continues apace. As a result, during the 1970's alone total usable living space, both urban and rural, more than doubled.

During the years of Soviet rule, Buryatia's agriculture has undergone profound social transformations. The old ulus, with its constant want and stagnant way

of life, has become a thing of the past along with the poverty, semistarvation, ignorance and cultural backwardness that accompanied it. These things have remained in the people's memory as grim reminders about life before the revolution, of which our contemporaries know only from historical treatises, artistic works and museum exhibits. Buryatia's folk poet N. Damdinov depicted the accurate, generalized character of the past when he wrote that "the gloomy summer camps of the Buryats, hiding the people from the bright sun, turned black," and the smokehole in the Buryat yurt "was like a single eye, gazing at the sky in misery and pleading."

On the basis of implementation of the CPSU's agrarian policy, the republic is conducting considerable capital construction and strengthening the material-technical base of the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, thus promoting increased agricultural production. Overcoming substantial difficulties due to the drought conditions of recent years, farm workers increased the average annual output of their main sector, livestock raising, by 45 percent in the 10th Five-Year Plan over the 7th Five-Year Plan (1961-1965). The USSR's Food Program, adopted at the May plenum of the CC CPSU, confronts the Buryat ASSR with tasks of enormous importance.

The highest aim of the socioeconomic strategy of the CPSU and the Soviet government has always been and remains a steady rise in the people's material and cultural standard of living. "...Never before in our country's history," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "have our workers had such a high material standard of living as now....Never before have they been so confident of their tomorrow, of the peaceful future of their country, as now."

Enormous economic and social accomplishments have become the foundation of a genuine cultural revolution in the republic. A yearning for knowledge had been an age-old dream of many generations of our people. Until the revolution, however, the Buryat people were almost totally illiterate. Only a small number of children went to school. The Buryats did not have their own writing system, artistic literature or professional arts. There was not a single cultural or educational institution in the entire territory. The consciousness of the toiling masses was weighed down by the dominating feudal-religious and entrenched bourgeois ideology.

Despite the national-colonial oppression and domination of the feudal-religious culture, the Buryat people had, over the centuries, created their own democratic culture. In their various genres of oral poetry, their songs and dances and applied arts, they had expressed their thoughts and aspirations, their yearning for freedom and happiness.

An enormous role in the enlightenment of the Buryat people was played by the advanced Russian culture. Under the benign influence of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia, ideas of democracy and liberation began to penetrate the toiling Buryat masses.

Many advanced representatives of the Russian intelligentsia did everything they could to promote the cultural development of the Buryat people, to disseminate among them the fruits of science. Rightly classified among these "knights" of

enlightenment were such Decembrists as the brothers M. A. and N. A. Bestuzhev, V. K. and M. K. Kyukhel'beker, K. P. Torson, V. S. Tolstoy and other political exiles who taught Buryat children and adults the rudiments of reading and writing, opened schools and workshops, and provided the people with medical treatment. The cultural and educational efforts of the Decembrists in our land were continued by the revolutionary narodniki. The proletarian revolutionaries who replaced them--the social democrats and the bolsheviks--not only taught the Buryats to read and write but also conducted political propaganda and agitation among them. They included such eminent bolsheviks as I. V. Babushkin, A. P. Vagzhanov, A. A. Kostyushko-Valyuzhanich, V. K. Kurnatovskiy, M. V. Frunze, Ye. M. Yaroslavskiy and others.

In the prerevolutionary period the major cultural center of Buryatia and the whole Transbaykal was the city of Kyakhta. The private works of A. I. Gertsen passed through it on their way to Russia in the middle of the last century. The almanac POLYARNAYA ZVEZDA and the newspaper KOLOKOL were widely read, became the object of fervent discussion and were sent to other localities in Siberia. Lenin's ISKRA was distributed to eastern Siberia through Kyakhta.

To this Russia--revolutionary and democratic--the peoples of Siberia are grateful for the fact that despite the colonial policies of czarism they managed to preserve their national culture. Despite their extreme economic, social and cultural backwardness they maintained considerable moral and creative potential over the centuries. Livestock farmers and tillers of the soil, hunters and fishers, they created a unique material and spiritual culture which reflected the wisdom of preceding generations, esthetic ideals and a sense of social justice. Lengthy intercourse with the Russian people, culture and freedom-loving ideas and traditions helped to bring it about that the oppressed and backward nationalities came to be sufficiently well prepared socially and morally to understand and wholeheartedly embrace the ideas of October.

It was this democratic culture which served as the basis for the creation of the Buryat people's new, socialist culture, beginning with the very first days after the victory of October. The cultural revolution in Buryatia took place under the guidance of the communist party and with the ever-increasing aid of the Soviet state and the country's working class, the great Russian people.

Only in the Soviet era did the Buryat people develop their own national writing system and literary language, a national press and artistic literature, professional arts. Throughout the republic sprang up a network of schools, clubs, houses of culture, libraries and museums, and secondary specialized and higher educational institutions as well as scientific-research establishments opened their doors. Already before the war the Buryat people brought into being a culture that was socialist in content and national in form, and national cadres of Soviet intelligentsia came into being.

Buryatia's culture has achieved genuine flowering and maturity in the period of developed socialism. Socialist ideology has profoundly penetrated all spheres of the people's spiritual life, social thought, science, literature, arts and morality. Socialist relations are becoming ever more firmly entrenched in the life of the people.

The level of education and culture of the broad masses of workers has risen immeasurably. According to the 1979 census, 73.7 percent of the workers and 58.6 percent of the kolkhozniks have a secondary (complete and incomplete) and higher education. The republic's national economy employs about 100,000 specialists with a higher or secondary specialized education. The workers' spiritual requirements are rising constantly. In 1982 there were 1,151 subscriptions to newspapers and journals for every thousand inhabitants. The language of international intercourse among Soviet people is in widespread use among the Buryat population. Eighty percent of all the Buryats are fluent in Russian.

The republic's party, soviet and creative organizations are well aware that behind the figures of capital investments in the sphere of arts and culture, behind the statistical indicators of advances in cultural construction must stand a concrete, practical and goal-oriented concern for each worker in the arts, club enthusiast and master of folk arts--that is, those people who give unstintingly of their spiritual and physical energies for the sake of the further flowering of the national culture.

...From time immemorial Buryatia has been famed for its remarkable craftsmen. In the middle of the 19th century, Decembrist N. A. Bestuzhev spoke of the Buryat blacksmith as an unsurpassed master. Unfortunately, however, the centuries-old folk art of metal chasing began to be forgotten and was fast becoming a museum relic rather than a living, developing creative genre. Then, thanks to the efforts of the Buryatskiy Obkom and the republic's Artists Union, a special expedition was organized to revive the all but lost tradition of applied arts. Through great effort they managed to find a few young men possessing the skills of artistic chasing. It was decided to create a training-production workshop, which has today become the base for the revival of the ancient arts of the Buryat darkhans, smiths and metal chasers. The correctness of this decision has been confirmed by the considerable successes already achieved by the young masters. Many of them are now preparing to join the USSR Artists Union.

A training-artistic brigade, consisting of capable young woodcarvers, is successfully working on the designing of a Buryat drama theater building now under construction in Ulan-Ude.

No, we do not see this as the pursuit of doubtful fashion in "olden things" but rather a striving to preserve all the best that has come down to us through the people's long history, to make the people's arts an active component of Soviet socialist culture. We have cited only a few examples, but they emphasize, in essence, a simple idea: Attitudes toward the resolution of cultural matters must always be effective and goal-oriented. Only then can we fully appreciate the ideological and moral effectiveness of the "cultural front," for which there are no and there cannot be any secondary tasks.

The republic is focusing considerable attention on the labor and esthetic upbringing of the rising generation, for which increasingly favorable conditions are being created. Buryatia has functioning today 34 palaces and houses of Pioneers, 31 sports schools for children and youths, 4 young technicians'

stations, a republic young naturalists' station and a children's tourist station, 55 music schools for children, 9 arts and painting schools of the republic's Ministry of Culture, in which over 43,000 children are enrolled.

Arts schools are organized in the cities and builders' settlements along the BAM (for example, in Severobaykal'sk and Severomuysk). In addition to music departments there are graphic arts departments, ballet, theater and general esthetic training departments. The idea underlying this kind of expansion of the profile of the traditional music schools is clear. We are proceeding on the basis that it is wrong to divide children into "gifted" and "nongifted" with respect to artistic creativity. Every child has the gift to understand and create beauty, and it is the task of the specialist teachers to awaken this gift, to make it into a social asset. It is also important, in our view, to ensure that adults are also drawn to these schools; frequently the schools are the bases for establishing arts clubs, circles and ensembles. And another very remarkable phenomenon is attested by the experience of the arts schools along the BAM. Under conditions of this most vital and difficult project, a real construction project of the century, involving enormous and intensive efforts of workers, high-speed construction of facilities and a difficult climate, the arts have not only found a place for themselves but are also actively securing a "bridgehead" and thereby confirming how vital and essential they are for modern man.

As for the development of science in the republic, clear proof of the unbounded capabilities afforded by the socialist social structure for human spiritual growth can be seen in the activities of Buryatia's scientific-research institutions. There are four institutes functioning within the Buryat Affiliate of the Siberian Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences: the natural sciences, the social sciences, geology and biology, and a department of economic research.

The affiliate's scientific subdivisions are involved in fundamental and applied research in the social sciences, the physical-technical, chemical-technological and biological sciences, and earth sciences, and coordinate all scientific research in the republic. The number of scientific developments adopted in the national economy is increasing year by year. Research in Oriental studies that is unique not only here but in the country as a whole is being carried out by the Institute of Social Sciences, which has become a recognized center for the study of the culture of the peoples of the Orient. Successful work is being done by the Buryat Scientific-Research Institute of Agriculture of the Siberian Department of VASKhNIL and the affiliate of the Scientific-Research Institute of National Schools of the RSFSR Ministry of Education, also four higher educational establishments, including an Institute of Culture.

The level of cultural and educational work in rural areas has risen markedly in recent years. Consider, for example, Pobeda Kolkhoz in Bichurskiy Rayon. They have set up there a cultural complex which includes a village House of Culture, a vocational school House of Culture, four libraries, a folk museum, an automobile club, a movie facility, a gymnasium, a branch of the rayon children's music school and five Red Corners. It is supervised by a coordinating council headed by the kolkhoz chairman, Viktor Vladimirovich Smolin,

a deputy to the Buryat ASSR Supreme Soviet, distinguished zootechnician and distinguished republic cultural worker.

The rayon House of Culture has choral circles (both for children and adults), a women's vocal group, a children's theater workshop, a folk song and dance ensemble, a ballroom dancing circle, a puppet theater, and three agitation brigades. More than 300 persons take part in amateur arts activities. Every year the ladies of the villages put on an exhibit titled "Praise for Women's Hands," at which they demonstrate their embroidery work, sewing and knitting. Kolkhoz craftsmen also display their wares: woodcarving, fretwork and metal chasing. The House of Culture also has a mobile picture gallery exhibiting paintings from the Ulan-Ude Museum of Art. The four libraries have numerous readers, and the folk museum is being filled with exhibits, including considerable materials about the Pobeda Kolkhoz, which recently celebrated its 50th anniversary.

Veterans of the front are honored by the whole village in the House of Culture. The memory of those who died in the war lives on not only in the obelisks but also in exhibits of the folk museum. Various traditions, folk ceremonies and rituals have also been developed there. Marriages are solemnized, and young kolkhoz members are dedicated. When young men are sent off to serve in the army, each one is given a little red bag containing his native earth. Sheep-herders Day and other celebrations are conducted in an attractive manner. Fifteen years ago, only about 1 of every 10 high school graduates returned to the village; now, the picture has changed: only 1 out of every 10 fails to return.

The culture of everyday life and behavior of the inhabitants of the village of Malyy Kunaley has risen substantially. It can be stated in general that attitudes toward cultural workers on Pobeda Kolkhoz are extremely respectful. Their efforts are appreciated no less than the labor of the machinery operator or livestock farmer. The farm itself has established a bonus for their salaries. They live in nice, well-appointed apartments. At present several persons are going to school in cultural institutes on a kolkhoz stipend. In terms of erudition, range of interests and professional skills the cultural workers in this village are in no way inferior to those of the cities. And the main thing is that none among them are apathetic or passive. These are people of fervent creativity who are obviously able to utilize familiar forms of work and to find new ones on the basis of local conditions.

Such examples of organization of cultural and educational work in Buryatia are by no means isolated. The Ulyunxhanskiy Sovkhoz is one of the most remote farms in the republic and was at one time one of the most backward. Now it is a leading agricultural enterprise both in terms of production indicators and in regard to cultural accomplishments. It is headed by V. Batorov, a well-known specialist in livestock farming. Like V. Smolin, he has been awarded the high title of distinguished cultural worker of the Buryat ASSR. This is no accident. Cultural developments on the sovkhos are viewed as matters of high priority.

Yet another pattern is to be traced in these and other examples of the republic's cultural life. Any success in club and cultural-education work--any stable and multifaceted success--is guaranteed only where the leader of the enterprise,

kolkhoz or construction trust takes these matters to be not something secondary but rather of enormous import, I would say matters of state importance, designed in the long run to ensure high production indicators, cadre retention and an excellent moral climate in the collective. It could not be otherwise.

Enormous influence on Buryatia's spiritual life is exerted by the mass media. At present practically all population centers in the republic have radio and electricity. Some 85 percent of the population can watch color television broadcasts from Moscow and Ulan-Ude. A substantial portion of the television and radio programs are in Buryat.

The museums occupy an important place in the republic's cultural life. We are rightly proud of them. A museum is essentially, after all, not just a lifeless collection of antiquities and documents but rather a source of revolution-mindedness, morality and people-mindedness, executed with enormous ideological power. The museums, born of the creative inspiration of the scientist, the researcher and the pedagogue, bring together in concentrated form, so to speak, a substantial stratum of the people's priceless memory.

In the southern part of the republic, in Novoselenginsk, there is a memorial complex to the Decembrists, organized in accordance with the last word in museum development. But here's what's remarkable: many exhibits have come into its collection from the collection of a school museum created in the 1950's in this village. And this bond of times and generations--in this case the example of a museum--is profoundly indicative of a genuinely socialist perception of cultural heritage.

Another object of pride is the open-air ethnographic museum near Ulan-Ude. And it is more than just the fact that so far it is the only museum of its type in Siberia. What is primarily noteworthy is the integrated and long-range character of the planning of the collection. Originally it was based on a desire to depict the life and ways of the Buryats, Evenkis and Russian family settlers of the last century. Today, however, the historical, geographical and--if one may say so--disciplinary boundaries of the collection are expanding rapidly. Along with exhibits relating to ancient times the content of the museum's exhibition will gradually come to be increasingly contemporary, reflecting the colossal changes in the cultural way of life of the peoples of Buryatia in the years since the revolution. Soon the ethnographic museum will be organically expanded by the addition of a museum exhibiting the natural features of the Transbaykal (a dendrarium, enormous open pens with unique animals and so on). Already the grounds of these museums are increasingly becoming a place for mass celebrations of song, dance and national sports contests.

And, finally, a third state museum that I wanted to talk about, the newest of them: the Museum of BAM Construction in Severobaykal'sk. It was opened in November 1981. The idea itself of setting up such a museum seems to make good sense. After all, from the very beginning the construction of the BAM was a project of truly historic significance. It is only natural, therefore, to desire not only to diligently and affectionately preserve specific material "objects" related to the project but also to transmit through them to future generations the atmosphere of labor and moral heroism and valor prevailing on the BAM. And this purpose is unquestionably being accomplished by the museum

exhibit, which is enormously popular. The museum teaches people to respect and appreciate labor, to receive its historical and moral significance, and not just in the abstract, either, but in a fully concrete manner, in the examples which daily surround the workers on the BAM. I should like to acknowledge the great contribution to this important matter that has been made by its initiators, also by the party, soviet and economic organizations of Severobaykal'sk, who under the conditions of the advancing edge of the enormous construction project have managed not only to create a museum but also to ensure its uninterrupted operation on a level of quality demanded of the country's state museums.

Three different museums. Three different eras. Truly, however, there is something which they have in common, which links them firmly. It is a sense of high patriotism, of revolutionary conviction, a striving to see the spiritual face of our future through the past and the present.

In educating Buryatia's working people in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism a substantial role is played by the creative unions, the theaters and other cultural institutions. We have our Writers Union, our Artists Union, our Composers Union, our Journalists Union and our Architects Union, four theaters, a state philharmonic and the Baykal Song and Dance Ensemble. The creative intelligentsia sees its main task as that of studying the profound processes of life in all its variety, the complexity and abundance of events and human fate, in understanding the life of the people, their cherished thoughts and aspirations in a time of unprecedented renewal of social way of life on the path of communist construction. Long since traditional are Literature and Arts Days in rural areas, also meetings between creative workers and industrial and agricultural workers and BAM builders. The creative and moral benefits from such meetings are extraordinary. Workers in the arts and their listeners and viewers are spiritually enriched, receiving a genuine charge of ideological energy in their everyday efforts.

The obkom is constantly concerned for the creative intelligentsia. In dealing with matters of the training and education of intelligentsia cadres, the formation of theater repertoires and the development of folk art workshops, the obkom focuses primarily on enhancing the ideological and artistic level of the works that are created, the shaping in these workers in literature and the arts of a Marxist-Leninist world view, a sense of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, an active life stance.

The literature and arts of the peoples of Buryatia--national in form, socialist in content, and internationalist in spirit--have come to be further developed in recent years, enriched with new, talented works which are famous today far beyond the boundaries of the republic. The best books by Buryat writers have won a firm place in the all-union literature and earned the broad appreciation of readers. This is due to the fact that they raise and resolve problems which are of concern to Russians, Georgians, Ukrainians, Kazakhs and Estonians--they reflect, so to speak, all-Soviet feelings and thoughts: love for one's motherland and party, affirmation of high moral principles and the unshakable friendship of peoples.

These qualities are brilliantly embodied in the creations of Buryatia's folk poet and winner of the RSFSR State Prize imeni M. Gor'kiy, N. Damdinov. Whatever he writes about--the past or the present--his verses, plays and articles are always infused by the motif affirming the friendship of peoples as the foundation of our common happiness. In his poem "Genealogy," which begins with a description of the old Buryat custom of learning one's pedigree "to the 20th generation," the poet writes:

...But I today a new tree sing!
I leaf through my pedigree book.
I open it with excitement, and there
I see the beginning was in 1917.

With new names is that book filled:
Russian, Buryat, Latvian names...
They are communists, I spring from them.
I will recall each one, nor forget
anyone in my line.

Now approach I to the main name--Lenin.
It is a name to warm the hearts of generations.
He is the founder of our pedigree.
A new pedigree, founded on the soviets!

It is not surprising that these thoughts and sentiments of the Buryat poet are embraced by representatives of any nationality as their very own.

At recent RSFSR and USSR writers congresses, "Zhestokiy Vek" [The Cruel Age], by Isay Kalashnikov of Buryatia, has been judged to be among the best Soviet historical novels. This novel fairly and profoundly, from the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism, in brilliant artistic form elucidates the era and personality of Genghis Khan, showing the bankruptcy of pretensions to world domination past or present, leading to bloodshed and brutal wars.

Isay Kalashnikov, who was born in the tiny Old Believer village of Sharalday, lived all his life in Buryatia. He was a timber worker, a staffer on the republic's youth newspaper, worked for many years as responsible secretary in the Buryat ASSR Writers Union and secretary of the writers party organization. His first novel "Posledneye Otstupleniye" [The Last Retreat] dealt with the events of 1918 in Buryatia; his "Razryv-Trava" depicted the life of the people in a broad panorama of time--from the civil war through collectivization and the Great Patriotic War to the postwar period. A communist writer, nurtured by the Buryat party organization, in these novels he manifested a consuming interest in the history of his native region, in the rise and strengthening of the friendship between the Russian and Buryat people fighting for a common cause, for justice; he presented a profound artistic analysis of the mentality of private-ownerism and misanthropy, and he revealed the striving toward serious understanding of the problem of man in his relationship to history. It was these traits which led the writer to the idea of revealing the historical social sources of events profoundly troubling to him, based on materials relating to the Genghis Khan campaigns of conquest in the 13th century which

have been so unambiguously raised aloft by the Maoists and other falsifiers of history. His incomparable gifts, enriched by the Marxist understanding of history and the party-mindedness of a Soviet artist, helped him to create a remarkable work.

Mikhail Zhigzhitov enjoys considerable popularity in the republic and in the literature of the RSFSR generally. A professional hunter who worked for many years on one of the hunting farms of Barguzinskiy Rayon, he created the monumental trilogy "Podlemor'ye" [By the Side of the Sea], a work about the life of the hunters of the Transbaykal, the region's past, the revolution and the civil war. The novel is unique for its folk verisimilitude and its palpitating perception of the spiritual world of the toilers of the Barguzinskaya taiga and the Siberian landscape.

Talented depiction of our people's past and present, affirmation of the people's greatness of spirit and the beauty of their moral world and the force and magnetic attraction of the implemented reality of Lenin's ideas are characteristic as well of other works of Buryat literature, which has found a worthy place in the multinational literature of our socialist motherland.

The Buryat Order of Lenin Academic Theater of Opera and Ballet, whose repertoire includes over 150 works of world, Russian and Soviet classics, has thanks to the high performance mastery of its troupe won the plaudits and appreciation of viewers in many cities of the country. The unique and talented performances staged by the theater have attracted the attention of other creative collectives: B. Yampilov's opera "Chudesnyy Klad" [Wonderful Treasure], for example, has played for years in the Moscow Children's Musical Theater; L. Knipper's and B. Yampilov's ballet "Krasavitsa Angara" [The Beautiful Angara] was a hit on the stage of the L'vov Theater of Opera and Ballet. The art of the opera and ballet soloists is enhanced in strength and attractiveness by the fact that their natural gifts were polished by masters of Russian art. Thus, for example, the wonderful schooling provided in the Leningrad Conservatory brought to light the national uniqueness and rich facets of the outstanding creative individuality of Buryatia's famous singer, USSR People's Artist L. Linkhovoin. One of the country's finest performers of the roles of Konchak in Borodin's "Knyaz' Igor'" [Prince Igor], Melnik in Dargomyzhskiy's "Rusalka," and Mephistopheles in Gounod's "Faust," he has appeared numerous times on the stage of the USSR Bolshoy Theater and has served as a passionate propagandist of the realistic principles of Russian art and a master of stage representation.

The unique and brilliant musical and dance artistry of performers of the Buryat Theater of Opera and Ballet has won the sincere plaudits of the people of Montreal and Tokyo, Sofia and Berlin, Havana and Stockholm, Teheran and Ulan-Bator, as well as many countries in Africa.

A good example of the flourishing of our republic's national arts is the Buryat State Academic Theater of Drama imeni Khotsa Zamsarayev. It has demonstrated its creative maturity for a quarter of a century now. It has formed an actors' ensemble of representatives of different generations united in artistic aspirations and joined together by a commonality of creative aims. The theater's repertoire includes works of foreign, Russian and Soviet classics. USSR People's

Artists G. Tsydynzhapov and M. Stepanova, whose experience is nurturing young performers, are the theater's pride and glory.

Major successes have been achieved in the area of painting and the graphic arts. Many works by Buryat artists are exhibited in the Tret'yakov Gallery and the Central State Theater Museum imeni A. A. Bakhrushin as well as at all-union art exhibits in Moscow and the capital cities of the union republics.

The achievements of the professional arts are promoted by the entire spiritual life of the people, by the broad development and renewal of the people's folk creativity at the present stage of communist construction. The need for artistic creativity, which has been inherent in man's nature through the ages, has received a powerful impulse toward fuller manifestation. Dozens of people give many hours of their leisure, their strength of spirit and force of intellect to creative endeavors and try their hand in the creation of artistic values.

In this connection mention must be made of the Molodaya Gvardiya People's Dramatic Theater, which has been functioning several years now in the BAM settlement of Kichera. This theater, organized by worker A. Baykov, is a remarkable phenomenon. Participants in all performances are workers in a brigade headed by Lenin Komsomol Prize Winner A. Bondar', who has, by the way, himself performed many roles. The theater's repertoire includes plays by A. Arbuzov, A. Gel'man and V. Shukshin. In the evening, after a day of laying track, the brigade begins its rehearsals, continuing sometimes until late at night. The striving to find self-expression by means of the dramatic arts has become a natural need for these young workers. They are well aware that they can hardly hope to compete now with professional theaters in terms of direction and acting skills. Their aim is different: to make of the performances themselves and the process of their preparation a social event which, in such a small workers' settlement as Kichera, can serve as a center of public attention and interest, to make this workers' theater a genuinely effective factor in the shaping of public opinion. The workers themselves acknowledge that by means of the theater arts they hope to conduct an open spiritual-moral dialogue with their comrades working on the BAM. And Molodaya Gvardiya has its emulators, in particular the Vdokhnoveniye Workers Theater in Severobaykal'sk.

Vast and various is the world of values created and constantly replenished by the people, great is the potential of culture, and truly priceless is its role in the spiritual enrichment of Soviet man. Active utilization of artistic values in everyday life does not lead to diminution of the general potential of our culture nor impoverish its spiritual reserves--quite the contrary, it promotes enhancement of the quantitative and qualitative parameters of society's wealth and strengthens the effectiveness of its influence on the minds and hearts of the people. The life-giving process of mutual enrichment and mutual influence in cultures is strengthened when each national culture brings something special of its own to contribute to the general coffers of socialist culture and they constantly grow closer together on this basis.

In light of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress the Buryatskiy Obkom is undertaking measures to strengthen the material-technical base of cultural

institutions and enhance the ideological-political content of their work. Considerable attention is focused on improving the cultural services to the rural population and livestock workers. It is up to us to build permanent cultural centers in place of temporary structures in the settlements and stations of the BAM. The obkom buro, party assemblies and plenums of the creative unions have mapped out measures to enhance the mastery and ideological maturity of the artistic intelligentsia. We are striving to inculcate in our cultural, literary and arts workers a spirit of high responsibility to the people; we want them to be creators of artistic works which affirm the truth of life and our humanistic ideals.

There is and there can be no more persistent and firm material in history than the fate of humanity. It is the measure of our spiritual power, our moral development. This is the people's culture in the highest sense.

...Not long ago we were informed that Valentina Gonchikovna Romanova, a leading sheepherder for Selenginskiy Sovkhoz, contributed 7,000 rubles of her work savings to the peace fund. During the difficult war years, Valentina--a very young Moscow girl--was evacuated to Buryatia along with her children's home. Here she was adopted by Buryat Gonchik Romanov. In time, Valentina married a Buryat, and now she and her husband are bringing up two adopted children--a Russian boy and a Buryat girl. The big Romanov family lives and does outstanding work for all to see. Could there ever be a more convincing proof of moral culture, internationalism, love of labor and remarkable modesty than that manifested by the Romanov family among their fellow villagers! Our homeland has rightly awarded Valentina Romanov--worker, mother and patriot--the title of Hero of Socialist Labor. And there are plenty of other examples of this sort in Buryatia.

In the period of developed socialism the shaping of a communist world view and Marxist-Leninist convictions in the broad masses is proceeding more intensively than ever before. The workers of Buryatia are increasingly characterized by an active life stance, by selfless labor and high moral principles.

Examples of valor and bravery, skill and mastery, and consciousness of one's civic duty to the country and the people are being set by the multinational collectives of the builders of the Buryat segment of the BAM, on which representatives of more than 50 nations and nationalities of the USSR are working. Patriotic initiatives such as "I Am Master of the Project" and "Work Without Laggards" are widespread among the workers. Forty-four collectives have been awarded the title of 26th CPSU Congress. In the vanguard of the competitors are congress delegate V. I. Aksenov, Lenin Komsomol Prize Winner A. V. Bondar', tunnel detachment brigade members V. R. Tolstoukhov and A. G. Ivanov, and others.

A number of brigades have completed the 10th Five-Year Plan ahead of schedule, including excavator operators of the Kholbol'dzhinskiy Coal Pit (headed by P. I. Konovalov), wool graders of the fine cloth combine (B. E. Ayusheyeva), loggers of the Kurumkanskiy logging operation (V. P. Paramonov), lathe operators of the Novobryanskiy mechanical plant of Goskomsel'khoztekhnika (A. S. Matveyev),

construction workers of SMU-1 [Construction-Installation Administration No 1] (L. N. Kuznetsova), carpenters of SMP-834 [Construction-Installation Train No 834] (V. Ts. Sandanov), also milling machine operator T. I. Fedorov of the aviation plant, insulation installer L. B. Vasilenko of the locomotive and car repair plant, lathe operator S. D. Buinov of the instrument making association, and many others.

Despite the difficult weather conditions of recent years, excellent indicators in raising farm production have been achieved by many shepherders. Among them are Hero of Socialist Labor D. B. Sunduyev, a shepherd on Kolkhoz imeni Karl Marx of Barguzinskiy Rayon.

In all these and many other cases of selfless labor of the toilers of Buryatia one could, of course, see only the production side of things. But that would not be entirely correct. The deeds and accomplishments of thousands of leading workers of production constitute a bright example of the communist attitude toward labor, the fulfillment of one's high civic duty, the moral wealth of the personality.

The republic's workers constitute an organic part of a new historic community--the Soviet people, united by the Marxist-Leninist world view, by a unity of life goals, by a commonality of historic destiny. For 6 decades they have been building a new life in the fraternal family of Soviet peoples, under the life-giving influence of the exalting force of friendship of equal nations and nationalities.

From the heights which Buryatia has achieved we can with justifiable pride review a path equal to centuries in significance but traversed in just 60 heroic years. The people, the working people of Soviet Buryatia, are fully resolved to dedicate their strength and energy to the successful implementation of the historic decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and to make their contribution to the further growth of the economic might and spiritual wealth of our motherland.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/16

CHECKING THE COORDINATES OF THE ROAD

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 82 pp 48-58

[Article by Vitaliy Korotich]

[Text] We are justifiably proud of the enormous prestige of Soviet literature. Meetings I have had with foreign cultural figures in recent years come to mind. Our conversations invariably touched upon the significance of our literature for the destiny of contemporary world culture. Even those who have no special sympathies for the USSR or socialism and are "perplexed" over its indisputable lofty reputation in the world could not conceal their envy. And our friends said eagerly that Soviet books had given them strength in the struggle; many, for example, called Gor'kiy's novel "Mat'" [Mother] a textbook of revolution. Luandino Vieira, head of the Angolan Writers Union, reminisced about how risky it was to have our books, translated into Portuguese, shipped from Brazil to Africa--it was real heroism just to get and read them. The Turkish writer and public figure Aziz Nesin told how Soviet literature had helped him in his creative development and of the love and affection with which he is translating the works of our authors....And Gunther Stein, a translator in the GDR, said excitedly that Soviet books had managed to get through to his fellow countrymen even through the dark night of Hitlerism, giving them inspiration and hope. These assessments are only logical, because no other literature in the world is so democratic or so oriented toward the resolution of the most urgent problems of our time. For our literature there is and can be nothing dearer than the well-being of the people. Ideas about the destiny of the world, human memory, the earth and bread--these infuse the pages of the works of Soviet writers.

Let us take a look at the letters to the editor: Frequently people write to us about the most recherche trochees and iambs, but almost always they ask us writers to intervene immediately in vital, public matters and, I must say, they are fully justified. I started out by saying that for foreign cultural experts, as in general for the absolute majority of foreigners, the high prestige of Soviet literature and to a large extent of socialist society as a whole is by no means identified with the authority of each writer of the Soviet Union. Foreign readers attempt to grasp our mode of creativity, our ways of thinking and at the same time way of life, as reflected in books. One cannot shake the feeling that one's interlocutors are seeking commensurability between the Soviet writer and the world of socialism, the land of the

soviets and its culture. The publicistic level of our literature is unusually high--we are constantly striving to resolve matters lying outside belles-lettres, and we do this openly. let us recall the words of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 26th party congress: "...We are gratified that in recent years literature, motion pictures and the theater have raised serious issues that it really wouldn't hurt Gosplan to 'sweat over' a little. And not just Gosplan either." Combining the high muses and Gosplan in a single thought construction looks binding. And it is not at all surprising--after all, Soviet literature has long since accustomed the world to the genuineness of its word. These binding assessments require the carrying out of a consistent and principled ideological line in all forms and genres of literary creativity.

...But now we open an issue of a publicistic yearbook, and we are struck by the following completely (alas!) typical stylistic "gem" from an essay about a hero of labor: "I did not want to take him away from his work," the author writes. "I stood as if in awe over a heap of billets and simply admired...." Somehow or other there has come to be a tradition of this kind of hearty composition, representative by all too many contemplative constructions ("I stood in awe...and simply admired"). And there is another typical publicistic "style" which resembles a report submitted by some shop artel or other, giving percentages, naming leading workers, but without any life to them, without character, without everything that constitutes the elements of artistic questing, genuine literature. And these are by no means rarities. When books written on current topics but overloaded with "gems" like that and samples of stilted "style" fail to win readers, it attests not so much to an absence of interest in the problems involved, as some of my colleagues claim, as to an inability to write in a talented and profound way about the subject.

"My novel about the working class was just awarded a prize," says the author, nervously drumming his fingers on the desk. "But when I organized a discussion of the book at the plant, you should have heard the slander! Not a bit of respect either for me or the contest I won. In my heart I understand, of course, that it wasn't very interesting to read, but it is essential." "Essential to whom?" I inquired ingenuously, knowing as I did so that I had spoiled my relations with this person, perhaps forever.

Yes, Soviet literature enjoys high prestige, and this requires of us writers complete dedication, no stinting; unfortunately, however, some of us aspire to ride on the mighty shoulders of this prestige. In his report at the 26th party congress, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev stated a thesis that is in keeping with the words quoted about literature and Gosplan. "...The point is to achieve genuine unity of the party's ideological-theoretical, political-educational, organizational and economic work." In a literature of the prestige and quality of ours there must be an absolutely clear-cut striving toward commensurability with the accomplishments of the people in all spheres of their spiritual, creative and labor life. This is a very responsible and demanding aspiration; it has nothing in common with the products of those literati who imagine that everything has been accomplished and that their task is just to hymn the success. The accomplishments must be sung, of course, but rationally. The laws of literature must be commensurate with the interests of the state, with society's mood. We have long since learned to tell each

other the truth, and we must cherish this ability in ourselves. The idealization of life, the writer's work and of us ourselves cannot lead to anything good.

The ship of Soviet literature is grand and unsinkable, but sometimes barnacles attach themselves to its hull and impede its speed. (Recall what Mayakovskiy said: "...So many filthy barnacles attach themselves to us.") It is a complex discussion, but we conduct it in private and all together: The year of the 26th party congress, the year of the writers' forum, is behind us. And this makes it essential to hold a frank discussion of current problems of special urgency.

Our literature is inseparable from the socialist way of life, the Soviet way of life; it is essential to say this, because the very concept "way of life" is complex: It includes production relations, society's culture and its system of spiritual value, in which none of the components are secondary.

The writer belongs not only to literature. He exerts an influence both by his own creativity and by his personality, his authority, his life stance. Our literary men are working in the soviets on all levels, appearing in the press, on the radio and television, and meeting with readers. But the pronounced focus of the mass media on the personality of the contemporary Soviet writer (recall, for example, the literary soirees in the Ostankino television studio that were so popular) cannot, in my view, justify the sometimes blatantly sensed note of spiritual eliteness, a special historic "predestination," practically a messianism clearly apparent in the public pronouncements of some of our writers. After all, the grand right of speaking in the name of the people is given by the people themselves, rather than being acquired by the simple fact of belonging to a particular profession, even one which is traditionally accorded universal respect. Nor is this right accorded by one's natural talent alone, taken outside the historically concrete resonance of literary talent. Nor, in the final analysis, can we ignore the sense of modesty.

Alas, it is this sense of modesty and moderation that sometimes fails even talented and deservedly famous literary men. Some of them, while sincerely and with considerable artistic mastery defending and praising in their works the ideals of the spirit, the purity of human endeavors, unselfishness and service to the people, themselves, all unwitting, become prisoner to the consumer mentality. And so to the highest authorities they all too frequently submit insistent requests, demanding--yes, demanding--awards, titles, literary prizes and even all kinds of material benefits which are allegedly the indispensable and, most importantly, immediate equivalent of literary merit.

It may be that the reason for this strange phenomenon, to put it mildly, is that the atmosphere of celebrity which now surrounds literary successes, has somewhat blunted the sense of reality. And oh how important it is to retain this sense in all cases and circumstances!

Consider how today's poet submits quite sincerely the following formula as his creative credo:

This life of mine is a carnival! A carnival!
There is no turning back now.
How often have I flown aloft above destiny,
Like a hot sword from the scabbard.

...But I must live desperately,
Squeezing out the maximum speed,
To grasp fortune by the mane!
Please forgive me my immodesty.

If this were just a sample of lighthearted poetry of little artistic pretension one could refrain from quoting it, but we are dealing here with something else, a different mentality that infuses not only poetry but also dramaturgy and songwriting. And inasmuch as this mentality has its exponents and its appreciators, some of them quite fervent and even aggressive, we must approach it as a definitely serious phenomenon, no matter unserious it may present itself to be.

The growing number of literary celebrations has created a corresponding number of festive audiences in which attitudes toward the word are sometimes ephemeral, exalted and even indulgent. And then the poet spreads his hands in perplexity as he attempts to understand why the enthusiasm with which he was greeted at the poetry soiree is not manifested in purchases of his books, which have been gathering dust on the shelves of bookstores for some time now. Creative and productive collectives willingly conclude collaboration contracts. This is a remarkable initiative. It must be remembered, however, that if the books gather dust on the shelves no contract can overcome the notion that we writers are not doing our duty in a completely successful manner.

Some critics classify books according to thematic "departments"--"village life," "production theme" and so on. Works "about workers" and "for workers" are often classified as an all but independent genre. But enterprise collectives, meanwhile, maintain their own "table of ratings;" there they read Sholokhov, Leonov, Gonchar, Simonov, Avizhyus, Bondarev, Abramov and Dumbadze, whose works are not all that filled with the triumphant roar of shop machinery. Recall Vladimir Il'ich Lenin's warning at the turn of the century: "...It is essential that workers not be closed off in the artificially narrowed framework of 'literature for the workers,' but learn to master increasing general literature. Instead of saying 'be closed off,' it would be more accurate to say 'be susceptible to being closed off,' because the workers themselves want to read, and do read, that which is being written for the intelligentsia, and only some intellectuals (not very good ones) think that 'for the workers' it is sufficient...to rehash old ideas" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 6, p 39).

Be that as it may, I do not know of a single good book--whether awarded with all-union prizes in recent times or not--that confines itself exclusively to the "production theme" or has won the reader's appreciation by its theme alone. Obviously, the criteria of commensurability with the world of socialist labor (and human characters are revealed chiefly in labor) are much more complex and still not grasped by everyone!

While concerning ourselves for the reputation of literature and the writer's commensurability with the ideological parameters of the era, one's commitment to the times in which we live, we must manifest the highest responsibility. We must always keep in mind that our readers are thinking efficiently and constantly throughout the working day. The hammer inscribed on the USSR State Seal has the same symbolic relation to the everyday activities of today's working class as the sickle does to the labor of today's kolkhoznik. Intellectual labor is increasingly becoming an active part of the life of workers and peasants. It is essential that when a man comes home from work he is eager to read a book or literary journal without at the same time lowering the level of his commitment to the times, and remaining on the level of his spiritual, creative contact with society.

This was stated with exhaustive clarity in the accountability report of the Central Committee to the 26th party congress: "Soviet man is an educated, cultured person. When anyone speaks to him in a thoughtless and stilted manner adorned by generalized phrases instead of concrete relations with real life, real facts, he simply turns off the television or radio or sets his newspaper aside." Or his book, or his poetry or publicistic collection....With the development of the scientific-technical revolution, spiritual demands on man increased. He must retain his humanism in all circumstances, acquiring an ever deeper consciousness of his responsibility for the world around him. Technology is inhumane unless it is commensurate with spiritual progress. As a rule, leveling, denigration and then destruction of spiritual values constitute the beginnings of preparations for war. German Nazism also began (at the same time, incidentally, as a number of interesting technological advances appeared in Germany) with book burnings in the squares of Nurnberg and Koln. And progressive mankind's struggle with fascism was not only a collision between technically equipped armies but also a confrontation of cultures.

Recalling the first battles in which he took part, Oles' Gonchar wrote: "For us the foxholes were a kind of second university. We had with us Tolstoy and Gor'kiy, Rolland and Barbusse, all the great lights of humanism, who taught us to respect man, to believe in him, to rejoice in his spiritual power, intellect and talent." Literature is obliged to manifest concern for the main problems of our time. Any man who, through lack of intellect, has never read a single book in his life is thereby apathetic not only to the past, to the reasoned experience of history, but also to what is going on around him. Do what you like with such a person, he is, as a rule, starting from scratch or only from his own experience, from which he by no means always takes wise instruction. Culturologists in the capitalist countries have written a great deal about the Stupid Fat Self-Satisfied Man--who has his own home and limousine but does not desire to read. The cancer of nonintellectuality that eats the soul can be cured only in a humanistic society. Those who suffer from it under capitalism are frequently in despair. In Washington a young man who had taken part in the aggression against Vietnam showed me his string of dried human ears which he had cut off people he had killed. In the famous American director F. Coppola's film "Apocalypse Now" (which won prizes in major film festivals in Moscow and Cannes) there is a startling scene in which a team of "arts figures" flies to an American military unit in South Vietnam. The "arts" they present are in keeping with the mission of the aggressor. Taking part in

them, one might easily indeed experience the desire to collect human ears. And such "arts" really do exist. I have seen them. During World War II Goebbels' propaganda machine approved special programs of films for the soldiers of the Wehrmacht. Our State Motion Picture Archives have captured films depicting acts of astonishing degradation and depravity which incited in the invading soldiers the basest, most bestial instincts. It was an "art" aimed like a shot in the back of the head....

Well, if a man can be subjected to degradation by means of the arts, real art nevertheless cannot be degraded. During the terrible months when the Hitlerites were trying to starve out blockaded Leningrad by dumping tons of bombs and leaflets on it, the city on the Neva answered them with Dmitriy Shostakovich's Leningrad Symphony, and the whole world heard it. When they were trying to return Kampuchea to the Middle Ages, they were destroying its arts and cultural figures with hoes. But they did not succeed....

Literature, like any other kind of creativity, inevitably bears within it the lessons of the great masters of the past; in each line pulses the assimilated experience of the ages--but in application to the new era, and refracted in its prism. In literature and art, what is constant is not just social pride but also an inescapable conscience and pain--for they preserve in themselves an enormous memory and in this are also in keeping with the people's accomplishments in numerous other areas. In scientific progress, earlier truths are frequently overturned, and sometimes are replaced by truths that are newly acquired. In cultural progress, on the other hand, in particular literature, we steadily multiply the humanistic potential--Tolstoy, Dostoyevskiy, Shevchenko, Schweitzer and Gandhi are just as important to us as vital movers of spiritual progress as they were for preceding generations. or, more accurately, that democratic portion of them whose traditions are inherited by our society.

And there is another aspect in this regard of the commensurability of spiritual and cultural values, having to do with the personality of the writer and the world around him. The writer's profession is becoming a mass phenomenon. There are about 9,000 persons in the USSR Writers Union alone (not counting members of the Journalists Union, of which there are many more, or other people who write and whose manuscripts pour into the various publishing houses). We tend to somewhat romanticize or even exaggerate the exclusiveness of those who work in literary fields and spheres in general associated with creative writing. People sometimes speak too bashfully and softly, with insufficient severity, concerning the personal culture of the writer, the correlation of intuition and conscious knowledge, the commensurability of the writer's personality and the times in which he works and lives.

The lofty achievements of our culture are there for all to see, yet into their shadow keep coming self-assured chatterboxes demanding respect on the sole grounds that Tolstoy and Sholokhov belong to the same literary tradition into which they are intruding. There is enormous public interest in what writers have to say--I will not repeat what I have already said about the vital importance of their statements outside of literature. It is only logical that there should be tens of thousands of annual meetings of our literary men with

a variety of audiences. The propaganda bureau of the Ukrainian Writers Union alone, for example, holds more than 30,000 (!) such meetings per year. No one could monitor all this "abundance" and the traditionally high prestige of literature restrains many readers from often justified reproaches. And how merciful we sometimes are! A man writes badly and is obviously never going to do any better, yet we go on for 20 years sighing over his creative problems, knowing full well that this literatus simply has no talent (an engineer would be reduced in grade or fired; in literature we suffer on). More than 10 years ago Oles' Gonchar, who was then chairman of the Ukrainian Writers Union, had this to say at a board plenum: "...If a writer really does have something in the way of the divine spark, then he does not have the right to extinguish it by his own passivity or neglect, by that laziness of mind and hand which is for some reason considered all but a privilege of the artistic nature, even though it is precisely the artist who should nurture and inflame that spark in order to return it, like the fire of his soul, to his native people." There are some who are often willing to elevate lack of education to a virtue and do not conceal that fact. Thus, on the pages of a highly respected monthly one can encounter statements to the effect that literature is not one of the realms of human interest but rather a state of his entire soul. A man may never read a single book and yet be spiritually rich. What is curious is that statements like this are no rarity. It is acknowledged, indeed, that "today the main trouble with many people is a paucity of education, covered up by an 'encrustation' of diplomas." With or without such an "encrustation," lack of education is always dangerous, especially when cultural figures boast of it.

Now here is a quote from a recently published book of verses, in which the author insistently opposes some traditional--all but inborn--wisdom existing outside of temporal and social conditions to the spirit of our time.

Life has now become something else...
But there is one thing I do not understand:
Having become a scientist or engineer
Or a teacher in school,
All of them, at the slightest provocation,
Peer into books
To seek the truth...
But did grandfather and grandmother
Ever forget the legends of their forefathers--
Could they not transmit
The wisdom of their ancestors
To their grandchild, that he might remember?
Hardly....

All of this was written with some pretensions to the Nekrasov style, but the question is: What about Nekrasov's dream about the educated peasant carrying "Belinskiy and Gogol'" away from the bazaar?

The question has to do with the criteria, the system of coordinates of the development of Soviet literature. We cannot allow these criteria to be displaced. The CC CPSU decree concerning literary and artistic criticism (1972),

the 10th anniversary of which is now being observed, was a timely reminder of the height of uncompromising demands and principles of all our literary endeavors. Without party principles, the writer's genuine labor is inconceivable.

There is a literary genre which reveals the essence of the writer's mentality with special accuracy and clarity, the degree of his mastery of his craft, his knowledge of real life. This genre, however, is frequently surrounded by esthetic neglect. What I have in mind here is publicistics, which writers can--this opinion does exist--take up on the side. Soviet literature is justly proud of its publicistics and its publicistic character (these concepts are close but by no means identical), but at the same time we must keep in mind the artistic criteria of the genre.

In our culture, Soviet culture, the man of labor has become a genuine hero in the system of socialist social relations--and in this we see manifested a completely new social tradition. Stakhanov, Chkalov, Angelina, Krivonos, Demchenko, Mazay and many more! There was no such thing until socialism. For the first time in history, the whole world saw the working man become the national hero, the hero of the nation's new culture. In bringing this new social tradition to light, writers deserve considerable credit. Let us recall that the novels themselves at that time were titled "Cement," "Hydroelectric Power Plant" and "Ferrous Metallurgy." It was convincing evidence of the writers' commitment to the social mandate. And all of this was being worked out in labor, in the quest for one's commensurability with life.

Profoundly tempered on the fields of revolutionary and war battles, and wafted by the triumphant spirit of peaceful accomplishments, Soviet publicistics expresses the essence of the social and artistic role which literature is called upon to play in the life of socialist society. Literary creativity not only influences the spiritual profile of people but also sensitively reacts to processes developing in social consciousness. For there is and can be no genuinely artistic creativity outside the spiritual needs of the people. These generally obvious and to some extent abstract matters are very closely linked to literary and artistic practice, demanding of the writer a publicistic character not so much in form as in the content of the literary labor.

One time a serious man who had gone through the great school of life and sincerely loved our literature said to me: "Doesn't it seem to you that our journalists and essayists have begun to write more frequently of easier and lighter subjects with respect to the plane of ideas? More and more of our heroes are athletes and stage stars. We get carried away with accounts about what they eat for dinner and what their children are like. Purely mundane chronicling."

My interlocutor was right: It is so nice to write about hockey and stage stars, although we would have a hard time outdoing the masters of the bourgeois press in this regard. For all my own love of sports I am not especially pleased when at literary conferences abroad the Soviet participants are referred to as representatives of the land of the famous giant weightlifter or the no less popular darling of gymnastics, and the successes of our athletes

are all but declared to be the loftiest triumph of the Soviet people. As far as that goes, many of our own newspapers and journals repeat the same doubtful compliment without even considering why the Western press is not so quick to refer to us as the land of Gagarin, let alone the land of Mayakovskiy or the land of Sholokhov. In our own press, meanwhile, we read excited stories about how this or that woman Olympic champion is getting ready to become a mother, or some world champion collects rare stamps. Or consider the ups and downs of relations between that famed pair of figure skaters and their equally famous trainer, which have become the object of universal gossip that has even appeared in our journals. All of this, multiplied by endless television reports from the "ice palaces" with their inevitable tinsel and costumes of doubtful taste along with the no less doubtful taste of the accompanying music medleys (Bach "organically" intermixed with "Kalinka")--all this, taken together, creates around a specific type of sport an atmosphere of hullabaloo that is altogether remote from the sport as such.

If there is anything we need to learn from tacky foreign propaganda, it is, of course, not the "star" cult, especially since the nature of athletic and stage accomplishments in our country does have its distinctions. Yes, our younger generation is the healthiest in the world; and the fact that our young people keep setting world records is fine; Soviet sports are a mass phenomenon, and this is an enormous achievement. But the main thing, nevertheless, is the man of labor. Much more has been written about hockey players pursuing a rubber puck on the ice than about those who pump the oil from which, incidentally, the puck is made. How many tears have been shed because our soccer has not yet reached the world's Olympic heights! It would be worth something to report that a member of the Soviet all-star team--and not just that team, either--had graduated from an institute and was going to graduate school, and that the country was keeping close watch over him. Yet the object of our constant envy--Brazil's many-times world champion team--has at various times included several illiterate players. And the fact that Argentina won the previous world soccer championship did not diminish the number of starving and unemployed people in that country. So what do we write about it for? When in the summer of 1980 some of the Western governments mounted an anti-Olympic hysteria against us, what they were afraid of was not that the Soviet athletes would win one, two or three gold medals more--they are relatively calm about that in their own stadiums. What they were afraid of, and still are, was the convincingness of the social advantages of our structure. They are even afraid of books which tell the truth about our country, its history and present-day accomplishment on a high level of artistic quality, on a high level of interpretation. Turning again to the subject of sports, it is worthwhile to think about why the capitalist world is not very eager to tell about the Znamenskiy brothers, Leonid Meshkov or Grigoriy Fedotov, who embodied not only the highest sports skills but also the most lofty morals of socialism, the Soviet way of life. That world, so alien to us, strives to stem the flow of objective information concerning genuine values, the real nature of the Soviet world, which convinces primarily by means of its social accomplishments.

Several years ago there was an attempt to make a world best-seller out of Smith's anti-Soviet book "The Russians," a work which was written in a very hostile manner and for a precise purpose--that of showing how unattractive and

uninteresting we Russians are to people in the West, how abhorrent our way of life is. How many films have been made "about us"--that is, against us! How many shows have been put on! We are obliged to rebut these lies with the whole force of our authority and talent. I fear, however, that until we learn to write in an interesting manner about the working people and the social character of our life, we will not accomplish this task. And we must write not only for Soviet but also for foreign readers. We have told the world about our coaches and half-backs. Now let's try something else. And on the same level of quality. So that people will read about it....No matter how hard it is to "get through" to foreign readers, we must see to it that they obtain the best Soviet books despite all.

The well-known Canadian writer Farley Mowett said to me: "Our people like to write and publish books about your curious aspects, your trained bears and champion runners--that's interesting. But when I tried to publish translations of the stories of Yuriy Rytshew--the same curious aspects, but with social analysis, the publishers turned me down one after another. They just don't want it. At a certain point they are afraid to publish you, and they are well aware of that point. You must observe it...."

And in recalling the constant television shots of the beautiful legs of our ice skaters, runners and cyclists, I got to thinking about Ivan Ivanovich Ivanov, the combine operator in Kazakhstan who has no legs but still works in the fields along with everyone else. His story was reported in Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev's remarkable book "Tselina" [Virgin Lands], but you and I have never written about it.

The lessons of social analysis of our reality ought to pulse constantly in artistic works. Firmly mastered, they should become the basis of creativity, the basis of the writer's relationship with life: for he must not fail to take to his heart everything by which the country lives--its triumphs and troubles. The writer's duty in a socialist society, along with everything else, is to use his creativity, his social endeavors, to promote strict ideological correction of the coordinates of our spiritual development.

History is never interrupted. Our country, and our literature, has won through adversity everything it possesses today. We are proud of this; we are the object of envy, love and hate--and all of it is social in nature. In every Soviet writer there is the quest for commensurability with the world being created before our very eyes. In contemporary Soviet literature much is said about the eternal, about eternity, and in this also is manifested the millennial continuity of the people's striving toward the future, the ideal of social justice. The nations making up the Soviet Union have won freedom and have revealed their historic capabilities so brilliantly and so uniquely thanks to the socialist revolution. And we always keep this in mind.

The internationalism and social justice of communist principles are instructive especially today, when there is so much militant chauvinism, religious fanaticism and black terrorism in the world, when fascism is being resurrected all the way from South Africa to the northern latitudes.

One of the most convincing lessons of our literature is the ability to find support in the thick of the renewal of life, in the fervor of its transformations. The new, socialist intelligentsia is inseparable from the people. "...Listen to the Revolution" exclaimed Blok, and in this was an acknowledgment of a new artistic perception of the world and our new commitment, including the commitment to emerge from the provincialism that is so destructive to culture.

But provincialism is astonishingly tenacious. It is not all that hard to be reminded that Prime Hangman Stolypin, apparently, was not such a bad guy (?!). One can also be reminded of which central periodical publications sang the praises of the sainted Sergiy Radonezhskiy, thanks to whom, it is claimed, we won the Battle of Kulikovo. And just recently an American study fell into our hands dealing with the theme of God and the orthodox saints in contemporary Soviet poetry. That was certainly something to write about....

In recent decades our literature has been replenished by an influx of powerful young writers who have declared the subject of their creative endeavors to be the investigation of Russian village life. The successes of these writers are apparent, and the social value of their difficult efforts is indisputable, for they reveal before us the entire wealth and multifaceted depth of the historical experience of the people, the genuine beauty of the people's character, the people's arts with their "earmarks" of genius.

But it is one thing to present a genuinely artistic interpretation of the life of today's village, people's destiny, a sincerely shared experience of the joys and sorrows of the peasantry, a profound, philosophically generalized understanding of the development of the socialist village, and quite another to adopt the strained pose of the "champion of village tradition," as some of the literati have done. Strenuously cultivating in his spoken language the "primordial" a or o, depending on the region of his symbolic literary assignment, such a person from time to time sets out from the capital city to the land of his fathers, so as to "take a look at" and sing the praises of scenes from the olden days. The object of interest changes frequently: the blackened boards of forgotten icons in the flickering lights, monasteries with caches of holy relics, manuscript incunabula, berry presses and fishing holes--but most frequently the gastronomic wonders of village hospitality with its "little cucumbers," "little cabbages," "cool-beaded flasks" and other gems which have already been so masterfully portrayed for us not only in the essays of Gilyarovskiy but also in the novels of Rabelais.

It is difficult to say what might be commensurately reflected by the literature of this kind of "immersion" in village lifeways. Certainly not the actual reality or the real problems of today's village.

It is not even a matter of the names of the authors of this kind of "quest" but rather the sheer impertinent displacement of all criteria both historic and philosophical. As a result, on the pages of our literary and artistic journals quite frequently appear vague discussions about the folk depths of the self-consciousness of Russian literature, outside of time and social concerns, which alone nurture our literary process. It may be that this

idealization of the spiritual past reflects a kind of protest by some writers against spiritual omniverousness and the loss of roots binding them to the land of their fathers. But who can structure one's premises on opposing the best of the village elders to the worst of the city drunks? In its striving toward progress, literature cannot be based on a life without clocks and calendars. It is mere conservatism, though perhaps unconscious....And why unconscious, after all? Here is what one young literary expert had to say for our edification: "...The concept 'conservation' in its Russian meaning--preservation--also embodies a profoundly positive idea....To preserve what is most valuable, most holy...."

We do observe the principle of preserving the priceless spiritual treasures of the past, but we reject conservatism as such. Lenin taught us a firm knowledge about the two cultures that exist in each national culture. And jingoist patriots were the object of sharp criticism of more than one generation of the democratic intelligentsia of the past century.

Saltykov-Shchedrin wrote that the village patriarchal system in Russia was a "form of coercion which one side imposed because it was able to and the other side accepted because it could not refuse." Here also the great wise man of the northern villages (and not just the northern villages, either) repeats that peasant life is primarily a source of "abundant material for study and even more for comparison and contrast." Here again it is not a matter of the denial but of the understanding of the social value of a particular state of the national soul and the national spirit. To show how the character of the people is realized under the new social conditions--this is our duty, because the unchanging mission of the arts has been and remains that of creating a hero who convincingly and rightly reflects the national character in keeping with the times. Lenin's thesis that "literary endeavors must form a part of the general proletarian cause" has not become obsolete by one iota!

Soviet literature is acknowledged and appreciated by all mankind as one of its loftiest spiritual triumphs. For this reason, our exactingness is undeviating. We are sincerely proud of our Soviet culture and our national literatures. And yet--think about it!--as late as this century more than three-quarters of the population of czarist Russia were illiterate. Before we became writers we became readers....This is also a hopeful lesson for mankind.

We have a great literature, one unprecedented in history. The exactingness and high principles of its criteria are instructive--in any of the national cultures of the land of the soviets there is constant interest in the processes taking place in each of the fraternal literatures, for they are accomplishments in common, a cause for shared rejoicing. But for all the variety of our national schools we are united in the commitment of our own destinies and creativity to the country's destiny.

It is no accident that provincialism cannot hold out especially in confrontation with the loftiest triumphs of our literature. One might even, for a time, pass one's lack of culture off as national tradition, but very soon in one's own national literature such a champion of the patriarchal past comes to be a disgrace, a defiant anachronism; Soviet literature has acquired the

ability to cleanse itself, and this is one of the greatest of its accomplishments. Its secret, also, lies in its commensurability with the life of society, in its striving toward this commensurability. For example, it was not just Georgian literature that was elevated after Nodar Dumbadze. The appearance of this talent is a pride we all share. It is encouraging to note that such a writer was shaped by Soviet literature, encompassing in his experience the accomplishments of many national cultures. And how about the Belorussian war novel? Or the new Lithuanian poetry with its brilliant E. Mezhelaitis and Yu. Martsinkyavichyus? One time, contemplating Mikhail Sholokhov's birthday, the eminent Georgian poet Irakliy Abashidze declared from the podium: "...This is a day of triumph of Soviet literature!..." To Georgiy Markov, first secretary of the board of the USSR Writers Union, belongs the vitally principled statement which defines one of the typically Soviet, internationalist traits of our literature: "The Uzbek, the Azerbaijani, the Ukrainian, the Lithuanian or the Russian critic, whenever he analyzes and assesses a particular phenomenon of the native literature, must have a perfectly well-defined conception of the entire multinational literary field, he must be able to compare, to contrast, to take account of the similarity and the variety of the literary phenomena--in short, to perceive our multilingual literature in constant motion. And--of considerable practical importance--in his criteria, in his artistic evaluations, he must proceed from the high accomplishments of all our literature."

We must carefully preserve the criteria and the correctness of the line of party-mindedness and people-mindedness which connects all the brilliant achievements of our fraternal cultures.

In rejoicing over the high triumphs of the literature of Soviet society, let us think a bit more about what it will be like tomorrow! Let us be accurate in our forecasts. Let us be fair in our analysis, in the commensurability of values that are defended and confirmed in creativity, with the ideas and deeds of our great time! Let us preserve unchanging the great responsibility of our teachers, our first mentors, their ability to look times in the eye and not avert their gaze.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/16

THE SOVIET SYSTEM OF CERTIFICATION OF CADRES AT THE PRESENT STAGE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 82 pp 59-69

[Article by V. Kirillov-Ugryumov, chairman of the Higher Certification Commission, Council of Ministers USSR]

[Text] Further improvement of the training and certification of scientific-teaching cadres is classified in the decisions of the 25th and 26th CPSU congresses among the tasks of greatest importance to the party and the state as a whole. It facilitates improvement of the quality and effectiveness of the creative efforts of Soviet specialists, accelerated scientific-technical progress in our country, and uniting of the accomplishments of the scientific and technical revolution and the advantages of socialism.

The attention of the Higher Certification Commission under the Council of Ministers USSR is focused on implementing the decisions of the congresses, CC CPSU plenums and party and government decrees concerning topical problems of the economy, science and culture. A concrete program of action of the certification system is mapped out in the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree "Measures To Further Improve the Certification of Scientific and Scientific-Teaching Cadres." The Higher Certification Commission, with the participation of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology and the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education drew up normative documents regulating the certification of scientific and scientific-teaching cadres and imposing unified requirements at all stages. The interdepartmental system of certification, the main link of which comprises the competent specialized councils, has made it possible not only to improve the appraisal of dissertations but also to accelerate the adoption of their findings in practice and has fostered improved planning of scientific research and the training of cadres of higher qualification. In turn, improvement of the level of general scientific and scientific-theoretical training of applicants has been facilitated by the introduction of unified programs of candidate examinations, drawn up for the first time.

The Higher Certification Commission carries out its functions with reliance on leading scientists and in close contact with officials of scientific-research institutions and VUZ's. Higher Certification Commission executives meet regularly with the chairmen of specialized councils for the defense of dissertations in pursuit of higher degrees.

During the 10th Five-Year Plan, the Higher Certification Commission conferred doctors degrees on about 10,000 applicants and candidates degrees on 114,000. The research findings of many of them yielded the national economy considerable economic benefits. The innovative character of the work of these applicants is attested, for example, by the fact that about five authors' invention certifications have been awarded for every successfully defended doctoral dissertation in the technical sciences.

It is by no means reasonable, of course, to express the significance of research findings in quantitative terms alone. Many dissertations in the social and natural sciences make a substantial contribution to the storehouse of human knowledge, develop theory, foster the resolution of social and political tasks, make it possible to enhance upbringing and education, and maintain or restore people's health.

A substantial decline in the number of dissertation defenses soon after the reorganization of the Higher Certification Commission (doctorals by about one-half, candidates by about one-third) has now been replaced by a growth trend, due primarily to a restructuring of training of cadres of higher qualification in accordance with new conditions.

Improvement of certification is inconceivable without the necessary level of scientific rigor in the organization where the applicant is directly employed. That is where his qualities as a specialist and a citizen are assessed, his personal contribution to science. It is the task of VUZ, scientific-research institute and scientific-production association executives, with the participation of the social organizations, to ensure the objectivity of this assessment, openness and high exactingness, and to eliminate the possibility of nitpicking or punishing the applicant for "stubbornness" of character.

Certification practice has shown that the "Statute on Procedures for Awarding Scientific Degrees and Conferring Scientific Titles" ensures an essentially new and higher level of certification and makes it possible to enhance the effectiveness of its mechanism as well as develop a system of evaluation in keeping with scientific development as a whole and in each specific sector. Whenever the specialized councils follow the "Statute" to the letter, study the personal qualities of the applicant carefully and submit definite and accurate assessments concerning the innovative character, reliability and scientific value of the findings of the dissertation, the Higher Certification Commission's appraisal proceeds without supplemental review and within a time span that is shorter than the "Statute" calls for. The viability of certification norms presently in force has been attested by the practice of many specialist councils, including those of the Institute of Physiology imeni I. P. Pavlov of the Academy of Sciences USSR, the Moscow Aviation Institute imeni Sergo Ordzhonikidze, the All-Union Scientific-Research Institute of Scientific-Technical Information and Economics of the Construction Materials Industry, Kiev University, and the All-Union Institute of Mineral Raw Materials. It is characteristic that in the dissertation defenses in these councils there are frequent sharp debates, and it sometimes happens that the conclusions of the applicant and the opponents are not backed up, but the genuinely

creative atmosphere, everyone's sole motivation to determine the truth and adherence to high principles ensure the quality of the findings and rule out subsequent complaints with regard to the decision that is made.

Unfortunately, such is not state of affairs everywhere. Out of 18 dissertations defended in one of the faculties of the Georgian Polytechnic Institute, for example, 8 did not receive a positive assessment and were turned down by the Higher Certification Commission. Eight doctoral dissertations submitted by the council of the Ufa Aviation Institute were also turned down. Unsatisfactory work defended outside of the applicant's speciality has come in from the council of the Moscow Motor Highway Institute. Specialized councils for the pedagogical sciences of the Tashkent Pedagogical Institute imeni Nizami have been subjected to severe criticism. At one time the presidium of the Higher Certification Commission had to put a stop to the activities of the specialized councils of the Moscow Institute of Land Development Engineers and the Council for the Study of the Productive Forces of the Ukrainian SSR. More examples of this sort could be cited. In all of 1981, the Higher Certification Commission turned down more than 400 decisions of specialized councils on the conferring of higher degrees. The main reasons included: ill-considered choice of theme, absence of innovation, incompleteness, purely descriptive character and low scientific level. It often happens that the methodological aspect of the study is weak, errors are found in the mathematical apparatus and the conclusions are unsubstantiated. In regard to a number of dissertations (in fact, 1 out of every 10 works in the agricultural sciences that were rejected) the negative decisions are handed down because of inadequate special and overall scientific training of the authors. Unfortunately, many organizations still ignore this sector.

Work is continuing in the current five-year plan to optimize the network of specialized councils.

It is already possible to determine the necessary number of councils and their location for each specialty, taking account of defense requirements and the availability of specialists. In reapproving a council for a new term we proceed chiefly on the basis of the quality of its work during the preceding period, keeping in mind the chart of an optimal network of councils. In the future, evidently, it will be advisable to review simultaneously once every 5 years all petitions concerning the organization or continuation of specialized councils in terms of the scientific sector. This procedure will make it possible for the appraisers and certification sections of the Higher Certification Commission to carry out timely analysis and comparison of the work quality of the specialized councils in terms of the particular speciality, to verify whether the institution in which the council functions is adequately provided with the necessary work conditions and whether dissertation defenses by applicants from other cities are possible and, finally, to bring the council network into line with needs.

The Higher Certification Commission ascribes considerable importance to the designation of leading organizations to be assigned the task of examining applicants' work. They should be institutions that are genuine leaders,

enjoying prestige and well known for their scientific accomplishments and their scientific school, capable of evaluating the theoretical and practical value of a dissertation in terms of substance and worth rather than merely formally. In 1980, consequently, the appraisal councils and the Higher Certification Commission's certification section for specialties in the medical sciences, in collaboration with the USSR Ministry of Health and the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, drew up a list of recommended organizations that could be entrusted with reviewing dissertations in particular specialties. Similar lists have now been drawn up for construction and architecture, metallurgy and metals science, machine building and machine science, pedagogics and psychology, and other sciences. This work will be completed soon, and we expect that it will have a positive influence on the quality of appraisals. In the future, leading organizations can be called upon to analyze the thematics of dissertation research; they can not only submit recommendations on the practical utilization of their findings but also promote their realization.

The certification of scientific cadres benefited from a revision of the "Nomenclature of Specialties of Scientific Workers," which was carried out in 1977 by the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology with the active participation of the Higher Certification Commission. Subsequently, new shortcomings were detected in it. It includes specialties that are too narrow, designated as independent specialties prematurely, others that duplicate one another and some that are made up of a vast conglomerate of scientific disciplines with extremely broad and ill-defined boundaries. At present the certification sections and appraisal councils of the Higher Certification Commission are accumulating and analyzing proposals to change the nomenclature. The results of this important effort (which in the new five-year plan must be completed and submitted to the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology) will be reflected in the structure of the network of specialized councils, in the drafting of programs of candidates examinations and in enhancing the quality of dissertation appraisal.

One of the main thrusts in the Higher Certification Commission's activities in the current five-year plan is the effective utilization of the capabilities of certification for the administration of scientific-technical progress and acceleration of the process of practical adoption of scientific findings. The certification of scientific and scientific-teaching cadres not only stimulates the higher qualification of scientists but also mirrors the quality of cadre training and the organization of scientific research.

Every year the Higher Certification Commission analyzes dissertation thematics, generalizes the recommendations of the specialized councils with regard to the practical adoption of the scientific findings contained in doctoral and candidates dissertations and submits these materials (in the form of collections) to the ministries, departments and councils of ministers of the union republics. By selecting and systematizing analytic material with respect to dissertation defenses it is possible to assess their correlation with the decisions of directive organs, national economic plans and goal-oriented integrated programs.

It is important that the thematics of dissertation works be determined by the scientific directions indicated in the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress. Relevance is a main requirement in the planning of dissertation research. A dissertation should be the logical conclusion of the applicant's planned scientific effort. If, however, the scientific-research institute or the VUZ fails year after year to ensure that the thematics are "dissertationable," it is not the fault of the certification system allegedly imposing excessively stringent demands on the dissertation. It only means that the institution is lagging behind scientific development and failing to meet the demands of production.

One excellent example of instructive integration of science and production is the Scientific-Research Physical-Chemical Institute imeni L. Ya. Karpov. Its collective has made a practice of carrying out long-term research along vital scientific lines that are frequently exploratory in character and often carried out in close collaboration with major enterprises and ending up, as a rule, in one or several dissertations. As a result, by the time the dissertation is defended there is no question about whether its findings will be recommended for adoption. In cases like this, the implementation of scientific accomplishments constitutes an inseparable part of the research process itself-- it is theoretically substantiated and organizationally provided for. Similar experience has been accumulated in the Urals Polytechnical Institute imeni S. M. Kirov, the All-Union Scientific-Research and Project-Design Institute of Metallurgical Machine Building and many other organizations.

The party and the state expect science to resolve tasks that are crucial and decisive at the present stage of the country's economic and social development. The 26th CPSU Congress emphasized the need for "timely determination and alteration of directions in research and applications." The analysis of dissertation themes makes it possible to determine the specialties and trends as well as the intensity of the primary growth of scientific cadres of higher qualification, to locate "bottlenecks" and detect shortcomings.

In general, the thematics of the dissertations we accept are relevant and in accord with the mainline trends of development of understanding and practice; they are linked to the integrated programs and scientific research plans of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, the USSR Academy of Sciences and the sector academies, and with the coordination plans of scientific-technical development of the ministries and departments. At the same time, however, certain disproportions occur in planning and in the training of scientific cadres. Thus, the appraisal council for machine building and machine science noted that a substantial number of the dissertation works deal with matters that have already been sufficiently investigated, while there is a relatively small number of works dealing with theories of radically new machines, especially robots and manipulators. Yet at the 26th party congress it was especially noted that if the fundamental basis of scientific-technical progress is the development of science, it is primarily machine building that can open wide the doors to new development. The congress also focused attention on the fact that some sectors of transport are strained very badly, yet the appraisal council for transport has established that there is a decline in major theoretical, fundamental research in this area.

Also completely inadequate is the number of dissertations dealing with problems of powder metallurgy, waste-free production technologies and rational utilization of fuel and energy resources.

Regarding the social sciences, the 26th CPSU Congress pointed out that many problems await solution in the political economy of socialism, that more attention must be paid to the social consequences of the scientific and technical revolution and that more profound and vigorous analysis is needed of phenomena of the political life of society. This is all directly applicable to dissertation thematics. Overall, thematics have become more meaningful and multifaceted in recent years, and many research works are dealing with extremely topical problems and carrying out new approaches to the working out of fundamental world-view matters. The overwhelming majority of the specialized councils are imposing the necessary requirements, as attested by the fact that the number of dissertations turned down by the Higher Certification Commission is declining steadily. At the same time, however, there is a distinct shortage of research dealing, for example, with such vital matters as the economic problems of development of the infrastructure, especially in Siberia and the Far East, environmental protection in conjunction with enhanced effectiveness and intensity of social production.

Despite substantial improvements, dissertation thematics reflect the weaker aspects and shortcomings of the development of the philosophical sciences.

All too few dissertations deal with crucial theoretical problems; research proceeds chiefly (at times in a rather headlong manner) along lines of the peripheral realms of philosophy. Meanwhile, the elaboration of a theory of materialist dialectics, including a dialectics of social development, a materialist interpretation of history, has been and continues to be task number one for the philosophical sciences.

Among dissertations dealing with historical materialism there is a predominance of works dealing with particular problems that are sometimes tangential to it. The proportion of general theoretical works is insignificant; there is a lack of works dealing with methodological problems of the theory of historical materialism and social cognition. There is a marked tendency to substitute a restatement of factual material for theoretical research. This is especially true of themes such as the scientific and technical revolution, the conversion of science into a direct productive force, the development of forms of labor, changes in the social-class structure of society and national relations.

Historical materialism is a general-theoretical Marxist sociology. In addition, however, applied sociology, or concrete-sociological research, is also developing rapidly. Considerable numbers of works deal with their methodology, with the structure of the rural population, problems of agrarian labor, and so on, yet at the same time many important aspects of our society's social development are neglected by the authors of dissertations.

In recent times, scientific efforts in the field of scientific communism have been reactivated. There is an increasing number of studies of current problems of mature socialist society, the formation of a personality of the socialist

type, and the communist education of the working people, especially young people. Dissertation authors are increasingly studying and generalizing the specific experience of socialist construction in the fraternal countries.

Among the shortcomings that could be judged on the basis of analyzing works dealing with the theory of scientific communism it should be noted that a number of vital and major theoretical themes remain outside the sphere of interests of the specialized councils, departments and individual applicants. This is especially true of the subject matter of the fundamental advantages of developed socialism and their realization in the field of socialist democracy, human rights, utilization of the opportunities of the scientific and technical revolution, the development of social relations, in particular class, family and domestic relations, and enhancement of the political and moral culture of members of society. Dissertation applicants still devote too little attention to the development of the Leninist theory of socialist revolution, the world revolutionary process and analysis of the contemporary ideological struggle. All too many studies are lacking in genuine innovation.

The same can be said about methodological problems of the theory of scientific communism, including the subject of this science, of which various points of view have been expressed.

Another lagging sector is the criticism of contemporary bourgeois philosophy and sociology, the philosophical foundations of anticommunism and right-wing and "left-wing" revisionism. Not many works deal with these themes, and those that are submitted to the Higher Certification Commission are not always up to standard. Practically nothing is being done on the methodology of criticism of bourgeois philosophy and sociology. We observe a considerable lag behind actual processes of the development of foreign thinking; work after work investigates trends and theories that have long since been discarded and long since thoroughly critiqued in the Marxist literature, while new ones become the object of analysis only after considerable delay.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's justified comment at the 26th party congress to the effect that philosophers all too frequently prefer to prove what has been proven instead of analyzing new phenomena in life is to a significant extent applicable to candidates and doctoral dissertations in other social sciences as well.

One way to improve the thematics of dissertation research is to provide better coordination. Many specialized councils reasonably urge that coordination organs be created for all scientific sectors, similar to the functioning coordination councils dealing with CPSU history and pedagogics. Having access to considerable information about dissertations completed or in preparation, they could collaborate with leading scientific institutions in given areas and appraisal councils on the drafting of a list of directions recommended for scientific investigation.

The capabilities of the cadre certification system as a component part of the control and administration of scientific-technical progress are quite

apparent on the example of the Higher Certification Commission's participation in improving the work of graduate studies. Graduate studies make it possible to carry out goal-directed training of specialists in the most promising directions of science and to replenish scientific ranks with young people manifesting an inclination for research and pedagogical work. Of the total number of specialists in the past five-year plan who were awarded the degree of candidate of sciences, 60 percent had completed graduate studies at various times.

Life itself indicates, at the same time, that about half of those completing graduate studies are not capable of defending a dissertation either within the specified time span or in subsequent years.

A major indicator of the effectiveness of graduate studies is the scientific level and practical value of the dissertations that are defended, the scientific and civic qualities of their alumni. Data on these matters are concentrated and analyzed in the Higher Certification Commission. How to explain, for example, the fact that the dissertations of graduate students of the institutes of the Siberian Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences generally pass the appraisal in the Higher Certification Commission without any reservations? First, this is due to that department's systematic concern for the quality of the graduate student enrollment in the early stages of student instruction in the VUZ's, and secondly, the precise orientation of the dissertation studies along the most promising lines of science and technology and, finally, the high quality of the scientific leadership.

Also meriting attention is the experience of the Moscow Physics Engineering Institute. It has a special faculty which enrolls students who have successfully completed two courses, who have been recommended, who manifest creative abilities and who desire to go on to obtain higher qualification in physics. Taking a special program which emphasizes research, most of them end up defending a candidates dissertation and completing graduate studies.

Regulation of acceptance for graduate studies cannot, of course, guarantee against the accidental enrollment of untalented or professionally immature persons or the intrusion of morally unstable people who are alien to Soviet science. When such persons are detected, the Higher Certification Commission is uncompromising in its decision.

In the preceding five-year plan, the Higher Certification Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers overturned more than 500 council decisions on the awarding of candidates degrees to graduate students. Chiefly to blame for this are the applicants' scientific supervisors. Now when dealing with a completed work of inadequate quality or insufficient relevance, the Higher Certification Commission calls a meeting of the appraisal council, to which are invited not only the applicant and a representative of the council in which the defense was conducted but also the scientific supervisor. We hope that the concreteness of the personal reservations of the Higher Certification Commission addressed to the scientific supervisors will have a beneficial influence on upgrading the quality of graduate studies work.

A substantial place in the Higher Certification Commission's work should be accorded to all-round analysis of the thematics and content of graduate dissertations. The resulting generalized data are of essential significance for further planning of scientific research and improved training of cadres of higher qualification. Here are the results, for example, of an analysis of the dissertations dealing with the specialty "Thermal Engines." Only one-third of them dealt with automotive engines, although these are the most widespread. The reason is that two-thirds of the scientific supervisors gravitate toward the study of ships' and tractor engines. Here we have good grounds for the amendment of graduate training plans by sector ministries and departments. This aspect of the activities of the Higher Certification Commission and all links in the certification system calls for business contacts with the ministries and departments that are directly responsible for scientific-technical progress, and such contacts are growing increasingly stronger.

In the current five-year plan, the Higher Certification Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers is focusing special attention on research work dealing with goal-oriented integrated programs spelled out in the "Basic Guidelines of Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-85 and for the Period Through 1990." The training and certification of scientific and scientific-teaching cadres must in the final analysis become a component part of goal-oriented programs, for it is these programs that must serve as the basis for long-range planning of the applicants' work. It is worthwhile for the executives of these programs to utilize the system of certification of scientific cadres as a means of enhancing the effectiveness of research and recruiting young specialists for creative work in themes of vital importance to the national economy. In evaluating dissertations with respect to the thematics of goal-oriented programs, the specialized councils should in turn consider as adequate practical verification the program executive's conclusion concerning completion of the corresponding stage of the work.

In the dissertation defense process, as is well known, competent scientists give recommendations regarding where and how to make most effective use of the resultant findings. This is not enough, however--it is essential to bring the recommendations to the attention of the enterprises that would be interested and ensure proper monitoring of their implementation. It is desirable that the appropriate organs of the ministries and departments take account of these capabilities of certification in working out their own measures to implement the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress.

For determining the quality of the work of the specialized councils and the level of the standards they impose on the dissertations that are defended, the method of assessment appraisal is used at the present time. A well-organized system of such evaluations is an effective lever for improving the decisions that are taken. We are striving to enlist in this work the country's best scientific forces and most competent institutions. We do not confine ourselves to a once-through processing of the materials to be appraised--we accumulate, process, analyze and store an enormous quantity of information. To make our work easier we use modern computer technology and automated systems based on large data centers. Recently the International Center for Scientific

and Technical Information, gathering data on scientific research in the CEMA-member countries, collaborated with the Higher Certification Commission on the compilation of a collection of dissertation and scientific report synopses dealing with the "Problems of Reliability of Machine-Building Materials" section of the "Machine Building" integrated goal-oriented program. The Higher Certification Commission proposes to continue its effort with the backing of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology and the USSR Central Statistical Administration. The first phase of an information-reference subsystem for specialized councils is already functioning. The All-Union Scientific-Research Institute for Problems of Organization and Administration and the All-Union Scientific-Technical Information Center have undertaken to deal with concrete tasks of data support for the certification system.

In light of the decisions of the 26th party congress, strengthened control and improvement of the system of administration of certification organs as well as improvement in the style and methods of their activities are of increasingly vital importance.

The task of improving the efficacy and effectiveness of the certification system as a whole is facilitated by improving work with letters. They represent a living channel of communications with the masses. In the letters addressed to the Higher Certification Commission, scientists and executives of scientific organizations evaluate the system of certification of scientific and scientific-teaching cadres and make suggestions on improving it further. We also get considerable criticism pointing out specific shortcomings in the work of the Higher Certification Commission's apparatus as well as instances of red tape, form-letter replies and a negligent attitude toward applicants' requests. The board of the Higher Certification Commission discusses these complaints and undertakes measures to impose administrative penalties on those responsible.

Certification experience as well as proposals submitted to the Higher Certification Commission show that it is possible to substantially reduce the number of documents submitted and simultaneously increase the responsibility of the specialized and scientific councils of the scientific-research institutes and VUZ's for their reliability. These proposals are included in the long-range work plan of the Higher Certification Commission.

We cannot, however, agree with all the opinions concerning certification improvement. Some letters and published articles, for example, propose the abolition of dissertation defenses or else urge that defenses be conducted without dissertations. The reasoning behind these suggestions is approximately as follows: If the scientific findings of the applicant are to be published, why write a dissertation? Let the Higher Certification Commission study these works in order to decide whether to award the degree. It all seems very simple. But just try to answer the main question of the certification--the applicant's personal contribution to science and his maturity as a scientist (for example, in regard to a publication concerning the properties of a new elementary particle when the number of coauthors come to several dozen). Also, in a series of publications by the same author we can see that each of them pursues a specific aim: One lays claim to priority; another

lays out the procedure of investigation; a third spells out the details relating to the innovative character and reliability of the findings; and so on. In time, some of it is obsolete. A subsequent publication may contradict what preceded or even cancel it out, for scientific understanding is a dialectical process. In the final analysis, in order to separate out from the cumulative work the concentrate which meets the standards necessary for the awarding of a degree it is necessary to discard tons of "verbal ore." For the opponents and reviewers this kind of "concentration:"--the crystallization of the "dry residue"--would take much too much time and effort were it not for the present procedures of dissertation certification. For the applicant, who has gone through his successes, mistakes and doubts, it is much easier to summarize the clear and logically coherent results of his goal-oriented scientific endeavors. This summarization is the dissertation proper; it is not only a completed study but also the applicant's personal contribution to science in his own words, characterizing his qualifications, culture and ability to express his ideas in a literate and logical manner.

The Higher Certification Commission constantly emphasizes the necessity of short dissertations and the fact that it is unnecessary to recopy in them truths that are generally well known or of little significance. Even a monograph (that is, a published scientific work which presents the elaboration of a particular theme in full), a textbook written by a single person (if it contains original scientific findings) and a short scientific paper (when the applicant is well known among specialists for his brilliant insights) can be a dissertation. Yet, let us note, we encounter quite a few people who seek the easy way into science. How can we agree to the proposal to award degrees without a dissertation defense, or the idea that the preparation of a dissertation is a futile waste of time? Of course we cannot. To accept these notions would be to open the floodgates to pseudoscientists.

Besides scientific degrees there are scientific titles. The awarding of these latter does not call for the defense of a qualifying work. In special cases, the Higher Certification Commission awards titles by way of exception, even without the presence of the appropriate scientific degree, for example to a specific category of VUZ teachers who have earned distinction in training-methodology work. It must be noted, however, that scientific-research institute and VUZ councils which have the right to petition for the awarding of scientific titles operate without the necessary control on the part of the Higher Certification Commission. This often leads to unsubstantiated petitions to award such titles that impose inadequate standards, so that it is the applicants who suffer in the long run. Improving the practice of awarding scientific titles is high on the agenda of the Higher Certification Commission.

We are focusing special attention on appeals and protests against decisions, also letters claiming the manifestation of subjectivism in dissertation appraisals. We can cite examples in which the Higher Certification Commission has established a conflict between scientific schools and found in favor of the applicant despite the fact that negative appraisals included those by reviewers acknowledged to be major scientists. A special article deals with this matter in the "Statute on Procedures for Awarding Scientific Degrees and Conferring Scientific Titles," approved by the USSR Council of Ministers.

Dissertation appraisal is based on the opinion of competent scientists not on the staff of the Higher Certification Commission, that is, fully social rather than departmental opinion. This applies to all levels of dissertation appraisal: to the councils in which the defense is conducted, to the appraisal councils of the Higher Certification Commission and, finally, to the highest certification bodies--the plenum and the presidium of the Higher Certification Commission; the overwhelming majority of the decisions they take are based on the opinions of nonstaff specialists. In this connection, it is strange to hear proposals concerning additional organs of social control which would be involved in the appraisal of particular dissertations outside the Higher Certification Commission system. What is important is to strengthen party and state control over the selection of cadres recommended for work in the certification system, to impose higher standards on scientists for adherence to moral principles.

Fundamental questions of relations among scientists--questions of scientific ethics--have already been brought up in the pages of KOMMUNIST (1981, No 9), and they must be vigorously resolved through the joint efforts of party and state organs.

Any question should be reviewed at that level as well by the people who are prescribed to do so by law. It is they who must be held fully accountable for the correctness of decisions that are taken. Scientific disputes should be resolved not by administrators or individual authorities but in practice, in real life, by experimentation. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted, "science does not tolerate subjectivism, hasty conclusions not verified in practice. It must be based solely on objective data backed up by precise experimentation, production experience and life itself." It takes time, as a rule, to determine the truth. And it is not always right to consider this time as mere red tape and bureaucratism. Although, to be sure, there are cases of intentional foot dragging, for which, of course, the guilty parties must be held to stricter account.

An analysis of shortcomings in the work of the certification system shows that the successful defense of scientifically weak dissertations generally comes about due to deviations from established procedures. It can now be stated definitely that the way to improve the quality of certification is to see to it that all the links (especially the councils) accurately and impartially carry out the "Statute on Procedures for Awarding Scientific Degrees and Conferring Scientific Titles" and to raise the personal responsibility of each opponent, reviewer and council member for the conclusion they draw. It is essential to vigilantly cut short any manifestations of formalism in certification, any attempts at unprincipled partiality or the substitution of meaningless ruminations and pseudoscientific formulation for clear answers concerning the substance of the innovation, reliability or relevance of the findings of the dissertation. In this, the help of party organs is essential.

Although the number of letters (including complaints) with regard to certification matters has declined noticeably, one-third of the letters coming into the Higher Certification Commission involve complaints against applicants whose dissertations were successfully defended. The way to reduce the flow

of such complaints is spelled out in the CC CPSU decree "Measures To Further Improve Work with Letters and Suggestions by the Working People in Light of the Decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress," which states: "Create a healthy moral-psychological climate in the labor collectives, an atmosphere fostering the development of open comradely criticism and self-criticism in order to eliminate anonymous slanders." It is possible to avoid giving offense, red tape and spiritual traumas by ensuring the correct, principled approach to certification from the very beginning of examining the matter of awarding a scientific degree or conferring a scientific title. One of the basic tasks of the certification system, the resolution of which will have a direct impact on the quality of our work, is the struggle to implement this most vital directive of the party. All of the Higher Certification Commission's work with respect to implementing the CC CPSU and USSR Council of Ministers decree "Measures To Further Improve the Certification of Scientific and Scientific-Teaching Cadres" is conducted with the active help of the party organizations. Matters of certification of scientific and scientific-teaching cadres were the object of special examination by the Moscow Gorkom, the Moscow and Leningrad obkoms and the CC CP Belorussia.

A substantial reserve for improving the certification system's work is to enhance the role of representatives of party and trade union organizations in the specialized councils. We can cite a number of positive examples. Representatives of party organizations in the specialized councils of the Novocherkassk Polytechnical Institute, the Institute of Electrodynamics of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, the University of Friendship of Peoples imeni P. Lumumba and others are taking active part in representative dissertation appraisal. In the Saratov University, for example, party organization representatives not only carefully study the documents but also conduct personal conversations with the applicants and officials of organizations recommending dissertations for defense. The party committees of many VUZ's and scientific-research institutes, for example the Moscow Higher Technical School imeni N. E. Bauman, Rostov University and others hear reports of party organization representatives as well as officials of the specialized councils.

It must be acknowledged, nevertheless, that in many cases the role of communist council members and representatives of party and trade union organizations is not very noticeable. In light of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the party's influence on cadre work should be substantially increased. On the average, about 70 percent of the make-up of the councils are party members; this large army must be directed toward enhancing the work quality of the certification system.

The Soviet system of certification of scientific and scientific-teaching cadres has demonstrated its viability as one of the components of the state system of administration and is yielding fruit. Resolution of the task of further improving the certification of cadres of higher qualification, as stipulated by the 26th CPSU Congress, will help to strengthen our country's intellectual and economic potential.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/16

NEW DOCUMENTS OF THE GREAT PATRIOTIC WAR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 82 pp 70-82

[Text] The Heroic 250-Day Defense of Sevastopol'

The legendary defense of Sevastopol' in 1941-1942 has entered forever the annals of the Great Patriotic War and the people's memory. During the difficult months of the war, the hero city on the Black Sea pinned down major enemy forces at its walls and delayed the fascist troops' 1942 spring offensive toward the Volga and the Caucasus.

Hitler's command assigned the mission of taking the Crimean Peninsula to Gen E. Manstein's 11th German Army and the Romanian Mountain Corps. These troops (originally the group included 7 infantry divisions and 2 brigades, 150 tanks and up to 300 aircraft), having broken through to the Crimea in October 1941, attempted to take Sevastopol' right off the bat.

But the enemy miscalculated. Soldiers, sailors and thousands of Sevastopolites defended their city with their very breasts. In a short time they had strengthened their defense, erected new permanent and temporary pillboxes, antitank emplacements and command posts. On 7 November 1941 came a telegram from the Supreme Commander demanding that "Sevastopol' must not be surrendered in any case."

The defenders of the Sevastopol' Defense Zone manifested truly unprecedented miracles of bravery, mass heroism and self-sacrifice that set an example for the warriors of the Red Army and the Soviet people. The whole world watched their valiant struggle with admiration. World opinion, the press and radio evaluated the defense of the bastion on the Black Sea as a heroic deed of the Soviet people, a solid moral victory of the Soviet Union.

During the defense of Sevastopol', the enemy undertook three large-scale offensives. The first one began on 11 November. For 10 days the enemy attempted to break through into the city, but without success. Suffering huge losses in personnel and equipment, the enemy was obliged to halt the offensive and mount a siege of the city. But the respite did not last long.

In December 1941 Soviet troops crushed the fascist hordes near Moscow. It was the first major defeat of Nazi Germany in the course of World War II.

Under these conditions, Hitler's command decided to undertake a new offensive on Sevastopol'. As a result of 2 weeks of ferocious battles (from 17 to 31 December) the enemy succeeded to some extent in pressing our units along lines of the main thrust, but he was not successful either in getting into the city or breaking through our front, and so he was compelled to settle for a siege.

The Red Army's successfully launched and elaborated Kerchensk-Feodosiya landing operation forced the enemy to hastily transfer some of his forces from Sevastopol' to the Kerch' area and thus give up on active offensive actions in the Sevastopol' area until June 1942.

Taking advantage of the situation, our troops defending Sevastopol' accomplished a number of particular operations aimed at expanding our advantageous defensive lines and pinning down fascist troops in order to prevent transferring more of them to Kerch' Peninsula.

In late May, when Soviet troops left the Kerch' Peninsula, the Sevastopol' situation sharply deteriorated. By early June the enemy had concentrated there more than 200,000 men, 450 tanks, more than 2,000 guns and mortars and about 600 aircraft. For 5 days the enemy conducted huge artillery and aviation preparations. Our troops' battle formations, and the city, underwent more than 9,000 air attacks, were bombarded by up to 45,000 large-caliber bombs and were hit with 126,000 heavy shells. Every meter of our defense lines was hit by an average of about 1.5 tons of metal.

The enemy was able to constantly replenish his depleted divisions. Sevastopol's heavy losses could not be replenished because the city was blockaded by the enemy by sea and by land. On the evening of 30 June, when the ammunition, food and drinking water ran out, the troops of the Sevastopol' Defense Area were commanded to begin leaving Sevastopol' for the bays of Streletskaya, Kamyshovaya, Kazach'ya and Cape Kherstones, where they continued the heroic struggle until 4 July.

The defense of Sevastopol' has gone down in history as an example of a prolonged and staunch defense of a maritime city and naval base surrounded by the enemy on land. It was distinguished by the precise interaction of the army, air force and navy thanks to the creation of a unified command and the expert organization of administration. A vital role in the defense of the hero city was played by its workers, who under the leadership of the city's party organization took part in building defensive structures, manufacturing weapons and ammunition for the front, helping the wounded and picking up rifles themselves to fight the enemy. It took the Hitlerites 250 days to advance the 16 km from the Bel'bekskaya Valley to Sevastopol'. They lost approximately 300,000 soldiers and officers and enormous quantities of military equipment.

The materials published here tell of the heroic defense of Sevastopol'. The documents are kept in the Central Archives of the USSR Ministry of Defense and in the Central Naval Archives. They have been prepared for publication by Col O. G. Gurov, First Captain G. A. Ammon and senior scientific staff member S. P. Abramova. They are published here for the first time, with the exception of Nos 4, 6, 8 and 15.

Document No 1

From a Directive of the Headquarters
of the Supreme Command Concerning the Defense of Sevastopol'
and the Kerch' Peninsula

To Comrades Levchenko, Oktyabr'skiy, Batov

7 November 1941

In order to pin down the enemy's forces in the Crimea and prevent him from reaching the Caucasus via the Taman' Peninsula, the Headquarters of the Supreme Command hereby orders:

The main mission of the Black Sea Fleet is to undertake the active defense of Sevastopol' and the Kerch' Peninsula by all forces.

Not to surrender Sevastopol' in any circumstance and to defend it with all forces.

Retain all three old cruisers and old torpedo boats in Sevastopol'. Form from these vessels a maneuvering detachment for action in Feodosiya Bay for the support of troops occupying Ak-Monayskiy positions....

Organize and ensure the transfer to Sevastopol' and Kerch' of troops departing for Yalta, Alushta and Sudak.

Keep fighter planes, attack planes and some MBR-2 scout planes in Sevastopol' and Kerch'; utilize remaining aircraft from the airports of the North Caucasus Military District for nighttime sorties against enemy airports and troop bases in the Crimea.

Evacuate from Sevastopol' and Kerch' to the Caucasus all materiel not essential for the defense.

Assign command in Sevastopol' to Black Sea Fleet Commander Comrade Oktyabr'skiy with subordination to you¹....

Stalin
Shaposhnikov
Kuznetsov

Copy
Central Archives of the
Ministry of Defense USSR,
Collection 407, Catalogue
9852, Document 1, Sheets
228, 220

Document No 2

From the Political Message
of the Chief of the Political Department of the Primorskaya Army
Concerning Party-Political Work Among the Troops

To the Chief of the Main Political Administration of the Red Army

13 November 1941

...The political departments of the army and the units are focusing their main attention on the following: the creation of full-fledged primary and low-level party and Komsomol organizations; organization of party-political work in the units; tallying of the figures of withdrawal to the defensive lines of the city of Sevastopol'; informing of all personnel of the tasks assigned by the commander of the Sevastopol' Defense Area. The political departments have sent all political officers into the units to accomplish these tasks.

Conferences of political officers and responsible secretaries of party and Komsomol bureaus were held in all units to spell out the tasks involved in strengthening the lowest level party and Komsomol organizations and improve the work of readers and discussion leaders as well as work with the battle aktiv. After the conferences, most of the subunits held party and Komsomol meetings. They discussed the next tasks in store and elected official party organs. The latter assigned party members and Komsomol members to the various subunits to conduct explanatory work concerning battle orders with respect to the defense of Sevastopol'.

Much attention was focused on digging in along occupied lines. A check on progress in entrenchment work showed that the political organs as well as party and Komsomol organizations are approaching this effort in all seriousness, with the result that in many units their work is nearing completion....

Faith in the final victory over fascism and the desire to do everything it takes to crush the enemy hordes at the approaches to Sevastopol' are inspiring our fighting men and officers to exceptional heroism and valor.

On the night of 5 November the enemy cut off the road along which units of the 95th Rifle Division were moving. To crush the enemy group a detachment of 50 men was created under the command of Lieutenant Bunim, which broke through to the enemy's rear and forced him to flee by a surprise strike. Forty dead fascists and a large quantity of war materiel were left behind on the field of battle.

In an encounter with the enemy in the area of the village of Gavro, the 97th Separate Artillery Division was the first to engage in battle. Division Commander Comrade Barkovskiy rapidly organized highly accurate and destructive fire power, with the result that the enemy fled in panic, abandoning three antitank guns which were immediately put to use against the fascists.

Near the population center of Ulu-Sala, the enemy delayed the advance of the 397th Artillery Regiment. Red Army soldiers Comrades Tsukanov, Petrov and Trubnikov were called upon to destroy this obstacle. Arming themselves with hand grenades and Degtyarev machine pistols, the three heroes sneaked up to the enemy's guns and hurled their hand grenades. Startled, the fascists were put to flight; our soldiers took advantage of this and opened fire against the fascists with their own weapons. Thanks to their heroism, the regiment was able to pass through without delay.

These examples testify to the high political and moral state of units of the Sevastopol' Defense Area and the readiness of the men to give their lives in carrying out the tasks assigned to them by the party and the government with respect to the defense of Sevastopol'....

Regimental Commissar Bocharov,
Chief of the Political Department,
Primorskaya Army

Original
Central Archives of the
Ministry of Defense, USSR,
Collection 32, Catalogue
11289, Document 308, Sheets
10-14

Document No 3

From the Summary of Battle Operations
and Party-Political Work
in Units of the Primorskaya Army During December 1941

To the Head of the Main Political Administration of the Red Army

21 January 1942

Implementation of the Military Order

From 1 through 16 December the enemy was not especially active but moved up his forces, conducted reconnaissance and in some places mounted an attack, which was successfully rebuffed.

Elements of the Primorskaya Army took advantage of the lull at the front to regroup its forces, improve the line of defense, train the personnel for battle against enemy tanks and submachine guns, and build heated dugouts.

On 17 December the enemy, having moved up substantial reserves and with the support of a large number of tanks and aircraft, mounted an offensive with the aim of taking Sevastopol' by 21 December. The enemy attempted to strike his main blow against the 2nd, 3rd, and especially 4th defense sectors. As a result of 15 days of fierce battle, including frequent hand-to-hand combat,

and at the cost of enormous losses, the enemy managed to drive back our forces somewhat and to take a number of heights and several small population centers and the Mekenziyevy Gory railway stop. By means of subsequent counterattacks our forces retook Mekenziyevy Gory, the villages of Kamyshly and Bel'bek, and several high points, firmly digging in on these lines.

In the 15 days of combat near the approaches to Sevastopol' most of our units and elements manifested excellent organization and decisive action in rebuffing the fierce attacks of the enemy, who enjoyed an advantages in tanks and aircraft. This is confirmed by the fact that despite superior forces, the enemy advanced only slightly.

Rebuffing the attacks, our units wore down the enemy and, going on the counter-offensive, inflicted heavy losses on him. Let me cite several examples.

On 17 December 1941 approximately one battalion of the enemy, supported by eight tanks and one armored vehicle, mounted an offensive against one of the defense sectors of the 90th Rifle Regiment under the command of Comrade Major Belyuga and Battalion Military Commissar Comrade Sinchenko. Comrade Belyuga organized an excellent rebuff of the attack, in the course of which five tanks, one armored vehicle, one heavy weapon and its tow truck, two trucks and many soldiers and officers were destroyed.

In 3 days of combat, the Seventh Marine Brigade under the command of Regimental Military Commissar Comrade Yekhlakov destroyed up to 500 officers and men, captured 2 soldiers and 1 officer and seized 8 light and 1 heavy machine gun, 4 automatic rifles and other military materiel.

The Political-Moral State of Army Units

The month spent in the defense of Sevastopol' against an enemy considerably superior in equipment demonstrated the high political-moral state of units of the Primorskaya Army, the boundless dedication of its men to the communist party and the socialist motherland and the readiness of the men and commanders to fully carry out the party's and government's orders concerning the defense of the approaches to the city, even at the cost of their blood or their lives....

In their fierce battles with the arrogant enemy, our fighting men, commanders and political officers showed themselves to be worthy sons of the socialist motherland, fighting fearlessly on the approaches to Sevastopol' and inflicting heavy losses on the enemy.

Comrade Zhuma, commander of a machine gun platoon of the 31st Rifle Regiment, three times led his men in an attack against superior enemy forces, inflicting huge losses. During the battle, the chief heavy machine gunner was gravely wounded. Comrade Zhuma immediately took his place at the machine gun and with deadly accurate fire destroyed 60 soldiers and officers.

A battery of the Third Division's Second Antiaircraft Regiment under the command of party member Comrade Shapovalov in a very short period destroyed a

company of enemy infantry, a machine gun nest, a radio station, two trucks carrying fascist soldiers and several ammunition carts, and routed two infantry platoons. For achieving successful results in rifle firing, the regimental command expressed gratitude to the battery's personnel.

On 19 December alone, the 926th Battery of the 61st Artillery Regiment, under the command of Lt Comrade Belyy, destroyed about 600 men and officers of the fascist army....

During December the units received 640,000 copies of ZA RODINU, 280,000 copies of KRASNYY CHERNOMORETS, 50,000 copies of KRASNYY KRYM, 22,000 copies of the central newspapers and 120,000 copies of various booklets. Some 1.5 million leaflets in German and Romanian were dropped by air.

Regimental libraries received 7,000 books of fiction, textbooks and social-economic publications to build up their holdings.

In conclusion: In the struggle against the fascist invaders and the approaches to Sevastopol', our men are demonstrating genuine solidarity around the communist party. Despite their fatigue due to 15 days of fierce battle to rebuff the enemy's offensive, our personnel are ready to fight with even greater steadfastness until all of Hitler's occupying forces are destroyed....

The commanders and political officers are inspiring the officers and men in a bolshevik manner, by personal example, to crush the enemy completely, utilizing the high prestige they enjoy among the personnel.

In its practical work, the army's political department has focused its main attention on carrying out the directives of the Main Political Administration of the Workers and Peasants Red Army in order to improve the whole system of party-political work.

For January, the army's political department has set itself the task of more profoundly studying and generalizing the experience of party-political work under battle conditions and using the best examples to teach political officers effective practices in carrying out political-upbringing work among the personnel.

Regimental Commissar Bocharov,
Chief of the Political Department of the Primorskaya Army

Original
Central Archive of the Ministry of Defense, USSR, Collection 32, Catalogue 11289, Document 309, Sheets 232-277

Document No 4

Awarding of Orders and Medals of the USSR
to a Group of Workers of Sevastopol'

By order of the commander of the Black Sea Fleet, eight workers of the city of Sevastopol' are awarded orders and medals of the USSR for exemplary carrying out of the command's assignments with regard to strengthening the city's defense and protection against the fascist invaders and for manifesting valor and bravery.

Among them is Anastasiya Kirillovna Chaus, a modest working woman in one of Sevastopol's plants. She was one of the first to master the production of a new type of item needed for defense. During an attack by the fascist carrion crows on the peaceful Soviet population, Comrade Chaus was wounded. She refused to be evacuated to the rear and, having lost an arm, went back to work in the shop after being operated on. Comrade Chaus is awarded the Order of the Red Star.

Engineer Georgiy Vladimirovich Prudnikov has worked on the railroad for 2 decades. During the Great Patriotic War he has risked his life many times to save valuable freight from air bombardment. Recently the fascist vultures attacked the station. At any minute the bombs could have fallen on cars carrying freight for the front....Georgiy Vladimirovich made a bold decision. He coupled a steam engine to the train and quickly pulled it out of the station. Concealed in a wooded depression, the train was not detected. On one of his runs, Comrade Prudnikov was wounded in the chest and legs by bomb fragments. Stifling his pain, he himself bound his wounds and did not leave the cab until he had brought the train to the station safe and sound. He has been awarded the medal "For Valor."

Yefrosin'ya Ivanovna Gulenkova took the place of her husband who had gone to the front. Day and night she studied her new profession. And in 2 months she had become an excellent duty electrician at the substation. In a short while she began to do the work of three electricians. Even under heavy fire, Comrade Gulenkova does not leave her work post. Comrade Gulenkova has been awarded the medal "For Valor."

Rayon soviet deputy Lidiya Alekseyevna Rakova, a housewife who has been awarded the medal "For Combat Services," has organized 30 women's seamstress brigades. In a very short time they have sewn about 2,000 warm garments for the men at the front and laundered 15,000 pairs of underclothes.

Thus, the workers of Sevastopol', along with the fighting men of the Red Army and the Red Fleet, are valiantly defending their native city and helping the front.

ZA RODINU,²
1 February 1942

Document No 5

From the Battle Message
of the Commander of the North Caucasus Sector
Concerning Help for Sevastopol'

Headquarters of the Supreme Command
to Comrade Stalin

9 June 1942, 1530 Hours

1. The Sevastopol' Defense Area is staunchly rebuffing the assault of substantial enemy forces with enemy aircraft dominating the air.
2. All reserves of sector commanders have been brought into combat in the third and fourth sectors. Three naval regiments have been brought in from the army reserve.
3. The 345th Rifle Division has been transferred to this area, taking the place of the incapacitated 172nd Rifle Division by the morning of 9 June.
4. The army reserve has one rifle regiment and 47 tanks.
5. To build up a reserve of the Primorskaya Army and render practical aid to the troops of the Sevastopol Defense Area, the 138th Rifle Brigade from the Krymskaya Station is being rapidly transferred overnight from 9 to 10 June.
6. In addition, to render aid to Sevastopol' the following are being assigned daily from the front:
 - a) reinforcements of up to 1,000 men (unarmed);
 - b) artillery shells and food within the limits of requisition of the Sevastopol' Defense Area.

The following were shipped on 8 June: 110 tons of bombs, 13 aircraft engines and 4.5 tons of aircraft gasoline. Ammunition: 51,110 50-mm mortar shells, 2,999 120-mm mortar shells, 19,890 DShK cartridges, 340 rounds of 31-gram 120-mm ammunition, 648 rounds of 1-gram 76-mm ammunition, 63,624 PTR cartridges, 2,142 10/30-gram 122-mm ammunition, 1,532 rounds of 76-mm ammunition, 1,516 85-mm antiaircraft shells, 296 130-mm shells, 399 rounds of B-24 100-mm ammunition, 20 tons of gun lubricants, 15 tons of smoke compound and 12 tons of KS liquid.

Foodstuffs: 30 tons of canned goods, 104 tons of rusk, 20 tons of salted beef, 8 tons of salt fish and other goods.³

S. Budenny, Isakov, Zakharov

Original
Central Archives of the Ministry of
Defense, USSR, Collection 16-A, Catalogue
1012, Document 11, Sheets 460, 461

Document No 6

Greetings from the Personnel
of the Red Banner Baltic Fleet
to the Defenders of Sevastopol'⁴

Sevastopol'
To Comrade Oktyabr'skiy

On behalf of the men, commanders and political officers of the Red Banner Baltic Fleet we send to you, heroic defenders of Sevastopol', this military greeting.

We are inspired by your valiant struggle against the fascist bandits and are confident that you will rebuff any new enemy attacks with the same success as in December of last year.

Mercilessly crush and destroy the fascist beasts, make the approaches to Sevastopol' the graveyard of Hitler's hordes and a junkyard of enemy materiel. Proudly preserve the military traditions of the naval fleet!

Tributs Smirnov

ZA RODINU, 10 June 1942

Document No 7

From the Political Message of the Chief of the Political Department
of the Primorskaya Army Concerning
Political Work Among the Troops

To the Chief of the Main Political Administration of the Red Army

10 June 1942

At 1000 hours on 9 June after heavy air and artillery preparation, the enemy again went on the offensive in the general sector of Kamyshly, cordon Mekenziya No 1, beacon west Inkermanskiy. The attack was provided with continuous air and heavy artillery support. Up to 1,000 air attacks were carried out on the day and more than 5,000 bombs were dropped.

Most of the units successfully rebuffed all enemy attacks. By the end of the day, the 287th Rifle Regiment of the 25th Rifle Division, the 79th Trainee Rifle Brigade and right-flank units of the 95th Rifle Division, fighting off continuous savage infantry and tank attacks, brought the battle up to the line: Polyana 2 km northwest of Mekenziya, 0.3 km north of the Mekenziya cordon No 1, Mekenziyevy Gory waystation, hill 104.5. Especially savage combat took place in the Mekenziyevy Gory area, where the enemy went on the attack four times sustaining considerable losses.

By 2400 hours on 9 June, the 79th Brigade and elements of 345th Rifle Division occupied the front (Excl.) Polyana 500 meters southeast of 192.0, the southern edge of Mekenziyevy Gory. On the remaining sectors the units are holding their previous positions.

In the battles on the approaches to Sevastopol' the enemy is sustaining exceptionally heavy losses. According to information from prisoners of the 28th German Light Infantry Division, in 3 days of combat every regiment lost over 1,000 men in wounded alone passing through regimental medical stations. During the same time the 18th Romanian Infantry Division lost up to 20 percent of its personnel. According to incomplete data, in 3 days the enemy lost a total of over 6,000 killed, up to 20 tanks, up to 100 trucks and up to 20 mortar and artillery batteries. During days of attack, the political organs and party and Komsomol organization are focusing special attention on mobilizing the men to fight off the enemy attacks. Personnel of the army and division political departments, political apparatuses and secretaries of party and Komsomol organizations are to be found directly in the front lines helping the commanders and party and Komsomol organizations to improve party-political work. Since they are always well posted on what is happening, they keep every fighting man and officer informed through group and individual discussions. Every day the division broadcasting stations provide information from army headquarters concerning the results of the preceding day. In addition, these reports are typed up and read aloud in the foxholes. The work being done to explain the accomplishments in the individual sectors of the front and visual demonstration of the strength of Soviet weapons have ensured a high level of political morale among the men. When the results of the preceding day's battles are tallied up, the officers and men express their readiness to fight with even greater ferocity and mercilessly destroy the Hitlerite occupying forces....

In fighting off the ferocious attacks of the enemy, our personnel are manifesting exceptional bravery, fearlessness and mass heroism. Let me cite several examples.

The men of the seventh company of the 381st Rifle Regiment, under the command of Senior Lt Comrade Vishnyakov V. D. and Political Instructor Comrade Barkalov, in the course of a day rebuffed three major enemy attacks and themselves went on the counterattack, successfully throwing the enemy back on his initial positions. Comrade Barkalov demonstrated exceptional bravery and selflessness in these battles. He himself advanced ahead of the subunit and thereby inspired the fighting men. During the third counterattack, Comrade Barkalov died a heroic death. Over the body of their political instructor, the company's men and officers took an oath that they would take revenge on Hitler's occupying forces.

The men of the first battalion of the 769th Rifle Regiment, under military commissar Senior Political Instructor Comrade Oganessian, fought valiantly and selflessly. On that day the battalion rebuffed three major enemy attacks, inflicting heavy losses. Under heavy enemy fire, deputy political instructor Comrade Chibisov, an acting platoon leader of a mortar company of the 769th Rifle Regiment, kept firing continuously on the attacking forces. When the

mortal shells ran out, he took up a light machine gun and continued his deadly fire. In this combat, Comrade Chibisov died a hero's death. Red Army soldier Comrade Zabolotin became surrounded, and his automatic rifle jammed. Keeping calm, he began to wield his rifle butt, killed an officer and two enlisted men, and escaped the trap. In hand-to-hand combat, Red Army soldier Kolesnikov V. M. killed one officer and three enlisted men, and Comrade Solomko killed two enlisted men. This kind of selflessness was encouraged by the commanders and political officers. Battalion military commissar Comrade Oganessian especially distinguished himself. Finding himself in the first company, where the enemy was hitting especially hard, he dragged a heavy machine gun out of a pillbox and opened fire on the open position, with the result that the enemy was routed. During the second attack he placed a light machine gun on the parapet and met the enemy with heavy fire, which helped to fight them off. Already at the command post, Comrade Oganessian discovered that during the third attack the enemy had broken through to the entrenchments of the second platoon. Hastening to the subunit, he led the men on a counterattack and forced the enemy out of the positions with great losses....

Brigade Commissar Bocharov, Chief of
Political Department of the Primorskaya
Army

Original
Central Archives of the Ministry of
Defense, USSR, Collection 32, Catalogue
11289, Document 313, Sheets 420-424

Document No 8

Greetings from the Supreme Command
to the Defenders of Sevastopol'

To Vice Admiral Comrade Oktyabr'skiy
Major General Comrade Petrov

12 June 1942

I heartily greet the valiant defenders of Sevastopol'--the men of the Red Army and the Red Fleet, commanders and commissars, who bravely defended every handful of Soviet earth and inflicted blows against the German invaders and their Romanian stooges.

The selfless struggle of the people of Sevastopol' will set an example of heroism for the whole Red Army and the Soviet people.

I am convinced that the glorious defenders of Sevastopol' will carry out their duty to the motherland with dignity and honor.

Stalin

"Boi za Krym. Sbornik statey i dokumentov"
[The Battle for the Crimea. Collection
of Articles and Documents], Simferopol',
1945, p 36.

Document No 9

From the Political Message of the Political Administration
of the Black Sea Fleet Concerning the Combat Operations
and the Political-Moral State of the Units

To the Chief of the Main Political Administration of the Navy

22 June 1942

By their personal bravery and selfless struggle, the commanders and commissars are strengthening the fighting men's faith in our victory, inspiring them to bold counterattacks, and teaching them to calmly and confidently destroy enemy tanks, to separate the infantry from the tanks and destroy them. The men of the Black Sea Fleet no longer fear enemy tanks and have learned to destroy them at close range.

Regimental commissar Comrade Georgidze, military commissar of the first battalion of the Second Marine Regiment, boldly led his men on attacks, himself repeatedly rained hand grenades on the enemy, and set examples of bravery and valor to the men; at present he is wounded and in the hospital. The fifth and sixth companies of the second battalion of the Second Marine Regiment successfully fought off seven enemy attacks; when the commander was wounded, Comrade Kulik, political instructor of the fifth company, led the company on the attack several times.

Battalion commissar Comrade Kiselev, military commissar of the second battalion of the Second Marine Regiment, went on the attack two times with two companies, managed to lead two companies out of an encircled position, and on another occasion organized the removal of 45 wounded fighting men from the battlefield.

Senior Political Instructor Comrade Yershov, military commissar of the second battalion of the 79th Marine Rifle Brigade, on four occasions personally led his men on counterattack, destroying 17 automatic riflemen and 2 officers in 1 day. Although wounded himself, he would not leave the battlefield, and only after he had been wounded a fourth time in the leg was he sent to the hospital.

Battalion commissar Comrade Sereda, military commissar of Floating Battery No 3, conducted himself bravely in fighting off attacks by the fascist carrion crows and skillfully organized party and political work. He was always among the men, organizing daily reception of summary reports from the Soviet Information Bureau and explaining them to the fighting men, instructing agitators at the combat posts, explaining the situation at the front and organizing the regular publication of combat leaflets. During lulls between battles, buro meetings of party and Komsomol organization were held near the weaponry. The best fighting men and officers declared their wish to be accepted into the party. The battery's personnel set examples of heroism and bravery in the struggle against the fascist carrion crows. During a bomb attack on the floating battery, the battery's commander, Lieutenant Captain Comrade Moshenskiy, was killed, and commissar Comrade Sereda was gravely wounded....

Considerable work is being done among the units to inspire the personnel with the heroic deeds of the men of the Black Sea Fleet....

The political department of the antiaircraft defense of the Sevastopol' Defense Area summarized the combat deeds of the personnel of the 365th Battery⁵, the commander of which was awarded the title Hero of the Soviet Union, and also the experience of party-political work, making it available to the military commissars of all the batteries. The reports of the commissars and agitators concerning the military deeds of the antiaircraft gunners of the 365th battery are truly inspirational, and the men of the other antiaircraft batteries will strive to match the efforts of their combat comrades.

Information in the summary reports of the political administration of the Black Sea Fleet concerning the combat heroism of the fighting men and commanders of the units are being used widely by political officers and agitators in discussions with the personnel in all the naval units of the Sevastopol' Defense Area....

Brigade Commissar Maslov, Deputy Chief
of the Political Administration of the
Black Sea Fleet

Copy

Central Naval Archives, Collection 109,
Document 24040, Sheets 87, 93, 94

Document No 10

From a Political Message of the Political Administration
of the Black Sea Fleet Concerning the Handling of Shipping
to Sevastopol' by the Submarines of the First Submarine Brigade

To the Chief of the Main Political Administration of the Navy

24 June 1942

In connection with stepped-up enemy activity in the Black Sea Theater and the resulting increased difficulty of navigation of surface vessels, the Military Council of the Black Sea Fleet decided to supply Sevastopol' by means of submarines of the types L, D, S and Shch serving as transport vessels.

The first runs carrying cargo to Sevastopol' were carried out on 7 May by submarines L-4 and D-4. Since 15 May shipments have been carried by submarines L-5 and L-23. Starting on 20 May, cargo has been shipped by submarines S-31 and S-32. In connection with the mounting of an enemy offensive on the Sevastopol' sector of the front, the number of transport vessels was doubled—shipments are now carried by submarines L-24, Shch-205, Shch-209, Shch-212 and Shch-214.

From the time the shipments began through 22 June, submarines of the First Submarine Brigade delivered more than 2,500 tons of ammunition and foodstuffs to Sevastopol'. Starting in June, without any special preparation, the submarines began to carry aircraft and vehicle gasoline in external tanks.

The commanders of the submarines have encountered considerable difficulties in carrying out this new kind of combat activity. It is necessary to take on and offload large-sized cargo, mortars and shells in large boxes, rocket shells and so on. Special difficulties are involved in the shipping of gasoline, because the submarines' tanks are not suited for it. On submarines L-23, L-24 and others the gasoline leaked into the boat, building up a strong concentration of vapor which poisoned the men. By bringing the submarines to the surface for ventilation, clearing the ventilation valves, lubricating them with soap and so on, the commanders managed to avoid disaster....

On the return trip from Sevastopol', the submarines carry wounded and evacuated personnel, taking up to 50 men on board. The number of passengers that can be carried on the bigger submarines will be increased to 100. The passengers are thoroughly checked and assigned to compartments. During the trip all weapons, matches and so on are confiscated. There have been some difficulties in feeding the evacuees, especially women and children, who because they lack provisions have to be fed from the submarines' own stores during the run.

On the way to Sevastopol' and back, and especially on approaching Sevastopol', the submarines have been repeatedly subjected to enemy bombardment and torpedo boat attacks, but only submarine L-4 has suffered slight damage as a result of enemy aircraft operations. Excellent observation and high vigilance on the part of commanders and signalmen have made it possible to detect and recognize enemy aircraft in good time and submerge quickly.

Because the enemy has advanced to the northern side of Sevastopol' and it has become impossible for vessels to enter the Northern and Southern bays, the submarines are being unloaded in the Kamyshovaya and Streletskaya bays. The vessels are unloaded at night in the course of not more than 3 to 4 hours. The short time the vessels remain in the bay creates exceptional difficulties in the unloading of such submarines as L-23 and L-24, carrying up to 100 tons of cargo. But the officers and men of the submarines are overcoming all difficulties and carrying out their missions successfully.

Despite the fact that as a result of intensive efforts on the crossings, after sleepless nights and heavy labor engaged in unloading operations in cramped compartments that are stuffed full, the men are so tired that they fall asleep on their feet on the return trip from Sevastopol' after loading the sub, the fighting men and officers continue to work with enormous enthusiasm, manifesting high vigilance and constant striving to supply food to the besieged city in an excellent manner and in the shortest possible time.

During these combat shipments, especially outstanding work has been done by L-5 commander Lieutenant Captain Zhdanov and military commissar Senior Political Instructor Yeremenko, S-32 commander Captain Third Class Pavlenko and military

commissar Senior Political Instructor Ryzhikov, L-4 commander Captain Third Class Polyakov and battalion commissar Atran, L-23 commander Captain Third Class Fartushnyy and battalion commissar Seleznev, and S-31 commander Lieutenant Captain Belorukov and military commissar Senior Political Instructor Zamyatin. They have been faster than anyone in delivering valuable cargo to Sevastopol', able to take reasoned risks, constantly striving for the goal and organizing the loading and unloading of military cargo in an excellent manner....

Division Commissar Rasskin, Chief of
the Political Administration of the
Black Sea Fleet

Copy
Central Naval Archives, Collection 109,
Document 24041, Sheets 41-45

Document No 11

From a Political Message of the Political Administration
of the Black Sea Fleet Concerning
Destruction of the Sevastopol' Panorama Building
by Fascist Aircraft⁶

To the Chief of the Main Political Administration of the Navy

27 June 1942

...Report: On 25 June at 1800 hours fascist bombardiers dropped high-explosive bombs on the Sevastopol' panorama building.

As a result of direct hits by bombs and artillery shells, the panorama building was destroyed and caught fire. As a result of the fire, the painting "The Defense of Sevastopol' 1854-1855," by the well-known artist Rubo, caught fire. Thanks to the selfless efforts and heroism of students enrolled in middle-rank Black Sea Fleet officer training, a large part of the painting was saved. It was sent to Tbilisi for safekeeping.

A document has been drawn up concerning this barbaric treatment of a historic treasure, here attached.⁷

Brigade Commissar Maslov, Deputy Chief
of the Political Administration of the
Black Sea Fleet

Copy
Central Naval Archives, Collection 109,
Document 24040, Sheet 170

Document No 12

Directive of the Commander
of the North Caucasus Sector Concerning
Evacuation of Personnel and Materiel
from Sevastopol'

To the Deputy Commander of the Black Sea Fleet

30 June 1942

I HEREBY ORDER:

1. All operative destroyers, submarines, escort vessels and coastal mine-sweepers to be sent systematically to Sevastopol' to evacuate the wounded, fighting men, materiel and documents.
2. Prior to arrival in Novorossiysk, Oktyabr'skiy, responsibility for organizing the evacuation is assigned to you.
3. Accompanying trips are to be used only for delivering ammunition necessary for the defenders to cover the evacuation. Shipping of replacements is to be stopped.

Organize the reception and placement of evacuees in Novorossiysk and Tuapse.

4. Throughout the evacuation, the Black Sea Fleet is to maximize its strikes against the enemy's airports and Yalta, from which the blockade forces are operating.

S. Budenny, Isakov, Zakharov

Copy
Central Archives of the Ministry of
Defense, USSR, Collection 48-A, Catalogue
5, Document 777, Sheet 405

Document No 13

From the Report Notes of the Chief of the Political Department
of the Primorskaya Army Concerning the Heroism
of the Commissars in the Battles for Sevastopol'

To the Chief of the Main Political Administration of the Red Army
Comrade A. S. Shcherbakov

Not later than June 1942

The military commissars are the vehicles of the party's will, spirit, firmness and valor, and on the field of battle with the bestial fascist bandits they

have worked miracles of valor and heroism. Together with the commanders, the bolshevik commissars are confidently leading our brave Soviet warriors to high deeds for the glory of our motherland.

By their personal fearlessness and heroism in the battles for our dear Sevastopol', the military commissars are setting examples of valor and scorning death for the sake of their sacred love for the motherland, for the sake of the complete destruction of Hitler's occupying forces, for the sake of the freedom of our nation.

A simple and ordinary man was military commissar Comrade Ivashchenko,⁸ who died a hero's death. Bolshevik Ivashchenko's image is unforgettable. He combined in himself all the traits characteristic of a commissar. He embodied the will and strength of the party. Comrade Ivashchenko earned the universal love of the fighting men and officers, and for good reason. Always, even at crucial times, commissar Ivashchenko was able to resolve complex problems in a cool, confident and quick manner.

The commissar's steadfastness, his confidence in our victory over the enemy, was transmitted to the men. Acting bravely and boldly, Ivashchenko inspired his subordinates with courage in the struggle with the enemy.

"With a man like that, no enemy is fearsome," say the men about their commissar.

The men and officers loved their commissar not only because he was a bold and decisive man. They loved him for his boundless dedication to the party and the nation, because he had so thoroughly mastered his job that he could teach the men to read the enemy's tactics; he was always closely linked to the men and taught them to trust in their weapons and in victory.

Comrade Ivashchenko's combat life was a real school of bravery and valor....

Brigade Commissar Bocharov, Chief of
the Political Department of the Primorskaya
Army

Copy
Central Archives of the Ministry of
Defense, USSR, Collection 288, Catalogue
9905, Document 19, Sheets 28-29

Document No 14

From a Telegram
of the Commander of the Sevastopol' Defense Area
Concerning the Evacuation of Sevastopol'

Moscow, General Headquarters of the Red Army--Comrade Vatutin

Copy: Krasnodar--Comrades Budenny, Isakov

4 July 1942

The removal and evacuation of individual groups of command personnel and fighting men of the Sevastopol' defense area are continuing, although this involves considerable difficulties and losses of ships' personnel. The submarines cannot get through to Sevastopol'. All navigable channels are closed off by enemy craft. No information as to the whereabouts of three submarines has been received, although they should have returned some time ago.

The returning submarines have been pursued all the way by aircraft and pursuit boats, and hundreds of bombs have been dropped on each one. Two small pursuit craft have not returned yet. Today we are dispatching six more small pursuit craft that did return, each having delivered more than 100 men. I will continue the operation....

Oktyabr'skiy

Copy
Central Archives of the Ministry of
Defense, USSR, Collection 48-A, Catalogue
5, Document 771, Sheet 512.

Document No 15

"The 250 Days of the Heroic Defense of Sevastopol'"

From a Report of the Soviet Information Bureau

The military and political significance of the defense of Sevastopol' in the Patriotic War of the Soviet nation is enormous. Pinning down a large number of Hitler's troops, the city's defenders confused and disrupted the plans of the German command. The iron steadfastness of the people of Sevastopol' was one of the main factors disrupting the enemy's proclaimed "spring offensive." The Hitlerites lost time and momentum and sustained enormous losses of personnel. Soviet troops have departed Sevastopol', but the defense of Sevastopol' will go down in the history of the Patriotic War of the Soviet Union as one of the brightest pages. The people of Sevastopol' have enriched the glorious combat traditions of the people of the USSR. The selfless bravery, fierceness in battle with the enemy and dedication of the defenders of Sevastopol' are inspiring Soviet patriots to further heroic deeds in the struggle against the hated occupying forces.

PRAVDA, 4 July 1942

FOOTNOTES

1. In its directive of 19 November 1941, the Headquarters of the Supreme Command subordinated the commander of the Sevastopol' Defense Area Vice Admiral F. S. Oktyabr'skiy directly to the Headquarters and designated Major General I. Ye. Petrov, commander of the Primorskaya Army, as deputy commander of the Sevastopol' Defense Area in charge of land troops.
2. The newspaper of the political department of the Primorskaya Army.
3. Throughout June the combat vessels and transports of the Black Sea Fleet carried out a total of 121 runs to Sevastopol'. They delivered 23,500 men and officers, 11,300 tons of ammunition and foodstuffs, about 600 tons of gasoline, 100 guns and mortars, 6,500 rifles, automatic rifles and machine guns, and evacuated 25,157 wounded and civilians.
4. Similar greetings were received from the personnel of the Pacific Ocean and Northern fleets and from the Amur Red Banner Naval Flotilla.
5. The 365th Battery was part of the 110th Antiaircraft Artillery Regiment of the antiaircraft defense of the main base of the Black Sea Fleet.
6. The dismantled canvas of the Sevastopol' panorama ("The Defense of Sevastopol'") was evacuated on the last of the surface vessels that broke through to Sevastopol', the leader Tashkent.
7. Not published.
8. Yakov Danilovich Ivashchenko, senior political instructor, military commissar of the 265th (subsequently the 18th Guards) Corps Artillery Regiment.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/16

FROM THE HOME FRONT TO THE FIGHTING FRONT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 82 pp 83-94

[Article by G. Kumanev, doctor of historical sciences, and A. Samsonov, academician]

[Text] In the course of the Great Patriotic War, the Soviet nation and its armed forces under the leadership of the Communist Party inflicted a crushing defeat on Hitler's Germany and its allies, defended the honor and independence of the socialist fatherland, served as the main force blocking German fascism's path to world domination and played a decisive role in ensuring victory over the darkest forces of reaction and obscurantism.

Along with the fighting men of the armed forces, victory over the enemy was forged by the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry and the Soviet intelligentsia. "The national character of the war," remarked Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CC CPSU general secretary, "was manifested with special force in the inseparable, monolithic unity of the front and the home front, which ensured our victory. The evacuation of thousands of plants and factories to the East in a very short time was a labor triumph of enormous significance in preserving the country's defense might. Disregarding all deprivations, the toilers on the home front did everything they could to provide the armed forces with excellent weaponry, to provide the soldiers with clothing, footwear and food, and ensure the uninterrupted operation of the entire national economy. During the war the people worked in such a fashion that it appeared there was no limit to man's capabilities. And special mention in this regard should be made of our wonderful women, who took upon themselves the lion's share of the work of the men who had gone to the front. The motherland will never forget the contribution made by the dedicated toilers on the home front in achieving final victory."

Reference to the history of the first, most difficult months of the war, the heroic deeds of the Soviet people on the country's home front in June 1941 to July 1942, sheds brilliant light on this magnificent heroism of our party and people.

The road to the historic victory required prolonged struggle and maximum effort. During the first months of the war, in the course of fierce defensive battles,

the Red Army was obliged to withdraw deep into the interior. By the autumn of 1941 the German fascist troops had broken through to Moscow, blockaded Leningrad, captured the Baltic region, Belorussia, almost all the Ukraine and other vast territories of our country.

The very first days of the war saw the mobilization of all material, financial and labor resources to meet the needs of the active army. The industrial enterprises converted to the production of war goods. A colossal wave of evacuation was launched at the same time. Everything was subordinated to the needs of the fighting front, the need to crush the enemy.

In its just struggle against Hitler's hordes, our people relied on the great advantages of the Soviet system, the planned socialist economy, our vast, all-encompassing achievements.

Under the leadership of the communist party, the Soviet people had accomplished Lenin's plan of building socialism in a historically very short time, transforming the country into an advanced, industrially developed power, capable of meeting defense needs as well. Implementing the decisions of the 18th party congress and the 18th All-Union Party Conference, the party and the Soviet government consistently and systematically prepared the country to rebuff a possible attack by the imperialists.

The material-technical base of the defense industry was being strengthened in the prewar years. Aircraft and tank plants as well as major facilities for the production of artillery and rifle weaponry were built and outfitted with advanced equipment, and older war plants were remodeled.

Substantial successes were achieved by the kolkhoz peasantry and the workers of the sovkhoses and machine-tractor stations. The extensively mechanized socialist agriculture was in a position to supply the population, the armed forces and industry with its goods in case of war.

The implementation of Lenin's plan to build socialism strengthened the alliance of the working class and the peasantry. Social-political and ideological unity, patriotism and the friendship of the peoples of the USSR served as powerful motive forces of Soviet society, capable of rebuffing any hostile attack from without.

On the whole, the economy and the prewar national economic plans of the Soviet state were pronouncedly peaceful in character. However, the ever encroaching threat of war by the states of the fascist bloc and the Second World War launched by the imperialists in September 1939 dictated the necessity of undertaking additional measures to strengthen the USSR's defense capability. Defense spending in 1940 was six times greater than the average annual level in 1933-1937. The party carried out a number of vital measures to restructure the work of industry and transport, including conversion of some civilian enterprises to the production of war goods. Major industrial enterprises drew up military mobilization plans in case of an enemy attack. It was planned, for example, that if a war broke out the USSR's tractor plants--the largest in Europe--along with motor vehicle, shipbuilding and steam locomotive

enterprises would be converted in the shortest possible time to the production of tanks, and the entire machine building industry would be converted to the production of weaponry, ammunition and so forth. Many civilian enterprises set up special shops to fill military orders.

In 1938-1940, all industrial output increased by 13.2 percent while military input increased by 39 percent. The country's second industrial-economic base was built up at an accelerated pace along the Volga, in the Urals and in Siberia. Large efforts were undertaken for the construction and deployment of duplicate plants there. In June 1941 the proportion of military industrial enterprises added up to 18.5 percent of the defense industry in eastern areas. For certain types of military production this figure was as high as 25 percent.

By June 1941 an essentially new tank industry had been built up, the aircraft industry had been radically restructured and a stronger base had been created for improving the production of artillery, rifle weaponry and ammunition.

The production of various kinds of military equipment increased substantially. Between January 1939 and 22 June 1941, industry gave the Red Army 17,745 military aircraft, more than 7,000 tanks, about 30,000 field guns, and almost 52,400 mortars. Dozens of new, modern vessels were supplied to the Navy.

However, the rearming of the Red Army was not fully complete. In regard to a number of vital kinds of weapons and military equipment, Soviet troops were inferior to Hitler's Wehrmacht. Series production of new types of tanks and aircraft was just getting under way. And these shortcomings had to be overcome right in the course of mortal combat with the aggressor.

In 1940 and 1941, the communist party and the Soviet government passed important decrees designed to build up state reserves and mobilize resources. During this 18 months of peace they were doubled (see "Istoriya Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny 1939-1945" [History of the Second World War, 1939-1945], Vol 3, Moscow, 1974, p 388).

On the whole, at the time of the fascist aggression the Soviet Union possessed the necessary potential to meet the needs of the Red Army to wage armed struggle.

The war disrupted the peaceful labor of the Soviet people, made it necessary to deal with problems of developing a war economy, and ensured resolution of these problems in an extremely short time.

"...Once it comes down to war," Lenin taught, "everything must be subordinated to the interests of the war..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 41, p 117). Among the priority measures designed to crush the enemy the party spelled out the demand to mobilize all forces and resources of the national economy and to redistribute its material, financial and labor resources in the interests of providing the front with all necessities.

The party and the government were fully aware that from the very first hour of the Great Patriotic War the Soviet Union would have to engage in single

combat with the most powerful military machine in the capitalist world. By the time of its attack on the USSR, Hitler's Germany not only had a fully mobilized army with considerable experience in waging modern war but also a thoroughly militarized economy. It also had access to the material and human resources of the European countries it occupied. In June 1941 almost 6,500 enterprises in these countries were working for the Wehrmacht. Some 3.1 million foreign workers were employed in German industry. The Nazis also made extensive use of the economic resources of their European satellites. Facilities for the production of metal, generation of electricity and extraction of coal available to Germany were approximately 2 to 2.5 times greater than for us.

Guided by Lenin's doctrine that "waging war requires a genuinely strong, organized home front" (op. cit., Vol 35, p 408), the communist party and the Soviet government focused special attention on ensuring the material-technical conditions for victory over the enemy. By 23 June 1941, the Politburo of the CC VKP(b) decided to put into effect the mobilization plan for the production of ammunition that had been passed on 6 June 1941. This kind of attention to that sector of military production was not by chance. The mobilization plan, which established the program of ammunition production, was to a certain extent also a plan to restructure industry, in particular the metalworking and machine building enterprises. During the very first days of the war, the mobilization plan for ammunition "was converted into an operational target for expansion of the production of the most vital and massive sector of the war industry" (N. A. Voznesenskiy, "Izbr. Proizv. 1931-1947" [Selected Works, 1931-1947], Moscow, 1979, p 529).

Between 24 and 27 June, the Politburo of the CC VKP(b) passed important decisions concerning wartime development of the tank and aircraft industry and the evacuation of population, industrial enterprises and state institutions from areas near the front, also worktime schedules and a number of other matters.

On the 8th day of the war, the CC VKP(b) and the USSR Council of People's Commissars approved a mobilized national economic plan for the third quarter of 1941, calling for a 26-percent increase in the production of military equipment. This first wartime plan replaced the national economic development plan for the third quarter of 1941, which was calculated for a relatively peaceful period and had been passed before the start of the war. It was "one of the first attempts to restructure the USSR's national economy and convert the socialist economy to a war footing" (ibid., p 501).

On 29 June 1941, the USSR Council of People's Commissars and the CC VKP(b) sent all party and soviet organizations a directive constituting a basic program document on transforming the country into a unified military camp. Replete with Lenin's ideas about defending the socialist fatherland, the directive called for discarding peacetime attitudes and restructuring all efforts to a war footing, and rallying the people around the communist party and the Soviet government for dedicated support of the Red Army to achieve victory.

Special attention in this vital document was focused on strengthening the home front. It was essential to ensure successful mobilization, to carry out all missions with regard to military shipments, to strengthen the work of all enterprises, to organize reliable protection of the plants, power plants and telephone and telegraph networks. The director called upon party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations "to strengthen the home front of the Red Army, subordinating all efforts to the interests of the front" ("KPSS o Vooruzhennykh Silakh Sovetskogo Soyuza. Dokumenty 1917-1981" [The CPSU Concerning the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union. Documents 1917-1981], Moscow, 1981, p 298).

Once more, as in the years of the civil war, Lenin's party slogan sounded the tocsin throughout the land: "Everything for the front, everything for victory!" This slogan expressed the main goal of converting the national economy to a war footing: to mobilize all the Soviet state's internal resources to ensure uninterrupted growth of military production in the shortest possible time, to ensure the Red Army's decisive material-technical superiority over the troops of fascist Germany and thereby lay a firm foundation for victory over the enemy.

The 29 June 1941 directive of the USSR Council of People's Commissars and the CC VKP(b) served as the basis for a speech I. V. Stalin made on behalf of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the party on 3 July 1941.

The directive of the USSR Council of People's Commissars and the CC VKP(b) was perceived as a militant program of mobilization of all forces of the party and the people in the struggle against the German fascist invaders. Guided by this document, the party committees and party organizations mapped out their wartime tasks with regard to organizing aid to the active army and strengthening the home front.

The State Defense Committee was formed on 30 June 1941; it took into its own hands all power in the country and supervised the armed struggle on the fighting front and restructuring of the national economy on a war footing on the home front.

Almost three-quarters of all the Central Committee members and half of the candidate members were directly involved in organizing the war economy. Experienced party and state officials took charge of the main industrial people's commissariats in the first months of the war: A. I. Shakhurin for the aircraft industry, V. A. Malyshev for medium machine building, later the tank industry, D. F. Ustinov for armaments, P. I. Parshin for mortars, B. L. Vannikov for ammunition, I. F. Tevosyan for ferrous metallurgy, A. I. Yefremov for machine tools, V. V. Vakhrushev for coal, and so on.

The efforts of a considerable portion of workers in all links of the party apparatus were directed toward resolving urgent military-economy tasks. The institution of sector secretaries and local party organs, created earlier, was expanded. The party committees introduced posts of secretaries for the various sectors of military industry as they came to be developed--aircraft, tanks, armaments, mortars and ammunition. The number of secretaries for crucial

sectors of heavy industry was increased, especially in the eastern regions. There was a quantitative growth in the composition of the party organizers of the CC VKP(b) and the party organizers of the central committees of the communist parties of the union republics, kraykoms and obkoms in the most important enterprises. In the initial period of the war, there were party organizers of the Central Committee in 1,170 industrial enterprises.

In agriculture, political departments of the machine-tractor stations and sovkhoses were created. A system of political organs was formed to supervise the political departments: political administrations for the USSR and the union republic people's commissariats of land cultivation and sovkhoses, political sectors for the kray and oblast land administrations.

Political departments were also established in railway transport. They were headed by the Political Administration of the People's Commissariat of Railways, which functioned as a department of the CC VKP(b).

Thanks to the correct deployment of party supervisory cadres it was possible to achieve, in Lenin's words, "strictest centralization in the disposal of all forces and resources of the socialist republics" (op. cit., vol 38, p 400).

In the complicated process of military restructuring of the national economy, a key role was assigned to the defense industry, which had to supply the front with ever increasing quantities of modern battle equipment, armaments, ammunition and other gear. Restructuring of the work of the defense enterprises above all entailed conversion to massive and large-series production of highly perfected, high-quality types of armaments and battle equipment, the widespread adoption of effective technologies.

Restructuring of the civilian sectors of industry required, as a rule, full replacement of the list of goods produced as well as substantial remodeling of the enterprises. These tasks were resolved in an extremely short time. An enormous volume of work was completed at the Chelyabinsk Tractor Plant between July and September 1941. The whole technological process was restructured for the production of tanks; hundreds of units of equipment were moved and reinstalled. New shops were erected at a rapid pace. The plant was receiving equipment around the clock from such evacuated enterprises as Leningrad's Kirov Plant and the Khar'kov and Moscow machine building plants. In the last 3 months of 1941 the plant received several thousand workers and engineering-technical personnel from other cities. The Khar'kov Electromechanical Plant, evacuated to Sverdlovsk, began to turn out katyusha rocket guns in 45 days. Locomotive and railcar building plants converted to the manufacture of armored trains, armored platforms and tank components. Local industry and industrial cooperative enterprises mastered the production of hand grenades, shells, bombs, machine gun belts, uniforms and medical supplies.

The restructuring of the military and civilian industry constituted a unified, interconnected and interdependent process. "Industry is the technical and material base of the front," wrote PRAVDA on 10 July 1941. "We cannot have 'peaceful enterprises.' Every plant, every factory must work to meet military needs. Even the fast pace of peacetime cannot meet our needs now. Winning

time is a most important gain in wartime. The needs of the front must be met as quickly as possible. A single thread of high, intensive willpower of all efforts of party and economic organizations, production executives, workers and employees must run through the whole process from rapid project design to rapid assimilation of series production."

On 16 August 1941, the USSR Council of People's Commissars and the CC VKP(b) adopted a decree approving a new military-economic plan for the fourth quarter of 1941 and for 1942 for the Volga area, the Urals, Western Siberia, Kazakhstan and Central Asia. In essence it spelled out the main tasks of accelerated development of the Soviet war economy and expansion of the Soviet Union's military-industrial base in the eastern regions. The plan called for broad development of the production of armaments, ammunition and military equipment.

In agriculture, plans called for increasing areas sown in grain, vegetables and industrial crops in the eastern areas of the RSFSR, Kazakhstan and Central Asia. Almost all the larger farm machinery plants were turned over to the people's commissariats of military industry.

The plan assigned a major role to strengthening the throughput capacity of the Soviet Union's main eastern rail lines by rebuilding and expanding a number of rail junctions and stations and building new railroads.

Of vital importance was the decision to develop a huge metallurgy industry at an accelerated rate in the eastern part of the USSR, one capable of fully meeting the rising needs of military production, especially high-quality metal and rolled stock.

The extraordinary conditions in which the Soviet war economy was developing required new, efficient forms of economic planning. They included short-term production plan schedules (from 1 to 3 months) and target plans for all sectors of the defense industry and transport.

In accordance with the directives of the Central Committee and the Soviet government, the central committees of the communist parties of the union republics, kray and oblast committees of the VKP(b) and organs of soviet power supervised the restructuring of the national economy locally.

A substantial role in developing the war economy was played by Soviet scientists. In August and September of 1941, the USSR Academy of Sciences drew up the first work plan of its institutions under wartime conditions. Outstanding scientists carried out responsible missions of the CC VKP(b), the State Defense Committee, the Council of People's Commissars and USSR Gosplan. Many industrial centers in the eastern areas set up scientific committees and scientific-technical aid commissions and brigades. Expeditions and integrated research were carried out to mobilize new reserves of natural resources for the front (coal, petroleum, iron ore and nonferrous metals).

In order to supply the national economy with labor resources in a correct and systematic manner, a Committee for Distribution of Manpower (later the Committee for Registration and Distribution of Manpower) was set up under the Bureau of the USSR Council of People's Commissars on 30 June 1941.

The industrial manpower shortage due to armed forces mobilization and the fact that the population of the enemy-occupied territories was excluded from the sphere of production had to be made up partially from other sectors of the national economy, also by extending the workday, introducing compulsory overtime and canceling regular and supplemental vacations. This made it possible to increase the equipment workload by about one-third without increasing the number of personnel. Those who had gone to the fighting front were replaced by women and young people in industry, construction and transport. An essential source of replenishing the skilled workforce continued to be the system of state labor reserves.

With the help and cooperation of party, trade union and Komsomol organizations, between July 1941 and January 1942 the Committee for Registration and Distribution of Manpower under the Bureau of the Council of People's Commissars shifted 120,850 persons from local industry, public catering, the industrial cooperative system and municipal services to the defense industry, including mobilization of the unemployed urban and rural population. During the same period, 608,500 persons formed into construction battalions and work columns were sent to the coal mines, the oilfields, power plants, ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy, construction and railway transport ("Istoriya Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny 1939-1945," Vol 4, Moscow, 1975, p 144). These and other extraordinary measures as well as early mass release of students from the labor reserves schools substantially reduced the cadre problem and played a vital role in expanding war production.

Successful resolution of extremely difficult military-economic tasks to an enormous extent depended on the development of military production in the eastern areas of the country to convert them into the USSR's main military-industrial base.

Exceptionally difficult tasks confronted the metallurgy enterprise collectives, who not only had to make up for the lost capacities of the plants of the Center and the South but also to radically change the technology of metal production and learn in the shortest possible time to produce new grades of pig iron, steel alloys and armored rolled stock.

A crucial role in this vital effort was assigned to the metallurgists of Magnitogorsk. As early as 22 June 1941, the Magnitogorsk Gorkom of the VKP(b) passed the resolution "On the Tasks of the City's Party Organization in Connection with War Conditions." It established control over the fulfillment of military goals in the combine, especially the production of new high-quality grades of steel. In the second half of 1941 alone the Magnitogorsk steelers mastered the production of over 30 grades of high-quality steel.

In addition to the smelting of high-quality steel, the combine also set up the production of special rolled steel stock. Because the necessary rolling mills did not exist in the Urals, blooming mills were adapted for the purpose--the first time this had been done in the history of world and Soviet metallurgy. In October 1941 the Magnitogorsk steelers tripled the output of armor plate compared with August levels, and in December they increased it by seven times. The Urals metallurgists produced high-quality armor plate for tanks 1.5 months earlier than the date set by the government.

In a short time, the Kuznetsk Metallurgy Combine was converted to the production of high-quality steel and rolled stock. The Zlatoust Plant, which had produced only about 10 grades of steel in the 12 years of its existence, mastered the production of 78 new grades in the second half of 1941.

Thanks to the truly titanic labors of the scientists in collaboration with engineers, technicians and workers, an exceptionally vital defense task was resolved in an unprecedentedly short time: new methods of smelting high-grade steel were developed using conventional open-hearth furnaces.

Restructuring of the metallurgy industry and expansion of military production required a substantial increase in coal production, especially coking coal, in the eastern regions.

Prior to the war, the Kuznetsk Basin had provided about 14 percent of the nation's coal. As a result of the temporary loss of a number of coal-producing regions it became the main supplier of coking coal and chemical products. The role of the Karaganda Basin as a supplier of coking coal also rose.

Of crucial importance for increasing coal production was the construction and start-up of new mines and pits in the eastern regions, especially the Urals, because possibilities for bringing coal there from Kuznetsk and Karaganda were extremely complicated due to the heavy demands on transport facilities.

The oil industry was in a more favorable condition compared with other sectors, because the main oil-producing regions were located outside of the enemy's control. Thanks to the selfless labor of the oilmen, all the refineries successfully converted to the production of aircraft gasoline (especially high-octane) and fuel and lubricants for tanks and ships in a very short time.

The military-economic plan for the fourth quarter of 1941 and for 1942 called for substantial capital construction in the oil-producing regions of the "Second Baku," Kazakhstan and Central Asia. At the same time it was essential to accelerate the construction and expansion of a number of refinery installations and plants in Ufa, Saratov, Syzran', Orsk, Ishimbay and elsewhere.

The country's energy production was developing under difficult conditions. Energy capacities on the home front were not capable of meeting the needs of the growing war industry. Measures were undertaken to redistribute electricity resources. Priority went to the military, metallurgy and coal sectors of industry, while construction was restricted in a number of other sectors, and strict control was established over its distribution.

Conversion of the machine building and metal working industry to the production of war materiel required radical remodeling efforts. A number of the largest machine building plants were turned over to the defense people's commissariats. Heavy machine building was almost wholly switched to the production of tank bodies, mortars, shells, mines, bombs and other ordnance.

The machine tool industry was also converted to meet the needs of the front. This sector was assigned a critical task--that of substantially strengthening the war industry's technical base, especially in the eastern regions.

Organizing the war economy required not only the restructuring of existing enterprises but also the expansion of new capital construction far away from the front. The volume of capital work in the Urals, Siberia, Kazakhstan and Central Asia increased from 3.1 billion rubles in the first (peacetime) half of 1941 to 5.1 billion in the second (wartime).

The country's agriculture suffered greatly from the war. The enemy's seizure of the richest agricultural areas, mobilization of the men and the transferring of tractors, vehicles and horses to the armed forces--these and many other factors had a substantial impact on agricultural production and made the harvesting effort difficult. The men who had gone to the front were replaced by women and adolescents. The proportion of women operating the machinery of the machine-tractor stations increased from 7 percent in 1940 to 37 percent in 1942. The countryside obtained additional manpower, especially during the harvest season, by temporarily recruiting the able-bodied population of the cities and rural localities. In 1942, for example, over 4 million city dwellers were working in the fields. Extensive use was made of simple machinery, draft animals and manual labor. At the same time, there was a substantial expansion of sown areas along the Volga, in the Urals, Western Siberia, Kazakhstan and Central Asia. In 1942 the sown area in territories not occupied by the enemy was increased by 2.8 million hectares. As a result of the heroic efforts of the toilers of the fields, the country obtained the necessary farm goods.

A component part of the restructuring of the USSR's economy to a war footing was the shifting of the country's productive forces, including millions of the masses and the equipment from hundreds of enterprises, from regions near the front lines to deep in the rear.

The communist party spearheaded the accomplishment of this gigantic undertaking. Directly involved in supervising all evacuation operations, the party organizations relied constantly on the broad masses of the working people, on soviet, trade union, military and other state and social organs.

The difficulties of the evacuation stemmed primarily from its historically unprecedented scale, the limited amount of time and the extraordinarily difficult conditions under which it was carried out. The American journal LIFE published a wartime article which called the evacuation of the USSR's productive forces deep into the interior truly legendary. "This transfer of industry to the east on a gigantic scale," the article noted, "is one of the most magnificent sagas in history" (LIFE, 20 July 1942).

Thanks to the advantages of the Soviet system, the socialist system of management, the efficient organizational efforts of the party organizations and selfless efforts of the Soviet people, this magnificent production operation was successfully completed. As G. K. Zhukov said, it was equal in significance "to the greatest battles of the Second World War" (G. K. Zhukov, "Vospominaniya i Razmyshleniya" [Reminiscences and Reflections], Moscow, 1969, p 288).

During the second half of 1941, according to data of the People's Commissariat of Railways, the USSR's railroads alone carried to the rear all or part of the equipment of 2,593 industrial enterprises (see "Sovetskiy Soyuz v Gody Velikoy

Otechestvennoy Voyny 1941-1945" [The Soviet Union During the Years of the Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945], Moscow, 1976, p 101). Considering, moreover, that a substantial portion of the USSR's productive forces were removed to the rear by decision of local organs, utilizing all types of transport, and that there were considerable quantities of so-called "undocumented freight," the figure cited above would be even greater. From the areas under threat, various forms of transport successfully evacuated millions of people, hundreds of thousands of tons of raw materials and fuel, huge amounts of agricultural resources and other material and cultural goods. Essentially the country's entire industry was shifted thousands of kilometers.

The evacuation enabled the Soviet state to preserve a substantial portion of its productive capacity. The Hitlerites' hopes of utilizing the industry of the Soviet regions they captured for military purposes were dashed.

In accordance with decrees of the USSR Council of People's Commissars and the State Defense Committee, the main bases for expanding the evacuated enterprises in the eastern regions were to comprise the heavy industry that had been built up there in the prewar five-year plans, including duplicate plants, and also a large number of production facilities of new projects that had not been completed before the war started. The equipment that was arriving sometimes had to be offloaded out in the open, in localities that were not developed at all, where the construction of new enterprises was only in the planning stages.

The reconstruction of the rebased plants and factories is one of the most brilliant, heroic pages in the annals of the accomplishments of the Soviet working class and all the people. Valiantly overcoming all difficulties, the workers, engineers and technicians of the evacuated enterprises, along with the workers of the Volga area, the Urals, Siberia, Central Asia and Kazakhstan, put the newly arrived plants and factories into operation in an unbelievably short time--an average of 1.5 to 2 months--thus strengthening and expanding the military-industrial base there.

The restructuring of the national economy proceeded under unbelievably difficult conditions. Failures at the front, and the resulting loss of economically vital areas, had a grave impact on industrial production. The Soviet economy experienced an acute shortage of manpower, fuel, electricity, metal, raw materials and other goods. In late 1941 the level of military production dropped sharply.

Especially critical were the last 2 months of 1941. Because of the country's losses, also because of the fact that a large number of enterprises were still being evacuated and reconstructed in the new locations, the USSR's gross industrial output from June through November 1941 fell by 2.1 times, and the production of rolled ferrous metals--the foundation of military industry--decreased in December by 3.1 times compared with June; the production of nonferrous rolled stock, without which war production is impossible, decreased by 430 times in the same period (see N. A. Voznesenskiy, op. cit., p 505). American deliveries to the Soviet Union within the framework of the lend-lease agreement concluded earlier added up during that period to less than 0.1 percent of all American aid to its allies. As before, the USSR relied exclusively on its own resources.

Thanks to the heroic efforts of the working class and the effective measures undertaken by the party and the government, the output of military production began to rise in December 1941, although the overall level of production in key sectors of heavy industry declined until February 1942.

The first quarter of 1942 marked a breakthrough in the development of the basic types of military production. The production of T-34 tanks in March 1942 was 2.8 times greater than in November 1941. This made it possible to begin forming large tank units. The average monthly output in the first quarter came to about 1,600 tanks of all types and 1,100 military aircraft of all types; in the second quarter of 1942 the output had risen to 2,000 tanks and about 1,700 aircraft.

By midyear, 1,200 major enterprises from the western regions of the country had been evacuated to the Soviet rear and put into operation. In addition, 850 new plants, shops, mines, power plants, rolling mills and blast and open-hearth furnaces had been put into operation. By that time, the USSR's military industry had not only regained its lost capacity but also substantially surpassed it. In July 1942, enterprises of the People's Commissariat of Aviation Industry produced 1.3 times more goods than in June 1941; the corresponding figures were 3.8 times for the People's Commissariat of Tank Industry, 1.2 times for the People's Commissariat of Armaments and 1.7 times for the People's Commissariat for Ammunition (see "Istoriya Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny Sovetskogo Soyuza 1941-1945" [History of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union, 1941-1945], Vol II, Moscow, 1961, p 498).

The accelerated start-up of the evacuated enterprises and the resulting rapid expansion of the military-industrial base converted the Soviet Union's eastern regions into the Red Army's main arsenal. The proportion of war industry enterprises there increased by 57.5 percent in June 1942 compared with June 1941 (ibid.)

The importance of the Urals as the backbone of the Soviet war economy increased immeasurably. Soon the industry of the Urals began to produce up to 40 percent of all military goods, including 60 percent of all medium tanks and 100 percent of all heavy tanks. One out of every two shells fired at the enemy was made out of steel from the Urals.

"The war industry built up beyond the Urals or evacuated there was now working at full capacity and made it possible to supply the armed forces with sufficient quantities of artillery, tanks and ammunition," admitted the former Hitlerite general Tippelskirch (K. Toppel'skirch, "Istoriya Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny" [History of the Second World War], Moscow, 1956, p 256).

Despite exceptionally unfavorable conditions, the Soviet Union's socialist economy proved capable of surviving the most difficult sufferings and resolving the most difficult tasks. The growth of the Soviet military economy was one of the most important factors in the Red Army's victories. The Red Army not only stopped the enemy but also inflicted on him in the Battle of Moscow the first major defeat, which marked the beginning of a radical turnaround in the course of the Great Patriotic War.

It took one year for the toilers of the Soviet home front under the guidance of the communist party to restructure the national economy to a war footing.

Industry kept increasing the output of materiel necessary for the front. In the first half of 1942, compared with the second half of 1941, our plants produced 2.3 times more tanks, 4 times more antitank artillery, 2 times more field artillery, 3 times more mortars and 6 times more light machine guns and anti-tank guns (see "Istoriya Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny 1939-1945," Vol 5, Moscow, 1975, p 48).

By the end of the first year of the war, the Soviet people had achieved significant success in creating the material bases for accomplishing a turnaround in the war, for preparing to crush the aggressor completely. But the road to this goal was not a simple or easy one. New and difficult experiences were in store.

In the summer of 1942 the enemy launched a broad offensive in the southeastern sector. The situation on the front lines again sharply deteriorated. Additional obstacles also arose for the development of Soviet war economy. A second evacuation became necessary. Again, as in 1941, we suffered heavy losses. Under such circumstances, oversights and mistakes were made. On the whole, however, military production in the rear developed successfully. The USSR's economic capacity was not only restored but increased.

Moral-political factors had a strong impact on the resolution of difficult tasks. Inspired and guided by the communist party, the land of the soviets defied mortal danger in mobilizing all its material and moral forces in the struggle against Hitler's occupying forces. The toilers on the home front manifested selfless patriotism.

The movement of the 200-producers, 300-producers and 500-producers, Komsomol youth and front brigades, multiple-machine tenders and job combiners was truly massive in character. Women and young people, who constituted most of the work force, labored steadfastly, sparing no effort. Leading workers fulfilled between 5 and 10 shift targets. Outstanding for their labor accomplishments were milling machine operator D. F. Bosyy, drill operators A. I. Semivolos and I. P. Yankin, blast furnace attendant F. V. Sharunova, locomotive engineers N. A. Lunin and Ye. M. Chukhnyuk, tractor drivers D. M. Garmash and P. N. Angelina and many other toilers on the home front. All-union socialist competition to aid the fighting front was launched in May 1942. Its role in increasing the output of war materiel is difficult to overestimate.

By the end of 1942 our country had a well-organized military economy. The task of organizing a new cooperative system was resolved despite the exceptionally difficult conditions of wartime. Soviet industry began to supply the front with military equipment and armaments in considerably greater quantities than fascist Germany's industry. The newest types of military equipment and armaments were being produced in increasing quantities. "...Not for a minute did the motherland's industrial heart stop beating," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said about that time. "Our plants supplied the Soviet army with weapons by which the war machine of Hitler's fascism, supported by the industrial might of almost all Europe, was crushed."

In autumn of 1942 the Soviet Union stood on the threshold of an important historical event--the defeat of a huge Wehrmacht offensive in the Battle of Stalingrad. Of untold value in preparing for this great victory were the efforts of the toilers of the Soviet home front, who under the guidance of the communist party converted the USSR's national economy to a war footing under conditions of the first and most difficult period of the war.

Our nation is proud of the immortal deeds of the Soviet people on the field of battle, the home front and in enemy-occupied territory. Each Soviet citizen's life stance at that time revolved around selfless service to the motherland, a high sense of civic duty, dedication to the ideals of communism. "Our party," A. I. Shakhurin recalls about that time, "in close unity with the working people organized and directed the efforts of the national economy, inspired the home front workers to heroic labor and the fighting men to heroic deeds and led the nation to victory over fascism."

The heroic traditions of the Great Patriotic War are profoundly linked to our time. They are cherished and emulated in the units and formations of the USSR's armed forces, who are vigilantly guarding the peaceful labor of the Soviet people. "Numbered now in the ranks of the defenders of the motherland are the sons and grandsons of the heroes of the Great Patriotic War," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 26th CPSU Congress. "They have not experienced the terrible sufferings that fell to the lot of their fathers and grandfathers. But they are faithful to the heroic traditions of our army, our nation."

The traditions that were born during the war are now being multiplied in the society of developed socialism, where patriotism is inseparable from everyday efforts for high discipline and organization of labor, increasing its productivity, improving production, ensuring effectiveness in the performance of each enterprise, sovkhoz and kolkhoz, the struggle for creative implementation of the magnificent tasks set before the country by the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the May 1982 CC CPSU Plenum.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/16

ON SOCIALIST STATEHOOD AND THE FUTILITY OF ITS CRITICISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 82 pp 95-105

[Article by A. Sobolev, doctor of philosophical sciences; this is the last article written by the eminent Soviet social scientist and publicist Aleksandr Ivanovich Sobolev (4 December 1915-7 November 1981)]

[Text] Enormous changes take place in the life of humanity, reflecting the variety of the different aspects of historical development, the abundance of concrete forms of social progress, and the national-specific characteristics of revolutionary transformations.

Each country has its own historic traditions, its own social and political heritage, its specific deployment of class forces. Hence the differences in the means by which the masses come to revolution, the methods of revolutionary transformation of society.

The socialist countries are in different stages of development, having an unlike degree of maturity of the new basis and the new superstructure. These and many other factors account for the variety of experience of socialist construction.

On the whole, there is continuous accumulation and enrichment of the experience of revolutionary-transformational activities of the working class and all the working people, the experience of the building of socialism, which encompasses all aspects of the rise and development of the new system--the basis and superstructure, economic relations and political structure. Marxist-Leninists do not doubt, nevertheless, that this abundance of the national-particular in the specific form embodies in itself the effect of objective laws governing social development.

The problem of revolutionary power, naturally, is also resolved in this context, the problem of socialist statehood--its class nature and the essential traits that are inherent in it as it comes into being.

A precise elucidation of this question was provided by K. Marx in his "Critique of the Gotha Program." He wrote: "Between a capitalist and a communist society lies a period of revolutionary transformation of the former into the latter. To this period also corresponds a political transition period, and the state

of this period cannot be anything else than a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 19, p 27).

The further development of Marxist-Leninist theory and revolutionary practice and the collective creativity of the communist parties have filled this postulate with concrete content and thereby significantly enriched it.

An enormous contribution toward elaborating the problem of the essence, role and forms of revolutionary, socialist statehood was made by V. I. Lenin and has been made by the CPSU and the other fraternal parties.

Speaking of the theoretical and political significance of the CPSU's contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory of the state, it is worth pointing out that it has revealed the organic link between the improvement of socialist statehood, with all its social-economic transformations in the process of the building of socialism, and changes in the class structure of society and relationships between classes, also the entire aggregate of international conditions and relations.

Unusually multifaceted experience of the dialectical interconnection between general laws governing the rise and development of socialist statehood and the variety of concrete-historical conditions, examples of rich interaction between the content of revolutionary power and the forms of its realization, has been accumulated by the fraternal socialist countries. This was stated clearly by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the Summary Report of the CC CPSU to the 26th Party Congress. He emphasized: "None of the forms, methods and paths of socialist revolution in the present socialist countries have mechanically repeated foreign experience. The GDR, Poland, Hungary, Cuba, Mongolia, Yugoslavia--in short, all the socialist countries--have made revolution in their own way, in forms dictated by the correlation of class forces within each of these countries, by the national structure and external circumstances."

The communist parties of the capitalist countries are actively discussing questions of the class content and mechanism of the people's revolutionary power which must come to replace the dictatorship of the monopolistic bourgeoisie.

Thus, the problem of socialist statehood at various stages of the rise of a new, communist formation is one of the most acute problems of our time. It reflects the vital objective laws governing the transition from capitalism to socialism and itself infuses revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice from Marx to our days.

Around this problem revolve fervent theoretical debates, exchanges of ideas and also an intense ideological struggle, with regard to which a special place is occupied by the question of the essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat, not to mention this term applied to the present stage of world development. Questions are being debated concerning the class content of revolutionary power in the transitional period under today's historical conditions, the role and place in the political system of revolutionary power of today's working class, which has thrown off the yoke of exploitation and risen to a high level of class consciousness; concerning ways and concrete methods of replacing the

bourgeois state with a socialist one under conditions of the development of the revolution in its unarmed form; concerning the mechanism of defeating the monopolistic bourgeoisie under these conditions and utilizing democratic levers for socialist transformation of society, and so on.

Here again it is essential to see the great variety (in ideological and political trends) of turns and facets of these debates and this struggle.

Starting with the fact that the ideologues of the bourgeoisie have always conducted a ferocious struggle against Marxist-Leninist doctrines concerning the dictatorship of the proletariat, not troubling themselves, meanwhile, to search for any serious conclusions whatsoever that merit attention. Their weapons in this struggle are cynically simple: never rising to the level of seriously discerning the real content of Marxist-Leninist doctrines concerning the socialist state, they stubbornly insist that any revolutionary power, any power born of socialist revolution, entails violence and only violence, and is therefore in conflict and incompatible with democracy.

The reformists and revisionists have always been the allies of the bourgeoisie in this struggle, and it may be that in no other issue does their sad "mission" --to serve as vehicles of bourgeois influence in the workers movement--have such a visible and sharp impact as here, that is, in their attitude toward revolutionary power, their interpretation of the class nature of democracy.

In recent years the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat has become a topic of lively debate and dispute even in some communist parties. This is due to a number of factors.

Considerable experience in the building of socialist statehood has been accumulated in the fraternal countries, which, as has been noted, are at various stages of maturity of the new society. And this experience, naturally, requires further profound generalization. Widening of the concrete-historical ways of bringing the masses to revolution and methods of revolutionary-transformational activities of the working class and all the working people gives rise to many new problems which, again, require new scientific elucidation.

It hardly needs to be argued that theoretical generalization of the accumulated experience and analysis of the new phenomena must serve to enrich Marxist-Leninist doctrines, which are always alive and continuously developing.

In the course of discussions, however, there have been frequent statements which, under the guise of creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory of the socialist state, have in fact lost contact with the scientific concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat (or even distort it), ignoring its essence, which, as is clear from the classic postulates of Marx, consists of revealing the class nature of a new type of state which is heading to replace the bourgeois state.

One may assume that subjective factors motivating the authors of such distorting postulates may be quite various in nature--from sincere confusion to

intentional or even ill-intentioned speculations. But these statements themselves, or at least the ones that are most often repeated and are most beloved of the critics of Marxism, do not as a rule go beyond a standard set:

--the necessary coming into being of the dictatorship of the proletariat allegedly stemmed not from fundamental requirements but from the specific conditions of the class struggle of the 19th and the early 20th century, but now these specific conditions have changed markedly, and for this reason history itself has removed the problem; consequently, the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat is obsolete;

--the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat brings to the forefront the dictatorial, violent side of revolutionary power and thereby contradicts democracy, while at the present stage it is the democratic levers which are used with increasing vigor in the class struggle; to this it is sometimes added that in the consciousness of the working people the word "dictatorship" is associated with dictatorial, fascistic, neofascistic and authoritarian regimes, and therefore the dictatorship of the proletariat is perceived as the opposite of democracy;

--and, finally, there is the following point of view: the concept "dictatorship of the proletariat" does not take full account of the changes that are taking place in the working class itself as it comes to dominate and liquidate the exploiting classes, as the oppressed proletarian is transformed into a free worker and master of the state.

Other critical remarks have been made concerning the Marxist-Leninist concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat based either on ignorance of the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin concerning the dictatorship of the proletariat or on a metaphysical separation of the most important sides of the integral social-political phenomenon that the revolutionary power of the victorious working class constitutes, thus in fact leading to absolutization of one of these sides.

Careful Marxist-Leninist analysis of these arguments, and in particular conscientious comparison of them against the experience of the accomplished revolutions and socialist construction, demonstrates the complete scientific inconsistency and, keeping in mind objective consequences, the political harmfulness of this kind of reasoning. But here specification of another point is in order.

In order to conduct a scientific debate, it is especially necessary to explain what the topic is: whether it is the class content of power in the period of the building of socialism--that is, the scientific concept which explains the essence of the social-political system of socialism under construction--or mere words.

If it is mere words, then it seems to me that there can be no basis for discussions or debate. In the Marxist-Leninist literature there are many synonyms corresponding to "dictatorship of the proletariat." As we know, many communist parties use other terms in their program documents. In some cases reference is made to the power of the working people under the leadership of

the working class. In others it is the revolutionary power of the victorious working class. In others it is the socialist state. And in still others it concerns the power of the people under the leadership of the working class. There can be other terms as well, although it is wrong to conclude that the term itself is devoid of all content and carries no ideological and political load. If we refrain from scholasticism but turn again to practical life, it becomes clear that in each specific case the selection and choice of a new term has been made under specific and even rather strict conditions. First, a new term designating revolutionary power emerged as a political slogan and must have corresponded to all the requirements stemming therefrom. Second, it correctly--that is, equivalently--reflected the objective essence of revolutionary power. And, third, for this reason replacing the slogan, that is changing the term, did not entail placing it in opposition to the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat as an expression, let us repeat, of the profound, class nature of the state, growing out of the socialist revolution, but rather represented the concrete-historical form of the existence of this idea. In other words, the appearance of a new term reflected real ideological, political and social processes, and was dictated by them, but by no means entailed "tossing the baby out with the bathwater."

It is necessary to speak clearly and unequivocally about these generally elementary truths which, however, are of highly principled character, because the promotion of new slogans or terms reflecting the idea of the power of the working class has by no means always met the requirements listed above. As an example of this kind, from the recent past, we can cite the attempt to characterize socialist statehood at the stage of its transformation into a state of all the people by the terms "workers democracy." In our opinion, this attempt evokes a critical attitude precisely in terms of the criteria we adduced above. Let us repeat: It is not a matter of words; "workers democracy," "proletarian democracy," "democracy of the working classes"--all these expressions are unobjectionable in themselves as long as they are used in their real meaning rather than others which contradict these goals in order to alter their original class significance. It is precisely in this case, meanwhile, that attempts are made to use the new term to discredit the very idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to say nothing of another, independent and fundamentally important matter: the extent to which this new term corresponds to the real ideological, political and social shifts that have taken place in the specific society and which have justified the new term. Terminological innovation inevitably gives rise to its own ideological-political "vector."

If, however, it is more than a matter of words, as has been mentioned, but rather the scientific understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat, then it must be emphasized at the outset that practically no one has attempted to rebut a single tenet of Marxist-Leninist doctrines concerning the socialist state. Especially, of course, as the critics do not risk touching upon the methodological principles of substantiating the essence of revolutionary power during the period of the transition to socialism.

What, then, remains? Attempts to fight against Marxist-Leninist doctrines concerning socialist statehood essentially revolve in a vicious circle around the arguments adduced above: the "obsolescence" of the dictatorship of the

proletariat because of failure to correspond to today's historical conditions; its "incompatibility" with democracy; and, finally, the "disappearance" of the proletariat itself. In other words, in a vicious circle of ignorance or lack of desire to understand the doctrines themselves.

A distinguishing feature of all criticism resting on these "whales" is the fact that such arguments change in form but remain the same in essence when they are applied to qualitatively different conditions--the socialist countries that have already embodied in social practice the Marxist-Leninist teachings concerning the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the one hand, and the capitalist countries, where the task of establishing revolutionary power remains a strategic goal of the class struggle of the working people, on the other.

It may be that the best known, not to say widespread, of these arguments is that which places the dictatorship of the proletariat in opposition to democracy. This argument is defective because it forcibly "equates" qualitatively different concepts: the concept characterizing the class content of a historically determined type of state--that is, the aggregate of class interests expressed by it, and the concept characterizing a political form, a political regime with the methods of exercising power that are proper to it. If we discard at long last the importunate cliché of bourgeois propaganda speculating on the word "dictatorship" itself, then we can state the only correct question in this regard: What is the actual correlation between the dictatorship of the proletariat and democracy? Does it turn out that the class interests of the working people and the proletariat spearheading their struggle require antidemocratic methods of exercising power?

Such an intentionally pointed statement of the question leaves no doubt that in fact quite the opposite is the case, that the establishment of the class domination of the proletariat, and only that, results in a true birth of democracy. This truth has been comprehensively and repeatedly demonstrated both theoretically--in the works of the Marxist-Leninist classics, the creative thinking of the communist parties--and, in full accordance with revolutionary theory, in historical, social practice. It need hardly be added that proof of this is to be found not only in positive but also tragic experience, the experience of revolutions that have been defeated, national movements put down by the most brutal violence, literally drowned in blood. The bourgeoisie has always fought against people's rule, resorting to a whole arsenal of antidemocratic techniques and means available to it. Can anyone bring himself to conclude from this experience, which knows no exceptions, that in this way the bourgeoisie is defending democracy and opposing "dictatorship"?

Obviously the main point, however, as has been stated more than once and must be stated again, is the principled correlation between the class essence of state power, born of the socialist revolution, and democracy, more precisely genuine democracy that is qualitatively new in its content and firmness and in principle inaccessible to all preceding class societies.

The problem of the dialectical interconnection between the class content of the revolutionary power of the working class and democracy is unquestionably of great theoretical and political interest. Attempts to "build in" to the

term "dictatorship of the working class" the danger of restriction, disruption or even abuse of democracy, as is "traditionally" done by the reformists and revisionists, constitute the purest sophism. It would seem that the scientific definition of the power of the bourgeoisie--that is, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie--can be correlated with democracy, while the scientific definition of the power of the working class inevitably entails limitations on the democratic rights of the working people.

In his works, Lenin revealed the organic link between socialism and democracy.

"Socialism is impossible without democracy, in two senses: (1) it is impossible for the proletariat to accomplish a socialist revolution unless it prepares for it by a struggle for democracy; (2) it is impossible for victorious socialism to sustain its victory and lead mankind to the withering away of the state without achieving full democracy" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 30, p 128).

In another place, Lenin formulates his brilliant dialectical postulate: "Engels here approaches the interesting point where systematic democracy is transformed into socialism, on the one hand, and demands socialism, on the other" (ibid., Vol 33, p 78).

Critics who place democracy in opposition to the dictatorship of the proletariat are either forgetting or consciously ignoring the real historical fact that it is socialism that ensures the flourishing of a genuinely popular, socialist democracy; it is socialism which marks the beginning of the conscious, organized, mass creative activity of all the working classes in the endeavor to create new and higher forms of social life.

There is, moreover, a definite pattern at work: The more countries that embark on the path to socialism, the stronger the alliance of the working class and all the working people, and the stronger their revolutionary power, the broader, deeper and more active the establishment of socialist democratism will be, the more fully its fundamental advantages will unfold. One cannot, therefore, agree with those who yammer about the "dictatorial nature" of revolutionary power and propose therefore to depart from the fundamental principles of Marxism. To do this is to occupy a more than defensive, passive position which benefits only the bourgeoisie.

The same thing is true of two other critical "arguments" cited above with regard to the dictatorship of the proletariat--its historical justification under present-day circumstances and the presence of the class subject of revolutionary power and socialist statehood as a whole.

Elaborating Marxist postulates concerning the socialist state, Lenin raises the fundamental issue defining the class content of revolutionary power in different phases of the development of a new society: Which class is at the center of the historical process? Which class supervises the revolutionary transformation of society? That class is the working class. It is the vehicle of the socialist ideal. For the building of socialism is its world-historic mission, and consequently that which unites into a single whole the various

detachments of the working class in particular stages of its historical development, that is stages of its accomplishment of this world-historic mission it has. Depending on the height and maturity of this stage of historical development of the proletariat, the concrete forms of power exercised by this class can change and inevitably do, but can one from this natural process draw a conclusion of the disappearance of the class nature of its power and the very statehood it has created?

Naturally, its forms do change and can vary. Engels, for example, wrote that a democratic republic can be a specific form of the dictatorship of the proletariat (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 23, p 237). Lenin discovered the soviets as a new state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the countries of Europe appeared people's democratic republics of various kinds, having structures and forms of revolutionary power of the working class distinct from the Soviet system and exercising it under circumstances of several parties or a single party. This constituted one more confirmation of the familiar postulate expressed by Lenin in his "The State and Revolution" to the effect that "the forms of bourgeois states are extraordinarily varied, but their essence is all the same: all of these states are in one way or another, but in the final analysis inevitably, dictatorships of the bourgeoisie. The transition from capitalism to communism, of course, cannot but yield a plethora and great variety of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be the same: a dictatorship of the proletariat" (op. cit., Vol 33, p 35).

This Leninist postulate was enriched through the collective efforts of the communist and workers parties at their conference in 1957, whose Declaration stated that the leadership of the working masses by the working class, the nucleus of which is the Marxist-Leninist party, in conducting the proletarian revolution in some form or other and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in some form or other constitutes the general pattern of transition to socialism. This dialectical-materialist, multiplane definition of the class content of the revolutionary power of the victorious working class is in full accord with Lenin's treatment of this problem. "The dictatorship of the proletariat," Lenin wrote, "if we translate this latinate, scientific, historical-philosophical expression into simpler language, means the following:

"only a particular class, namely the urban industrial workers of the plants and factories, is capable of leading the masses of working and exploited people in the struggle to cast off the yoke of capital, in the process of casting off, in the struggle to sustain and strengthen victory, in the cause of creating a new, socialist social structure, in the whole struggle for the complete elimination of classes" (op. cit., Vol 39, p 14).

Also very important for a correct understanding of this matter is the fact that Lenin spoke of the dialectical interconnection between the content of the creative efforts of the victorious working class and the forms of revolutionary creativity. He pointed out that "the main task of the proletariat and the impoverished peasantry which it leads in any socialist revolution--and, consequently, in the socialist revolution which we launched on 25 October 1917 in Russia--is the positive or creative work of organizing an extraordinarily complex and refined network of new organizational relations encompassing the systematic production and distribution of goods..." (op. cit., Vol 36, p 171).

In carrying out its world-historic mission, therefore, the working class under the leadership of the revolutionary vanguard at a certain stage of historical development rallies around itself all the working people and enlists them in broad historic creativity, organizing the building of a society without exploitation and then without classes at all, ensuring the broadest rights and freedoms for all the people and establishing genuinely socialist democratism--such is the content of the activity of the revolutionary power of the working class in the transitional period, and it is this essence of the political mechanism of the socialist system which on the scientific-philosophical plane is termed the dictatorship of the working class.

To resolve all these multifarious and complex tasks of the building of socialism, the revolutionary power of the working class utilizes a great variety of forms and methods determined by the level of social-economic maturity, the deployment and correlation of class forces, the form and intensity of the resistance of the disappearing classes and the historical heritage, political and cultural traditions, national specifics and social mentality of the majority of the population.

Of crucial importance are international conditions, the forms of confrontation between world capitalism and the socialist forces of a given country, the intensity and methods of interference by world imperialism. All of this determines the infinite variety of forms of the revolutionary-transformational activities of the working class, the methods of resolving the urgent tasks, and the functions of the socialist state.

Among the activities of revolutionary power we are fully justified in including both destructive actions against the forces and traditions of the exploiting society and creative actions designed to develop productive forces and new social relations between classes, to establish the principle of voluntary collaboration and mutual aid of people free of exploitation, to shape a new culture and propagate a highly humanistic ideology. These are two organically inter-related aspects of the working class' exercise of its revolutionary power. They include measures of persuasion and compulsion, the voluntary organization of the masses to build a new society and a system of means of liquidating the exploiting classes, of struggle against the counterrevolution, foreign interventionists and other internal and external enemies of the new system.

The dictatorship of the proletariat carries out economic-organizational and political-educational tasks. The economic-organizational functions ensure the growth of productive forces, the establishment and development of the social ownership of the means of production, planned management of the national economy and maintenance of the necessary proportions and steady rates of development, while the political-educational function is designed to shape the dialectical integrity of centralism and democratism, to instill socialist attitudes toward labor and social property and to comprehensively develop socialist consciousness. It is a matter of enhancing the political commitment of each worker, engineer, and kolkhoznik as the real masters of the country, the decisive force of social progress, the creator of a new historical reality, the central figure of the whole political system of socialism, of all mass social organizations of the working people.

The socialist state carries out administrative and ideological, pedagogical tasks, because right up until the complete victory of communism it will still be necessary to ensure control over the measure of labor and the measure of consumption.

On the international plane, the revolutionary power of the working class ensures the defense of the gains of socialism, creation of the necessary conditions for the creative efforts of the masses of people, their further advance along the road to communism. All of these tasks are resolved by an aggregate of measures to strengthen the defensive capability of the socialist state by means of a vigorous, aggressive struggle for peace, disarmament and peaceful coexistence. The sphere of activities of the socialist state includes tasks of struggling against imperialist intelligence efforts, against the spies and saboteurs dispatched to the socialist countries to incite the activities of subversive antisocialist elements.

Such are the most important, broad and various functions and aspects of the activities of the socialist state. Considering rapidly changing internal and external conditions and depending on concrete historical situations, a particular aspect of the activities of the socialist state may come to the forefront in different countries. Such is the real dialectics in the interaction of the general, the particular and the unitary in the development of the political system of socialism.

Its critics, however, ignore these real connections, this vital dialectics of socialist reality. Generally they extract one particular trait out of the aggregate of all the tasks and functions of the socialist state. Primarily they absolutize and exaggerate the coercive side and on this basis they subject to doubt the whole scientific concept of the class content of the dictatorship of the working class.

In this connection a theoretical and political analysis is necessary of the essence and forms of coercion during the period of the building of socialism. Coercion can be highly democratic and it can take repressive forms. Control over the measure of labor and the measure of consumption, subordination of the minority to the majority, social control over compliance with labor discipline--these are also manifestations of definite social pressure on the citizen. At the same time, they are democratic forms of the social organization of people's activities. The nationalization of industry and the liquidation of exploitation and the exploiting classes--these are still another but no less important form of coercion without which genuine democracy is also inconceivable. The state's exercise of its right to struggle against stealers of socialist property, bribe-takers, speculators and other enemies of socialism also constitutes coercion, but coercion being exercised in the interests of the masses themselves.

But coercion--let us repeat once more--is just one side of the dictatorship of the proletariat. And depending on the forms of the bourgeoisie's resistance it can be exercised either by repressive or by democratic methods. A decisive victory at the polls is also the imposition of "social force" upon the losers.

Even in the case of the USSR, where the resistance of the overthrown exploitive classes was especially savage, it is wrong to rely only on the coercive side of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin emphasized: "...The essence of the proletarian dictatorship lies not in force alone nor mainly in force. Its main essence lies in the organizational level and discipline of the leading detachment of the working people, their vanguard, their sole leader, the proletariat. Its goal is to create socialism, to eliminate the division of society into classes, to make all members of society workers, to eliminate all exploitation of man by man. This goal cannot be accomplished at once, it requires a relatively prolonged transitional period from capitalism to socialism--because the reorganization of production is a difficult matter, because it takes time to accomplish radical changes in all spheres of life, and because the enormous strength of being accustomed to petit bourgeois and bourgeois dominance can be overcome only through long, persistent struggle (op. cit., Vol 38, pp 385-386).

Strictly speaking, these considerations alone are sufficient to understand the groundlessness of any doubts about the historical legitimacy of the revolutionary power of the working class as applied to today's conditions and, along with it, the groundlessness of those critics of the dictatorship of the proletariat who maintain that it entails the working class' repression of other social groups and strata among the working people. In this connection it is worth noting that the very slogan "state of workers democracy" may bring about the narrowing of the democratic rights of the peasantry, employees and intelligentsia.

In fighting to establish revolutionary power, the working class of any country creates broad social alliances on an equal footing with all who are subjected to exploitation and oppression by the monopolistic bourgeoisie and who can in some way or another be enlisted in the struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and social progress. The historic experience of October demonstrated to all the world the justness of Lenin's postulate that the highest principle of the dictatorship of the working class is the alliance with the peasantry and all the working people. "...Without such an alliance," Lenin pointed out, "democracy is not well founded and socialist transformation is impossible" (op. cit., Vol 33, p 40).

In the countries of Europe where people's democratic revolutions have taken place, broad national, patriotic fronts have come into being and in various forms exist to this day, embodying the ideological-political alliances of all the working classes and strata. The socialist countries' accumulated historical experience demonstrates that the stronger the alliance of the working class and the working people the more successful the process of socialist development of a country will be. Contrariwise, the whole historical experience of the class struggle shows that the working class cannot maintain power unless it establishes its revolutionary power in all its fullness in alliance with other working people.

This revolutionary power, taking on different concrete historical forms, is maintained up until the complete liquidation of the exploiting classes, the creation of the ideological-political unity of the people, complete overpowering

of the forces and traditions of the old society and replacement of the private-ownership ideology and mentality among the masses by a socialist consciousness founded on the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism.

Are these tasks completely resolved in the socialist countries? Are all the forces and traditions of the old exploiting system done away with? Can we, finally, forget that under conditions of the savage attacks by the imperialists these vestiges and traditions can come to life and be very dangerous?

It is worth emphasizing once more that the power growing out of the victorious socialist revolution has never at any time been something cut and dried; its content and forms are constantly being enriched and deepened. And the main direction of this development, which is incidentally proceeding at an extraordinarily rapid pace unknown in the experience of bourgeois statehood, is determined by the very class nature of this power and accomplished in accordance with the historical interests of its class subject--the working class.

A concrete embodiment of this interconnection between social reality and the forms of socialist statehood historically equivalent to it is the theory and practice of the transformation of the dictatorship of the working class into the state of the whole people. "With the construction of mature socialism, when all strata of the population have converted to the ideological-political positions of the working class, our state, coming into being as the dictatorship of the proletariat, has also been transformed into a state of the whole people," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, elaborating the ideas of the CPSU Program, in his report on the draft USSR Constitution at the May 1977 CC CPSU Plenum.

All of the foregoing makes it possible to see clearly not the semantic or even the terminological but rather the profoundly content-based, conceptual difference between the idea of the state of the whole people as a particular historical stage in the development of socialist statehood, growing out of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and any attempts to distort contemporary socialist statehood by characterizing it--in the face of historical logic and today's social reality --as a "workers democracy." The erroneousness of such attempts, in our opinion, stems primarily from the fact that they are based on an extrahistorical contrasting of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist statehood in its present forms, that is, they are designed to discredit the original, founding characteristics of socialist statehood which express its fundamental, class essence. To Marxist-Leninists, the inconsistency and defectiveness of this kind of split are obvious. It would clearly be in vain to seek in these attempts any new argument beyond the framework of the usual set of propaganda cliches that are traditionally used by all who attack Marxist-Leninist doctrines concerning the socialist state and the practice of making it a reality.

Thus, the critical barb of the terminological coinage "workers democracy" is directed not only, and possibly not so much at the historical past, as at today's reality, at current problems. Among these problems touched upon, in particular, by the authors and commentators of the "workers democracy" concept are such genuinely essential matters as the extent to which state forms correspond to a country's social-historical realities; expansion of the social base of

socialist statehood; improvement and expansion of the range of democratic forms of state power; the place and role of the communist party in the political system of socialism; and, finally, the international aspects of the theory and experience of exercising the power of the working class. Even if we grant that an attempt is being made by means of the term "workers democracy" to answer these questions and reflect the real shifts that are taking place in the development of socialist statehood, it still must be acknowledged to be at least unsuccessful.

To the extent, moreover, that they attempt to place this term in opposition to the concepts and categories worked out in Marxist-Leninist thought, it is rather in conflict with the real processes that we have just named and which it is supposed to reflect. What, then, is its purpose? Does it not boil down to an attempt one way or another, even in ways that are blatantly illogical in form and content, to distance oneself from Marxist-Leninist doctrines and the well-verified variety of the historical experience of implementing them?

This is why, as we said at the beginning, it is more than a dispute about words. The CPSU has always considered its internationalist duty to be that of defending the truth of Marxism-Leninism in genuinely creative comparison of this great theory with revolutionary-transformational activities. And this conviction is dictated by our party's interest in the cause of building a new society, which is shared by all of toiling humanity, in realizing the ideals and goals for which the world army of communists has struggled and does struggle.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/16

THE IRANIAN REVOLUTION AND ITS SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS

PM051033 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 82 pp 106-116

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences Prof R. Ulyanovskiy]

[Text] ...The expression of political protest in religious garb is a phenomenon characteristic of all peoples at a certain stage of their development... -- V.I. Lenin

"Islamic explosion," "Islamic renaissance," "the new Islamic revolution"... Such expressions have constantly featured in Western newspapers in recent years. The above terms have been used to designate heterogeneous social phenomena in the Muslim world ranging from the counterrevolutionary proimperialist activities of the "Muslim Brotherhood" and related organizations in Afghanistan, Syria and other countries to mass revolutionary anti-imperialist movements like those that shook Iran in 1978-1979.

Marxist-Leninists' attitude to political movements operating under the slogans of Islam is based on a principled, class approach. In the CPSU Central Committee report to the 26th party congress Comrade L.I. Brezhnev noted: "Islamic slogans have been vigorously put forward in certain Eastern countries lately. We communists treat with respect the religious convictions of people professing Islam or other religions. The main point is the objectives that are pursued by the forces proclaiming particular slogans. A liberation struggle can develop under the banner of Islam. This is shown by historical experience, including the most recent experience. But this also shows that Islamic slogans are used by reaction too when it is stirring up counterrevolutionary rebellions. Therefore the whole point is the real content of the particular movement."

The question of the reasons for the revival of Islamic traditions and for the use of Islamic slogans for political purposes by particular social-class forces is assuming fundamental importance in this connection.

The main reason for the increase in the sociopolitical and ideological role of Islam in the second half of the seventies is the counteroffensive by international imperialism against the national liberation movement in the countries of the Islamic East and the considerable acceleration and deepening of the breakdown of the traditional autarkic economy of the Asian and African Islamic countries wherever this had persisted, or of traditional socioeconomic structures wherever these had for a time coexisted more or less peacefully with capitalist production forces and production relations actively introduced from outside or else created "from above."

It is precisely in the situation of massive imperialist pressure on the young independent Eastern states that attempts are being made almost everywhere to "transform" the seemingly fatally static Islamic religion and to utilize believing Muslims' feelings, religious methods of communications, and standard patterns of thinking and behavior for particular positive or negative purposes in conformity with the political strategy of the struggling forces.

And the difference between the social, politicoeconomic and ideological objectives of the various Islamic communities, sects and forces is also associated to a great extent with the level of socioeconomic development of Islamic countries as a whole or of their regions. Under conditions of age-old technical and economic backwardness and the lack

of development of capitalist relations, religious views remain a social and spiritual-cultural phenomenon [obrazovaniye] of a largely precapitalist type. If you add to this the fact that almost all the Islamic peoples -- from the shores of the Atlantic across North Africa and South Asia to the Philippines -- were subjected to colonial exploitation for decades, and many of them were subjected to it for centuries, it becomes clear why Islam objectively often retains a definite anti-imperialist potential. At the same time, the possibility of a counterrevolutionary Islamic movement on a class-religious basis emerging in particular situations is certainly not ruled out. One manifestation of such a movement is the underground activity of reactionary organizations like the "Muslim Brotherhood."

The existence in the modern era of diametrically opposing prospects for the social development of liberated countries causes keen arguments over questions of "reforming" Islam. Endless debates about the "Islamic economy," "Islamic revolution" and even "Islamic Marxism and socialism" are held among Muslim theologians and politicians. Depending on the specific conditions, political forces operating under Islamic slogans (they include the resurgent religious semifeudal elite) in some cases embark on an alliance with ruling bourgeois and probourgeois circles, which, of course, does not remove the question of rivalry between them and in others embark on sharp and overt opposition to the forces of capitalist and proimperialist reaction, which, however, is not tantamount to turning toward the choice of the noncapitalist path. Such situations are usually characterized by a quest for a "third path" between capitalism and socialism.

It is not surprising that Islamic political currents, reflecting the struggle between opposing forces, in such situations obtain mass support among traditional strata with no direct connection with modern industrial production. These include, first, the social groups occupying a relatively self-sufficient position in the traditional subsistence and small-scale commodity farming and partly in the emergent small-scale capitalist structure, which still retains the birthmarks of the past (the entrepreneurial section of the so-called "middle strata"). The other social pole to these groups is the various precapitalist -- proletarian and semiproletarian -- elements, the millions of artisans and the poor and extremely poor peasantry. Aligning with the traditional strata are declassé groups of the population -- lumpen proletarians and paupers -- which are of tremendous size, and the huge army that has emerged in recent decades of ruined, "depeasantized" [raskrestyanennyye] working people who have left the countryside, have filled large and medium-sized cities and constitute the social groups most underprivileged by the growth of capitalism. In many countries the role of political leader and ideologist of the traditional strata is performed by representatives of the "free professions" of the civilian and military intelligentsia, petty and medium employees and officials and the technocratic bureaucracy (they are often called the service [sluzhilyy] section of the "middle strata"). However, in Iran, in view of the exceptionally sharp increase in the pressure exerted by national and foreign capitalist production on traditional structures, especially in the last 30 years, and the accumulation in the cities of huge, many millions-strong masses of rural migrants, this role -- especially in a situation of extremely brutal repressions against civilians, and political opposition parties -- passed to the clergy, the basis of whose existence and influence was being undermined by the development of capitalist industrialization and the great spread of the Western, bourgeois way of life.

While struggling above all to retain their own comparatively privileged conditions of existence, the Iranian Shi'ite clergy were at the same time acting in these situations on behalf of all the traditional, semitraditional and marginal strata (and also a section of the modern industrial proletariat) interested in the free and independent development of the country. The slogans of the "Islamic revolution" and the Islamic republic which the clergy put forward were able to become and indeed did become the banner of a national [obshchenatsionalnyy] struggle against domestic and foreign reaction. This was also helped by the multifunctional nature of the Islamic religion as an expression of a distinctive social and cultural community, spiritual force and the most accessible form of social consciousness for the masses. Under these conditions the clergy are theoretically capable of initially securing the successful implementation of the immediate tasks of the national anti-imperialist struggle, which consist of eliminating the forces of the power-corrupted bourgeois-comprador, capitalist and proimperialist reaction, which in general is in line with the direct demands of all the aforementioned social groups.

Clarification of the question of the anti-imperialist clergy's theoretical capacity to retain the role of spokesman for the interests of the whole people during the next, reconstructive -- in other words socially creative -- phase of the liberation movement is closely associated with the analysis of its mass base and of the correlation of class forces.

It goes without saying that the interests of the small property-owning strata that were the pillar of the Iranian clergy, on the one hand, and of persons deprived of the ownership of any means of production, on the other, cannot be identical, notwithstanding all the comparative similarity between the levels of their material positions and their ways of life. Indeed, as the social practice of several Muslim countries, not only of Iran, shows, they hold different interpretations of the slogans of "Islamic revolution" and the Islamic republic that can create a common platform for joint action by them against the monarchy and the dominance of foreign capital during the phase when the tasks of the liberation struggle are being resolved. The first of the aforementioned two groups associates with these slogans a conscious or not entirely conscious possibility of the widespread and massive development of capitalism "from the bottom" while the second invests them with an impulse toward social justice, an impulse reached through suffering in its own way but an impulse that is powerful and spontaneous in all respects.

By virtue of their close ties with the population, with the ordinary people, the clergy cannot help seeking to reconcile these aspirations that are, if not opposing, at any rate mutually intersecting. They begin to act as the mediating force, and this prompts a quest for a "third path" between capitalism and socialism, a quest that in fact ultimately turns into service of the feudal-bourgeois strata and camouflage of that same old capitalist path with paternalist charitable measures in the spirit of the principles of Islam. A direct result of this sort of activity can also be more or less successful attempts to revive the moral and ethical norms of Islam destroyed during the preceding bourgeois development.

The events of the last 4 or 5 years in Iran are a vivid illustration of the so-called "Islamic revival" movement -- that is, the revolution in Iran, the only Muslim country where Islamic political forces on the crest of a people's revolution have been able to assume direct state power. These events are of great interest because in them, in the late 20th century, an antimonarchical and anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle took place under religious slogans. They reveal in detail the peculiarities of the direct political leadership of a revolution by religious circles, and this is what constitutes the novelty of the contemporary Iranian phenomenon.

So it is clearly advisable to examine the main peculiarities of the Iranian revolution during all the stages it has experienced and in close connection with both a general assessment of the revolutionary events and certain conclusions stemming from them.

Right up to the downfall of the shah's monarchy in February 1979 the Iranian revolution developed thanks to joint action by all revolutionary forces in an ascending line both from the viewpoint of the involvement of various social strata in the antishah and anti-imperialist struggle and from the viewpoint of the buildup of revolutionary demands. During the first stage -- from the beginning of the revolution in January 1978 until the introduction of martial law in September of that same year -- the revolutionary struggle, which as yet embraced mainly the traditional, middle strata of the population, was mounted under slogans of democratizing the existing sociopolitical system. During the second stage -- which was characterized by political maneuvering by the shah's regime and culminated in its handover of some power in early January 1979 to the government of S. Bakhtiar, a representative of the liberal section of the "new middle strata," which, along with the industrial proletariat, joined actively in the revolutionary struggle -- a consciousness of the need to totally eliminate the monarchical system gradually ripened among the masses. During the third stage, in January-February 1979, the revolutionary movement of the whole people, assuming a pronounced attacking -- it might be said ferocious -- mass nature, achieved the decisive victory: the overthrow of the shah's regime.

The first point that strikes you when you assess the antishah revolutionary struggle is its people's character. This was determined not only by the composition of the revolution's motive forces, not only by the methods of struggle used in it -- various forms of nonviolent resistance, political strikes by oil workers and workers in other sectors of industry and, finally, an armed uprising -- but also by the universal demands for social justice, which were expressed in the slogan of creating an Islamic republic. This slogan is very popular, clear and simple, but it is vague, extraclass and nonparty. It reflected, on the one hand, the spontaneous desire of the broadest people's masses for a cardinal social restructuring, for the elimination of the monarchy and of the dominance of foreign capital, and, on the other, the hankering of the trading and entrepreneurial section of the "middle strata" for the unimpeded development of national capitalism, which was blocked by the shah's policy of implanting from above -- with the aid of foreign capital -- modern capitalist monopolies and state-monopoly structures. So the subsequent differentiation of the extremely provisional and relative unity of the revolution's political forces is no accident.

The other point that should be noted in making a general assessment of the Iranian revolution is its antimonarchical, anti-imperialist (with an anti-American emphasis) character. During the revolutionary fighting the main assaults were directed against the despotic regime of the shah and U.S. imperialism, which supported it, and against the capitalist monopolies and state-monopoly structures which they actively implanted -- in the interests of strengthening their own political dominance and with a view to giving the country access to the "latest" achievements of Western bourgeois civilization. As early as late 1978 and early 1979 banks and other economic institutions that the people's masses, rising in revolutionary struggle, saw as a symbol of the corrupting influence of the West, financial plundering and capitalist exploitation had been sacked almost everywhere. At this period the expulsion from Iran of almost 40,000 American advisers, mostly military and police advisers, and the members of their families began, and on 16 January Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi left the country. After the victory of the February armed uprising the results of the antimonarchical, anti-imperialist and anti-American struggle were officially enshrined: The monarchy was declared overthrown, a great number of military and civilian contracts with the United States and the other imperialist powers amounting to many billions of dollars were cancelled and all the banks and insurance companies and a number of major heavy industry enterprises were nationalized.

The carrying out of the above measures, which were dictated by the immediate pressing tasks of the revolutionary struggle, does not in principle transcend the bourgeois-democratic framework although, given more favorable conditions and a different nature of leadership of the revolution, these measures could have been the starting point for consistent, large-scale anticapitalist transformations throughout society. Consideration of these circumstances makes it possible to offer a comprehensive assessment of the social content of the Iranian revolution, of the level it has attained and of its future prospects.

Finally, the clarification of the Iranian revolution's specific organizational and ideological basis is of extremely great importance for the full characterization of the revolution. It would be no exaggeration to recognize that the original organizational base of the revolution was chiefly the mosque, and only later institutions such as the bazaar, the universities and plants and oilfields. The main ideological banner of the revolution was the postulates of the Shi'ite branch of Islam, which is popular in origin and has traditions of sacrifice. Since religion was the organizational and ideological basis of the nationwide desire for freedom and prosperity the Islamic Shi'ite hierarchy naturally found itself at the head of the mass revolutionary struggle. What has to be considered here is the fact that the other antishah forces -- truly leftwing, revolutionary and democratic -- were extremely weakened. Specifically and in particular, the Iranian People's [Tudeh] Party had been illegal for over 25 years and was brutally persecuted; its best representatives were physically eliminated or kept for decades in Evin, one of the most terrible prisons in Iran.

Thus, summing up all that has been said about the nature of the Iranian revolution, it can be defined as follows: as a people's and therefore democratic revolution in terms of its motive forces, methods of struggle and the universal demands for social justice; as an antimonarchical, anti-imperialist and acutely anti-American revolution in terms of its basic thrust; as a bourgeois revolution in terms of its social nature (because the definite anticapitalist trends that emerged in it have for the time being remained unrealized); and as an Islamic revolution in terms of its ideological form and the leading role of Shi'ite theologians.

The Iranian revolution represents nothing other than an expression of class struggle, albeit a struggle emerging in unclear forms. The latter fact clearly stems from the inadequate level of development of class differentiation in Iran and from the specifically Islamic organizational basis and ideological form that have made a substantial mark on the revolution.

The frequent use of the term "Islamic revolution" in non-Marxist literature is by no means grounds for depicting events in Iran as some kind of religious coup [perevorot]. For Marxists, this is merely additional evidence that the political movement assumed a religious form and proceeded in religious garb, which has happened many times in the West, the East and Russia. It is true that after the victory of the armed uprising in February 1979 the clergy, who had led the revolution on the basis of their own interests, did everything in their power to consolidate and institutionalize its Islamic organizational basis and ideological forms. In this situation the term "Islamic revolution" acquires a state legal significance too. The Shi'ite clergy are consolidating, setting up and monopolizing their power, rejecting all opposition forces, dealing not only an ideological but also an armed rebuff to them and resorting to terror. So it is still less possible for a class approach to the post-February events in Iran to be based on an assessment of them as phenomena of an exclusively clerical nature. After all, the clergy have ultimately objectively continued to implement very definite class goals. The whole range of socioeconomic measures carried out so far by the new regime is largely in line with the interests of petty and medium trading and entrepreneurial capital, which has squeezed a narrow group of large-scale financial and industrial and comprador magnates out of economic power.

The question that arises in this connection is did the Iranian revolution end with the victory of the armed uprising in February 1979? In our view, it should be held that the uprising ended only the antishah phase of the revolutionary struggle, which was followed by the phase of struggle within the revolutionary camp itself over the choice of path for future development; insofar as this struggle took place in a situation in which tremendous advantages were enjoyed by the clergy, who had mass political and military support and the opportunity to use the levers of state rule, the clergy were gradually able to channel the revolution in a direction in which efforts to consolidate its Islamic organizational basis and ideological forms would determine the main content of the anti-imperialist people's movement. In view of this the new, post-February phase of the political struggle can be described as the critical point of the revolution, as its temporary crisis. But the crisis of a revolution is also a revolution. Either the revolution retreats, or it advances.

However, the February victory, which was achieved primarily through the efforts of all revolutionary democratic forces in Iranian society, did not result immediately and directly in absolute rule by the clergy, which is what the Islamic political forces that implemented general leadership of the revolution desired. The question of power was resolved only in a schematic form and the undisputed leader of the revolution, Ayatollah Khomeyni, was for almost a year the unofficial head of state and asserted his new role as generally recognized leader; at the same time the clergy as a whole had to share certain functions of executive power with pro-Islamic representatives of centrist circles of the "new middle strata" headed by Prime Minister M. Bazargan, who helped in time to secure full power for his government; at the same time revolutionary democratic forces were seeking participation in determining government policy. Thus while in conventional situations the process of creating the new, revolutionary power comes in the postrevolutionary period, in the case in question it was in precisely this sphere that all the internal contradictions of the revolutionary events after February 1979 were

concentrated. In other words, the clashes between different social-class interests continued, although not in the usual form; therefore the revolution too continued, especially as the broad people's masses took a direct part in events. The first stage of the new phase of the revolution ended with the dismissal from power of the Bazargan government in November 1979.

Therefore the struggle for the leading role took place largely within the ranks of Islamic political forces themselves -- between the most consistent representatives of the so-called people's current of Islam in the shape of the clergy and their active supporters, on the one hand, and the champions of utilizing the revolution's achievements chiefly in the interests of the trading and entrepreneurial bourgeoisie, whose sentiments were expressed mainly by President A. Bani-Sadr's grouping, on the other. The weakening of the president's civil power that began in the fall of 1980 seemed to be temporarily halted as a result of the Iraqi-Iranian war, which broke out in September of that year and continues to this day. But nonetheless, by June 1981 Bani-Sadr's groupings was dismissed from power. This was the end of the second stage of the new, post-February phase of the revolution. It is indicative that this stage too was characterized by the involvement of the broad people's masses in the internal political struggle.

The next, third stage of the new phase of the revolution, which began with acute clashes between Shi'ite theological forces that had consolidated their political dominance and a number of leftwing radical and revolutionary democratic organizations, resulted in the establishment of absolute rule by the clergy and its most active supporters. During this stage the direct involvement of the masses in the political struggle was supplemented by the utilization of previously created new armed formations completely dedicated to the clergy. The genuinely people's nature of the revolution began to change, its extremely broad basis began to narrow and those who had become disillusioned with the leadership of a "society of Islamic justice" began to break way from it. A trend that had been gradually emerging finally appeared. The more the new organization of power with its specifically Islamic features (to which the ruling clergy paid paramount attention) strengthened, the more rapidly the foundations of the revolution as a truly people's anti-imperialist and democratic revolution were eroded and few hopes remained that its social aims would be implemented and that the vital interests of the million-strong masses of the Iranian people would be satisfied.

Internal contradictions are also revealed in the new regime's foreign policy. The war with Iraq, which Comrade L.I. Brezhnev has called "a conflict of tragic senselessness" and which has already cost Iran, according to the calculations of certain Western press organs, several tens of thousands of human lives, is a heavy burden on the country. The illusory quest for a "third path" between capitalism and socialism and the attempts to assert in the life of Iranian society in the late 20th century social, economic and moral and ethical norms borrowed from the "sacred" texts of the Koranic Suras, as the social practice of many countries and of Iran itself shows, cannot have any real basis or long-term historical prospects.

This practice is evidence of the political untenability of attempts to adopt a neutral stance regarding basic manifestations of the present-day class struggle in the international arena and regarding the solution of the problem of averting nuclear war and to distance oneself in an alienated fashion from the world socialist community -- the friend and ally of the developing countries' peoples.

The Iranian revolution is still by no means part of history. The Iranian revolution continues, it is raging and seething, it is fighting and shooting, it is dividing orthodox Muslims into two opposing camps. Inside each of these is a multitude of political and philosophical currents, tendencies, desires and simple elementary aspirations on the part of the ordinary people, who are increasingly showing disillusionment with those who only recently were their idols.

A comprehensive and careful analysis of the complex and multifaceted problems of the Iranian revolution can be the result only of long and painstaking research. But such research has an acute need both of an initial generalization of the snowballing factual material and of a solution, if only in the most general terms, of the theoretical

problems that arise on this basis. For "anyone who tackles particular questions without first solving general questions will inevitably unconsciously 'stumble' over these general questions for himself at every step" [V.I. Lenin, Complete Collected Works, Vol 15, p 368].

Considering from this angle the factors that caused the deterioration of the extremely profound political and socioeconomic crisis and the collapse of the shah's regime, it should be said that the main such factor was the grave economic situation and lack of social rights of the broad people's masses. Iran's working people naturally linked with the victory of the antimonarchical, anti-imperialist revolution hopes of an improvement in their economic situation and of an expansion of their sociopolitical rights and freedoms.

Under the direct influence of the broad people's masses, after the revolution Iran's religiopolitical leadership announced an intention to carry out measures in the interests of the "underprivileged." One of the republican government's first steps was to establish complete control over the extraction and sale of the country's main natural resource -- oil, which had previously been in the hands of an international oil consortium. The nationalization of the gas and power industries, and also heavy industry enterprises, private banks and insurance companies was announced. In the 2 years after the revolution, according to foreign press reports, 51 large and around 600 medium and small enterprises were nationalized. By government decree workers' minimum wage was increased from 217 to 567 rials (from \$2.90 to \$7.40) per day. The Ministry of Agriculture announced the nationalization of the large estates that had belonged to minions of the Shah's regime and the leasing of these lands to peasants. A bill on the nationalization of foreign trade was submitted for consideration by the Majlis.

However, thereafter the process of socioeconomic transformations in the interests of broad strata of the Iranian working people was retarded by the resistance of counter-revolution, especially the wing of the industrial and financial bourgeoisie that was closely linked with international capital, and also representatives of the rightwing conservative clergy. The fulfillment of one of the most important provisions of the bill on land -- the provision limiting large landowning, confiscating surplus land from landowners without payment and transferring it to peasants with little or no land -- was suspended on the pretext of the war with Iraq, which began in September 1980.

Without solving one of the main social issues -- that of eliminating large landowning and providing the landless peasants with land -- the Iranian revolution has not fulfilled its purpose for the majority of the people. Rural inhabitants constitute a fairly significant section of Iran's population: out of the more than 37 million Iranians, around 23 million, or 62 percent, live in rural areas. Since the overwhelming majority of peasants are believers, they constitute a favorable environment for the dissemination of the Islamic ideas propagandized by the ruling clergy, who regard them as a firmer prop than the urban population. But although representatives of the clergy talk of "defending the interests of the entire peasantry," in reality the grave economic situation of Iranian peasants persists. Around 540,000 of the 2.5 million peasant households have no land at all. There are around 735,000 households owning less than 1 hectare of land. Thus over 50 percent of peasant households have little or no land; they account for only 1.6 percent of the land. At the same time the 25,000 or so families of large landowners, landlords and representatives of the clergy (who constitute only around 1 percent of the total number of farms) who own parcels of over 50 hectares have more than 20 percent of the total cultivable and long-fallow land in the country. The ruling clergy has not implemented profound agrarian transformations. Only about 1 million hectares of land has been distributed; these are usually nonirrigated and infertile parcels. Some 850,000 hectares have been granted to peasants "for temporary use." Land was confiscated mostly from people who had compromised themselves by cooperating with the shah's regime. About 630,000 hectares of this land has been distributed among the families of members of the "Corps of Guards of the Islamic Revolution," revolutionary committees, and so forth.

Thus large landowning has virtually not been seriously undermined in the more than 3 years since the victory of the antishah revolution in Iran and the question of distributing church lands among the peasants has not been raised at all.

The backwardness of agriculture in Iran persists. Moreover, agricultural production, in which around 7 million peasants are engaged (35 percent of the gainfully employed population), is showing a tendency to decline. Thus by the end of 1981 it had fallen 40-45 percent compared with 1979. In 1981 Iran's government was forced to appropriate almost \$2.2 billion (the figure for 1979 was \$1.4 billion) for purchases of wheat, rice, corn sugar and meat abroad. The volume of meat imports has increased almost sixfold since the revolution. It is true that around 3,000 agricultural consumer cooperative companies whose activity formally embraces around 50,000 villages have been set up in Iran. However, the allocation via these companies of small loans from the funds of the agricultural bank, fertilizers and seeds and the opening of stores to sell industrial goods to peasants have not had any substantial influence on improving the peasantry's position. The loans are often issued on terms whereby an interest rate of 6-9 percent instead of a concessionary 4 percent is levied and the term is reduced. The existence of many middlemen and speculators who buy up a large part of the harvest from the peasants is also retarding the development of agriculture. Of the wheat harvest of almost 6 million tons in 1980, only 400,000 tons were sold to the state.

Since the expulsion of foreign capital Iranian industry has also run up against serious difficulties -- shortages of raw materials, equipment and spare parts. In the opinion of Western observers, industrial production in Iran in 1981 was only about half the production in the prerevolutionary period. The adverse consequences of the imperialist powers' economic "sanctions" against Iran, the war with Iraq, the lack of effective economic planning and the Iranian economy's dependence on the export of oil have had an impact. The number of unemployed has reached 3 million.

Statements by representatives of the clergy and government documents still speak of the importance and necessity of eliminating the economic difficulties, but no specific plans or timetables are put forward. The unresolved nature of the question of attitudes toward private ownership of means of production should clearly be ranked among the main reasons. This form of ownership is recognized by Islam and by the Constitution adopted in December 1979, but in democratically minded circles of the Iranian public and among a section of the clergy proposals are being put forward that its extent be restricted, without which the slogan of defending the interests of the "underprivileged" is simply left hanging in the air. However, the precise limits of this restriction are not being mentioned, just as ways of solving this urgent problem for Iran are not being indicated. So it is natural that the differences between rich and poor should remain. The real social inequality in practice is veiled by "the equality of all people before God."

Proclaiming the building of an egalitarian society in Iran, the Iranian leadership is advocating the creation of a so-called "tawhid" economy -- that is, bringing the country's economy into line with the demands of Islam and "unifying" it ("tawhid" is one of the main postulates of Islam, meaning unification, monotheism) with traditional spheres of life. The clergy interpret this principle as the elimination of inequality, the unification of production and consumption, production according to ability and "consumption according to piety." At the same time slogans opposing "wasteful consumption" and advocating "the renunciation of greed and turning toward Allah" are being proclaimed. The supporters of creating a "tawhid" economy believe that private ownership of means of production must be confirmed to small enterprises while large plants and factories must belong to the state, but that overdevelopment of the state sector must be curbed and the emergence of monopolies prevented. The slogan "Bar the way to any kind of concentration of ownership and capital" effectively promotes the development of the petty bourgeoisie in the country. Thus the concept of the "Islamic" or "tawhid" economy represents a combination of principles aimed at protecting small propertied interests from a standpoint of Islam.

The Iranian leadership has repeatedly emphasized that the economy must not be based only on oil revenue. The improvement of the tax system so that taxes are not a heavy burden on poor strata of the population has been mentioned as one of the main sources of budget revenue. The people greet positively this statement of the question. However, no specific ways of fulfilling this task have been indicated. The size of the capital of large entrepreneurs in the private sector, on whom the taxes are primarily to be levied, has not been determined. Intentions to abolish interest are being expressed,

citing Islamic norms. This is scarcely possible under the conditions of developed commodity-money exchange in both the city and the countryside, especially when you consider Iran's involvement in the world currency and credit system.

The unsolved nature of the many acute economic problems that the Islamic Republic of Iran has run up against is paving the way for the further complication of the economic situation of broad working people's masses and a sharpening of the class struggle in Iranian society.

Thus the Iranian revolution is experiencing a complex stage in its development. By and large three sociopolitical forces have emerged in the political arena in Iran today: the ruling Shi'ite clergy (extremely heterogeneous in composition), the liberal bourgeoisie, which is aspiring to access to the levers of power, and the various detachments of leftwing democratic forces.

Some of the clergy realize the need to continue a consistent struggle against the united front of international imperialism, headed by the United States, and to carry out profound socioeconomic transformations in the working people's interests. But the conservative wing of the clergy, which reflects the interests of feudal landowning circles and big capital, is clearly afraid of the further growth of the revolutionary process. It is prepared to compromise with counterrevolution and to restore Iran's dependence on the United States. This, of course, is opposed by the broad people's masses, primarily the working class, revolutionary young people and the advanced intelligentsia, which often preaches "Islamic Marxism." The liberal bourgeoisie, though it has been squeezed out of power, has not abandoned its attempts to overthrow the Islamic anti-imperialist regime, seize the reins of government and steer Iran down the capitalist dependent path. The leftwing democratic forces most fully express Iranian working people's aspirations and operate from sharply anti-American, truly anti-imperialist positions. But they are disunited because of disagreements over questions of strategy and tactics, which are sometimes artificially dramatized. Moreover, they are subjected to attacks and repression.

The future direction of the development of the Iranian revolution will to a considerable extent depend on whether Iran's progressive and above all leftwing forces succeed in creating a united people's front of struggle in defense of the revolution's gains based on a firm anti-imperialist course and the implementation of radical socioeconomic transformations in the interests of broad strata of the working people, especially the millions of underprivileged people's masses.

It is riveting attention as a revolution full of contradictory potentialities that contains the possibility of sharp turn-arounds in the future.

CSO: 1802/16

THE CPSU AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 82 pp 117-119

[Review by Prof N. Kuz'min, doctor of historical sciences, of the book "KPSS i Voennoye Stroitel'stvo" [The CPSU and Military Construction], Voenizdat, Moscow, 1982, 311 pp]

[Text] Problems of defending the gains of Great October and providing peaceful conditions for socialist and communist construction have always been the focus of attention of the party of Lenin and the Soviet state.

The dialectics of history is such that as imperialism's positions are weakened its most reactionary forces and ruling circles step up the arms race and make efforts to whip up war hysteria in order to change the correlation of forces in the world in its own favor. Assessing the current international situation, the 26th CPSU Congress noted that it is characterized primarily by the intensive struggle of the two trends in world politics. On the one hand there is the course of the USSR, the countries of the socialist comity and other peace-loving forces aimed at curbing the arms race, strengthening peace and detente and protecting the sovereign rights and freedoms of nations; on the other hand there is the course taken by the reactionary imperialist forces spearheaded by the ruling circles of the United States and aimed at undermining detente, stepping up the arms race and conducting a policy of threats and interference in others' affairs and putting down national liberation struggles.

The multifarious experience of Soviet military construction has been profoundly generalized and elaborated in CPSU documents and the works of Soviet scientists.

Recently, Voenizdat published the monograph "KPSS i Voennoye Stroitel'stvo," prepared by the Institute of Military History of the USSR Ministry of Defense, edited by Army General A. A. Yepishev.

The work elucidates the general laws governing Soviet military construction, the activities of the CPSU in strengthening the defensive potential of the Soviet state and the Soviet Armed Forces; the activities of the military councils serving as the organs of military leadership; the place and role of party-political work in strengthening the USSR's Armed Forces and the CPSU's work with military cadres.

The work emphasizes that the party, creatively implementing Lenin's ideas about the defense of the socialist fatherland, serves as the inspiration, the leading and guiding force in Soviet military construction, in enhancing the moral-political and combat strength of the Soviet Army and Navy and their constant readiness to give a devastating rebuff to the aggressive forces of imperialism and defend the peaceful labor of the Soviet people. The main source of the strength and indestructibility of the USSR's Armed Forces is the fact that by their class nature, goals and tasks they reflect the nature of the socialist social and state structure, which is based on the unshakable alliance of the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry, the Soviet intelligentsia and the friendship of all peoples, nations and nationalities of the USSR under the leadership role of the multinational working class, the monolithic unity of the Soviet people under the guidance of the communist party.

The leadership of the CPSU is the foundation of the construction and development of the Soviet Armed Forces. It is pointed out in the book that the party's leadership of military construction and the Armed Forces is political in character. It is exercised on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory, the ideology and policies of the CPSU, in accordance with the USSR Constitution, on the basis of the laws and legal norms that are in effect in the Soviet state.

The processes taking place in the country's social development are reflected in the army and the navy. This is applicable, first, to the make-up of the Armed Forces, which is determined by the class structure of society, the level of its education and social consciousness; it is applicable, secondly, to the technical outfitting, the means of conducting military operations. Under present conditions, Lenin's conclusion retains its validity--namely, that the build-up of our army was successful to the extent that "it was created in the spirit of overall Soviet construction, on the basis of class relations which are in effect in the area of any construction effort" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 40, p 77).

The work presents a detailed exposition of the strength and vitality of the system of leadership of the Armed Forces, the nucleus of which is the party. The main thing in party leadership is the elaboration of the Soviet state's military policies, the definition of their aims and missions, ensuring a constant link with the party's overall policies. Party leadership also calls for determining the concrete forms and methods of implementing the military policies that have been worked out, conducting constant organizational, political and ideological work among the Armed Forces. The core of all this work, the book notes, is the mobilization of the troops to successfully carry out the tasks of defending the gains of socialism and perfect the forms of organization and combat and political training of the troops and naval forces, the selection and assignment of cadres, and verification of execution of the party's decisions in the Armed Forces.

The CPSU constantly and systematically conducts considerable work on educating the fighting men of the army and navy, all the Soviet people, in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, Soviet patriotism and proletarian, socialist internationalism. The party focuses special attention on strengthening the unshakable unity of the Armed Forces and the Soviet people, the comprehensive support of the army and navy by the Soviet people.

The work presents a detailed and well-argued proof that our party and its Central Committee, guided by Lenin's teachings, are undertaking all necessary measures to strengthen the country's defense and enhance the strength and combat readiness of the Soviet Armed Forces.

The work analyzes the multifaceted activities of the CC CPSU and its Politburo in further strengthening the USSR's defense capability and enhancing the combat and political readiness of the Armed Forces. "...The Politburo of the CC CPSU, the government of the USSR and all others who are directly involved in matters of strengthening the country's defense," said L. I. Brezhnev, "are manifesting the maximum concern for enhancing the military strength of the army and navy, for improving military equipment and the combat training of the personnel."

The monograph devotes considerable space to an elucidation of the principles of party leadership of the Armed Forces. They are based on the general principles governing the party's supervision of all spheres of the life of society. By their nature they are political in character and are applied in consideration of the character and characteristics of the sphere of military construction. As the book points out, the most important principles of party leadership in the army and navy primarily comprise a scientific, objective, realistic approach to the evaluation of any state of affairs and prospective developments. The CPSU is constantly guided by Lenin's teachings that the party "must act on a scientific basis" (op. cit., Vol 41, p 65).

The book devotes considerable space to an elucidation of the CPSU's activities in strengthening the Soviet state's defense potential. It views in their historical aspect the military-economic and scientific-technical measures the party has taken to strengthen the USSR's defense and build up its social-political foundations. It elucidates the growing role of the political system of Soviet society, the nucleus of which is the CPSU, in resolving the tasks of military construction, improving the Armed Forces, and enhancing their combat capabilities and readiness.

The authors systematically demonstrate the dialectical interconnections of the activities of all links of the Armed Forces which are responsible for implementing the party's policies among the troops--the military councils, political organs, party organizations and command cadres. Special importance attaches to generalizing the work experience of the military councils, because not much has been written about this matter up to now. Also deserving attention is the detailed analysis of the role and place of party-political work in implementing the party's military policies, in strengthening the combat potential and military readiness of the Soviet Armed Forces.

The work focuses special attention on the role and place of party-political work in strengthening the USSR's Armed Forces. In analyzing the complex of problems involved in this theme, the authors proceed on the basis of Lenin's statement that "in any war, victory is determined in the long run by the spiritual state of the masses who are shedding their blood on the battlefield" (op. cit., Vol 41, p 121).

The authors rightly emphasize that party-political work in the army and the navy constitutes a powerful party tool. One of the key thrusts in the party's activities is the improvement of this work, the patriotic and internationalist education of the Soviet people. The necessity of enhancing its effectiveness under present conditions is dictated by the worsening confrontation of the two social systems, the whipping up of international tension by the reactionary forces of imperialism and their striving to disrupt the present approximate equality of forces and achieve military superiority. The defensive might of the USSR is the most important factor of peace, holding in check the imperialist aggressors headed by the United States. As was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress, imperialism is putting into action a whole system of measures designed to subvert the socialist world, to bring about its dissolution. The bourgeoisie and its hirelings are systematically conducting hostile campaigns against the socialist countries. They are blackening and distorting everything that is taking place in these countries. For them the main thing is to turn people away from socialism.

The party proceeds on the basis that in the struggle between the two world views there is no place for neutralism and compromise. What is needed is a high level of political vigilance, efficient and well-thought-out effective propaganda efforts and timely rebuffs to hostile ideological sabotage. The CPSU is doing everything it can to strengthen ideological and political-educational work among the masses and is undertaking the necessary steps to enhance the combat strength and constant readiness of the USSR's Armed Forces to repel any aggressor.

The book investigates the problem of the unity of the national and international tasks of the defense of socialism, the build-up and training of the fraternal armies of the socialist comity, taking account of the profound and irreversible changes in the international arena. For the first time the work shows, in its broad historical and social-political aspects, the significance of such a fundamental gain of the Soviet people as the establishment of military-strategic parity in the world. Achieved at the beginning of the 1970's between the USSR and the United States, between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, it serves the cause of peace and the strengthening of the defense capability of world socialism on the principle of equality and identical security of the two sides. The CPSU and the other fraternal communist parties are striving to maintain and strengthen this parity, to make it the starting point for a gradual restriction of the arms race, reducing the level of military confrontation and the danger of nuclear war.

As was pointed out at the 26th party congress, today more than ever the Soviet Union and its allies are the main bastion of peace on earth. The countries of the socialist comity have established a principled unity of views with respect to all major problems of domestic and international development. This has resulted from the constant interaction of the fraternal communist parties. In resolving the tasks of internal and international policies, the role and authority of the CPSU, the great party of Lenin, is steadily rising. As was mentioned at the 26th party congress, it is now, in light of the impressive achievements of the Soviet people, that Lenin's well-known formula is perceived even more profoundly: the party is the mind, honor and conscience of our era.

This is graphically evident in all spheres of creative activities of the Soviet people, including the sphere of military construction and the strengthening of the country's defense capability.

In assessing the monograph it must be pointed out above all that it has made use in generalized form of the findings of previously published investigations and published documents dealing with problems of Soviet military construction. At the same time, the book marks a new step forward in elaborating current problems of party leadership of Soviet military construction and strengthening of the USSR's Armed Forces at the stage of developed socialism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/16

ATHEISTIC LITERATURE: SEARCHES AND PROBLEMS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 82 pp 119-125

[Review by Prof M. Novikov, doctor of philosophical sciences, and Yu. Pishchik, candidate of philosophical sciences]

[Text] In communist upbringing, a vital role is assigned to literature on scientific atheism. Everyone is aware of the great significance V. I. Lenin attached to the publication of publicistic works capable of interesting the masses "in a conscious attitude toward religious matters and a conscious critique of religion" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 45, p 27). At the same time, he warned against dry, boring restatements of generally known truths and recommended translating the vigorous, lively, talented atheistic literature of the past, providing it with scientific commentary and exposition of the development of atheistic views.

Lenin's teachings are topical in our days as well. Substantial studies have been published that are profound in content and interesting in form, dealing with problems of the theory and history of atheism and generalizing the practical experience of party committees and social organizations in conducting atheistic propaganda and incorporating the recommendations and measures contained in these studies into integrated plans of atheistic upbringing. There is no scarcity of books on the history of religion, the critique of religious ideology and religious-idealistic philosophy, the analysis of today's religious-political movements and the shared interests of believers and unbelievers in the struggle for peace and social progress.

In the past 5 years, more than 750 books on scientific atheism have come out in Russian alone. A vital role in the publication of atheistic literature is assigned to Politizdat, which has given readers over 100 works. They include the classics of Marxism-Leninism, textbooks, handbooks, a variety of reference literature, scientific and artistic classics and contemporary studies, the "Atheist's Library" series for propagandists and agitators, and booklets intended for a broad circle of persons interested in matters of atheism and religion, including believers, and so on. Their authors include some eminent Soviet scientists--Academicians B. M. Kedrov, I. V. Petryanov-Sokolov, A. M. Prokhorov and V. A. Engel'gardt, USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding Member I. R. Grigulevich, and others. Books published by this publishing house get sold out immediately.

Also of considerable interest are booklets from the "Scientific Atheism" series of the All-Union Znaniye Society. They are deservedly popular among lecturers and propagandists and teachers of scientific atheism. The highly qualified authors' aktiv enables the Znaniye Publishing House to elucidate the most topical, lively problems of theory and practice of atheistic upbringing as well as the status of religion and the church in our country and abroad. There has also been a substantial increase in published works of atheistic literature in Kazakhstan, where more than 30 books and booklets were published in a 5-year period.

It must be noted regretfully, nevertheless, that in terms of their thematics, theoretical level and practicality by no means do all atheistic publications meet the growing spiritual needs of readers. Also very striking is the fact that some publishing houses are not paying the same attention to the publication of atheistic literature. Atheistic problems are the stepchild in such publishing houses as Detskaya Literatura, Pedagogika and Prosveshcheniye. There has been a dramatic decline in attention to atheistic literature in the CC Komsomol and AUCCTU publishing houses. It is astonishing to note that Molodaya Gvardiya's plans for 1982 include no atheistic literature. Perhaps it would be worthwhile to pursue the course of publishing thematic yearbooks, as the publishing house did until recently, publishing the collection "Mir Cheloveka" [The World of Man] that was so interesting and in popular demand. The Nauka Publishing House has also virtually ceased the publication of popular atheistic literature; for years it made substantial contributions to the propaganda of scientific atheism.

A knowledge and understanding of the processes taking place in contemporary religion is unthinkable without a serious historical literature.

In recent years there has been somewhat of a rise in interest toward problems of the primitive forms of religion. There are serious works on the mythology of the ancient world, also Australia and Africa, and the peoples of our country. A major event was the appearance of the two-volume encyclopedic work "Mify Narodov Mira" [Myths of the World's Peoples]. It must be pointed out, nevertheless, that despite a rather substantial number of books dealing with the history of religion, in many ways they do not meet today's requirements. There are a number of problems of ideological importance to which our researchers are paying inadequate attention. Worth singling out specially among these problems are those having to do with religious-political movements in the past and present, religion in the spiritual life of society.

We cannot overlook the fact that in the publication of historical works there is a sense of lack of direction, they are being published at random and not without a touch of archaism. For dozens of years there has been talk of the necessity of scientific publications on the history of the church in Russia, the activities of the monasteries and so on. And it is this theme which today is the subject of all kinds of falsifications by our ideological adversaries. Various Christian societies have recently undertaken vigorous publishing and propaganda in connection with the 1,000th anniversary of the adoption of Christianity in Russia and the 2,000th anniversary of Christianity. The importance of a Marxist elucidation of the history of Christian and other churches in the regard is obvious.

Various works on the history of the Eastern religions have been published in recent years--Buddhism, Lamaism and Hinduism. They include G. M. Bongard-Levin's "Drevneindiyskaya Tsivilizatsiya. Filosofiya, Nauka, Religiya" [Ancient Indic Civilization. Philosophy, Science, Religion] (Moscow, Nauka, 1980); N. R. Guseva's "Induizm. Istoriya Formirovaniya. Kul'tovaya Praktika" [Hinduism. History of Its Formation. Cult Practices] (Moscow, Nauka, 1977); G. G. Stratanovich's "Narodnyye Verovaniya Naseleniya Indokitaya" [National Beliefs of the Population of Indochina] (Moscow, Nauka, 1978); N. N. Bektimirova's "Buddiyskaya Sangkha v Nezavisimoy Kampuchii" [The Buddhist Sangha in Independent Kampuchea] (Moscow, Nauka, 1981); A. I. Ionova's "Islam v Yugo-Vostochnoy Azii: Problemy Sovremennoy Ideynoy Evolyutsii" [Islam in Southeast Asia: Problems of Contemporary Ideological Evolution] (Moscow, Nauka, 1981); and others. Of unquestionable value is the reference literature on the religion of the countries of Asia and Africa prepared by G. A. Shpazhnikov. One can hardly be gratified, however, by the fact that in research on the social nature of the Eastern religions there is a predominance of historical problems, also the lack of contentful books on the nontraditional Eastern cults that have become widespread among various groups of young people in Western Europe and America. Readers also have a right to expect highly scholarly works elucidating the characteristics of today's religious-political movements in the developing countries, the specifics of the social-political and ideological struggle under the banner of Islam and new tendencies in the activities of the clergy and believers operating in the framework of religious slogans.

Although some successes can be noted in the study of the history of religion, the same cannot be said about the history of atheism and free thinking. We can only cite Z. A. Tazhurizina's "Aktual'nyye Voprosy Istorii Ateizma" [Current Problems of the History of Atheism] (Moscow, Izd'vo Moskovskiy Universitet, 1979), A. D. Sukhov's "Ateizm Peredovykh Russkikh Mysliteley" [The Atheism of Leading Russian Thinkers] (Moscow, Mysl', 1980), and a number of works by G. M. Livshits. One of the shortcomings of works dealing with the nature and essence of the atheism of the Russian revolutionary democrats is their tenuous link with modern times, with the struggle against the recidivists of slavophilism, the back-to-the-soil movement and the like. Rather striking is the absence of fundamental research on the origin, development and evolution of atheistic ideas both on the theoretical level and in everyday consciousness, reflections of them in artistic literature, the graphic and applied arts, the natural sciences and humanities, in popular crafts and the social-political movements of the masses. There is an appreciable shortage of textbooks on the history of atheistic teachings.

Among the numerous problems investigated in Marxist atheism, one of the most important is that of demonstrating the atheistic significance of scientific views of the world, man and society, revelation of the moral significance of atheism, its role in social progress and culture. The point, in other words, is the shaping of a scientific-materialist world view and an atheist conviction determining the individual's life stance and his place in the contemporary struggle of ideas. In his foreword to M. P. Gapochka's "Materializm Protiv Fideizma. Leninskiye Printsipy Kritiki Fideizma i Sovremennost'" [Materialism Against Fideism. Lenin's Principles of the Critique of Fideism in Our Time] (Moscow, Politizdat, 1980), Academician P. N. Fedoseyev writes that "affirmation

of the principles of dialectical materialism and the scientific world view is taking place today under conditions of the ever sharpening ideological struggle in the world arena. Among the adversaries of the scientific world view we may note the reactivation of the activities of religious-mystical philosophy, proclaimed by the bourgeois ideologues as an integral world view capable of competing with dialectical materialism. Such claims by the apologists of the antiscientific world view constitute evidence of the profound crisis in bourgeois philosophical thought."

Indeed, it is now necessary to take a somewhat different view of the problem of relations between the scientific and the religious world view, science and religion. It is hardly justified to view this problem as a simple historical antithesis. Science always opposes religion, and any scientific knowledge or scientific discovery strikes a blow against religion. Under present conditions of the scientific-technical revolution, the problem of relations between the scientific and the religious world view is a good deal more complex. Today the church does not come out openly against science; quite the contrary, it appeals with increasing frequency to scientific authority, adapting scientific achievements to its own dogmas. This is why it is wrong to reduce the critical-atheistic factor to mere opposition, even one which is at first glance advantageous. History has shown that the churchmen will always strive to adapt even to quite unexpected turnarounds in scientific thinking. Theology today is inclined to accept atheism's reproach that for centuries the church fought with science and did not understand its historic role. Theologians even regret that the church has been characterized by a slow pace of the "development of the complex process of Christianity's emergence from self-isolation, its break with the complacent but narrow-minded conservatism of Christian provincialism, its liberation from centuries of entrenched social prejudices and its entry into fearless, objective perception of reality" ("Bogoslovskiye Trudy" [Theological Works]. Collection No 6. Moscow, publications of the Moscow Patriarchate, 1971, p 171). The task, consequently, is more complex. It is essential to demonstrate the nontransient significance of the scientific world view in shaping the spiritual world of the individual in all its richness and variety, its role in the development of one's values and life stance. Many interesting conclusions with regard to this problem are to be found in the works of M. P. Gapochka, V. I. Garadzha, I. G. Ivanov, A. S. Onishchenko, V. A. Saprykin and V. I. Shinkaruk.

Different publishing houses have put out a number of works addressed directly to the teacher and the senior class pupil. Unfortunately, many of them present their materials in an uninteresting manner, make use of excessive examples and are not well provided with methodological recommendations.

Among the complex and topical problems involved in shaping the scientific-materialist world view, mention should be made of the question of superstitions that has so repeatedly been raised in our literature. Without going into an analysis of the various positions taken on this question, we should like to focus attention on the undoubted link between the dissemination of superstitious notions, indifference in world views and inconsistency. Belief in various kinds of omens, talismans, astrology and telekinesis is frequently accompanied by lack of ideological discrimination, especially among young people. This

is why it is so important in educational terms to demonstrate the causes of the rise, spread and long-term retention of superstitions in traditions and customs. Yet all too few books are being published on this problem.

L. I. Ibrayev's "Skvoz' Liki Mira. Kritika Filosofskikh Osnovaniy Mistitsizma" [Through the Assemblies of the World. Critique of the Philosophical Foundations of Mysticism] (Moscow, Molodaya Gvardiya, 1979) and Ye. I. Parnov's "Bogi Lotosa" [The Gods of the Lotus] (Moscow, Politizdat, 1980), and certain others, are not enough to resolve this problem.

A knowledge of contemporary religion and religious practices and an understanding of the processes taking place in them largely depend on how comprehensively we have studied the characteristics of contemporary religion's influence on man, how fully we take account of the individuality of different types of people on whom this influence is exerted. In the preceding 5-year period numerous sociological studies of religiosity were made, making it possible to develop effective techniques of atheistic influence.

Serious works were published containing substantial sociological analysis of religious practice under socialism: I. N. Yablokov's "Sotsiologiya Religii" [Sociology of Religion] (Moscow, Mysl', 1979), V. D. Kobetskiy's "Sotsiologicheskoye Izucheniye Religioznosti i Ateizma" [Sociological Study of Religiosity and Atheism] (Leningrad, Izd'vo Leningradskiy Universitet, 1978), and many others. They constitute a substantial contribution to the in-depth study of processes taking place. Nevertheless, these sociological studies continue to lack practical conclusions and recommendations, precise and concrete proposals with respect to the adoption of their findings in the practice of atheistic propaganda, in perfecting the instruction process in the VUZ's, the secondary specialized schools, in the cultural universities, the labor collectives and in residential instruction. The same reproach can be made of works on the psychology of today's believer.

One of the most important trends in atheistic efforts is the investigation of problems of the interaction of religion and the arts, religion and spiritual culture. These problems are examined in a number of monographs, including Ye. G. Yakovlev's "Iskusstvo i Mirovyye Religii (Sistema Iskusstv v Strukture Mirovykh Religiy)" [Art and the World Religions (The System of Arts in the Structure of World Religions)] (Moscow, Vysshaya Shkola, 1977), D. M. Ugrinovich's "Protivorechiya Religioznogo Iskusstva" [Contradictions of Religious Art] (Moscow, Znaniye, 1976). In the preparation of such works, however, an insignificant role is still played by the scientific-research institutes dealing with cultural problems, publishing houses and creative unions. At the same time, it has become fashionable in publicistics and artistic literature to depict the first years of Soviet rule as a time of neglect toward cultural monuments, including religious monuments, and even total destruction. The problem of the treatment of the cultural heritage of the past has become one means of realizing the ideas of the God-seekers, the falsification of Russian history, and sometimes simple echoing of theological and other idealistic concepts.

Attention is also drawn to the fact that many masters of the literary word have ceased to deal with problems of atheism. Back in the 1960's, Politizdat published a number of interesting collections compiled from the works of

outstanding Russian, Soviet and foreign writers such as M. Gor'kiy, V. Korolenko, T. Dreiser, J. Galsworthy, H. Balzac and others. But this initiative was never taken up by the other publishing houses.

As we know, in the course of its historical development religion fully penetrated all spheres of life, and it is for this reason that it has preserved its own position to this day. Even today, in socialist society, religion mostly functions as everyday religiosity, the practice of religious rituals and the observance of certain traditions in everyday life. Accordingly, it is necessary to expel religion from this sphere of existence, to develop and popularize a new, socialist system of holidays and rituals. A number of party documents deal with this matter.

Efforts in this regard have been noticeably reactivated in recent years. Two all-union conferences have been held to deal with problems of the development of socialist rituals, and more and more of the relevant literature is being produced. In contrast to previous years, the process of developing socialist rituals involves more than simple expulsion of religious rituals; it has become broader, in the framework of the objective process of the immanent development of a new society, as one of the natural patterns of development of the socialist way of life, man of the communist type. This process must be based on a knowledge of folk traditions and customs, stripping the religious encrustation from those positive factors of man's moral life and the history of his family and domestic relations that are of permanent value. This is why the growing interest in folk customs is not accidental, the folk calendar, those holidays and ceremonies which have been part of human life for centuries. The publication of a number of fundamental works dealing with calendar holidays, undertaken by the Institute of Ethnography imeni N. N. Miklukho-Maklay of the USSR Academy of Sciences and other scientific centers, based on materials investigating the life of the peoples of our country and of foreign countries can only be welcomed and viewed as a positive step in the treatment of this vital problem (see, for example, "Kalendarnyye Obychai i Obryady v Stranakh Zarubezhnoy Yevropy XIX-Nachalo XX v." [Calendar Customs and Ceremonies in the European Countries 19th to Early 20th Centuries]. Books 1-3. Moscow, Nauka, 1973-1978; A. I. Mazayev, "Prazdnik kak Sotsial'no-Khudozhestvennoye Yavleniye. Opyt Istoriko-Teoreticheskogo Issledovaniya" [The Holiday as a Social-Artistic Phenomenon. Experience of Historical-Theoretical Investigation], Moscow, Nauka, 1978; "Prazdniki, Obryady, Traditsii" [Holidays, Ceremonies, Traditions], Second edition, Moscow, Molodaya Gvardiya, 1979; "Semeynaya Obryadnost' Narodov Sibiri. Opyt Sravnitel'nogo Izucheniya" [Family Rituals of the Peoples of Siberia. Experience of Comparative Study], Moscow, Nauka, 1980; "Sem'ya i Semeynyye Obryady u Narodov Sredney Azii i Kazakhstana" [The Family and Family Rituals Among the Peoples of Central Asia and Kazakhstan], Moscow, Nauka, 1978; I. V. Sukhanov, "Obychai, Traditsii i Preyemstvennost' Pokoleniy" [Customs, Traditions and Continuity of Generations], Moscow, Politizdat, 1976; and others).

We can hardly ignore the fact, however, that the content of the mass popular literature intended for organizers of ceremonies, young people and believers is not yet up to today's requirements. Such works inadequately elucidate the experience of development of Soviet ceremonies. The issues that are raised

are dealt with in a declarative, random and exclusive manner, and although it is no longer recommended that Komsomol weddings be conducted in a commercial manner, and violations of sanitary and hygienic norms are no longer the rule in the religious christening ritual, nevertheless the argumentation of the criticism of religion services, and also practical recommendations and advice with respect to new ceremonies, generally remain a weak point.

A key role in dealing with the problems of socialist rituals, obviously, must be played by researchers and state and social institutions in the Ukraine. For the Ukraine was the first in our country to create a Commission for Soviet Traditions, Holidays and Ceremonies under the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR. Our Ukrainian comrades initiated the holding of all-union conferences to deal with these matters and are systematically organizing republic and oblast seminars. The republic has created a well-organized--and, more important, a truly functional--system of training for the relevant cadres. Our Ukrainian comrades have conducted a number of serious investigations into Soviet ritual practices and have published works generalizing the experience of their organization. Among them we may cite N. M. Zakovich's "Sovetskaya Obryadnost' i Dukhovnaya Kul'tura" [Soviet Rituals and Spiritual Culture], Kiev, Naukova Dumka, 1980; U. N. Yel'chenko's "Novomu Cheloveku--Novyye Obryady" [New Ceremonies for the New Man], Moscow, Politizdat, 1976; V. Ye. Ostrozhinskiy's "Obryadnost' v Nashey Zhizni" [Ceremonies in Our Life], Moscow, Politizdat, 1980; and "Sotsialisticheskaya Obryadnost' i Formirovaniye Novogo Cheloveka" [Socialist Ceremonies and the Shaping of the New Man], Kiev, Politizdat Ukrainy, 1979.

In 1977, Politizdat published a large and nicely designed monograph "Nashi Prazdniki (Sovetskiye, Obshchegosudarstvennyye, Trudovyye, Voinskiye, Molodezhnyye i Semeyno'bytovyye Prazdniki, Obryady, Ritualy)" [Our Holidays (Soviet, State-wide, Labor, Military, Youth and Family-Domestic Holidays, Ceremonies, Rituals)]. This book has been well received by specialists and readers. It reports the abundant experience of serious work in the field of creating ceremonies conducted in the past 10 years. One would think that now it is time to consider the broad adoption of the ceremonies that have been supported by the people and have become a natural phenomenon in social life. In connection with this we should like to focus attention on a small work called "Programma Kurasa Podgotovki Ispolniteley Obryadov" [Program of a Course of Training for Conductors of Ceremonies] (Kiev, 1979). This is a useful work, because many soviet organs and organizers of ceremonies called upon to conduct such occasions still act in a disorganized and amateurish manner, making mistakes that have long since been discarded in practice.

Religion occupies an increasingly important role in the present-day policies of the imperialist states. One could mention a number of valuable and useful booklets on this theme by M. V. Andreyev, A. V. Belov, L. N. Velikovich, N. S. Gordiyenko, N. A. Koval'skiy and others. We cannot, nevertheless, ignore the absence of fundamental research on the process of converting religion into an important factor of world policy.

The Institute of Scientific Atheism under the CC CPSU's Academy of Social Sciences has prepared and published two interesting works: "Religiya i Tserkov'

v Sovremennuyu Epokhu" [Religion and the Church in the Contemporary Era], (Moscow, Mysl', 1976), and "Religiya i Tserkov' v Kapitalisticheskikh Stranakh" [Religion and the Church in the Capitalist Countries], (Moscow, Mysl', 1977), which present a profound and multifaceted analysis of the social role of religion in today's world. They do not, however, adequately elucidate the link between religion and politics, the role of religion in shaping the political doctrines of contemporary imperialism.

Of current topicality today is the question of the necessity of a concrete approach to elucidation of the role of religious organizations in particular countries, in connection with the characteristics and specifics of the social-political situation there. I. R. Grigulevich's interesting "'Myatezhnaya' Tserkov' v Latinskoy Amerike" [The "Mutinous" Church in Latin America] comes to mind, which presents a detailed, differentiated analysis of religion's role both in individual Latin American countries and on the continent as a whole. No works of this type have been published in recent years. There are only a few works which analyze the introduction of religion into the sphere of activities of the social movements and organizations (trade union, women's and youth organizations, and so on) and the bourgeois mass information media.

Clerical anticommunism and the falsification of the status of religion and the church in a socialist society are the theme of a substantial number of books and pamphlets, an analysis of which indicates that most of them are intended for propagandists and lecturers rather than believers, and they fail to present material which would open their eyes to the long-range plans of our ideological adversaries and unmask the most typical techniques of the Western anti-Soviet propaganda centers. Even Politizdat's yearbook "Argumenty" [Arguments], unfortunately, presents mostly "heavy" materials intended more for specialists than for the masses, especially the believers.

Attention has now been drawn to the necessity of translating into Russian the best foreign literature concerned with problems of atheism and the critique of religion. Thus, works by A. Tenase, P. Berard and Z. Kosidovskiy, scientists of the socialist countries, and books by Western Marxists A. Donini and R. Steigerwald have been published. The lack of literature on Islam has been filled somewhat in recent times by the appearance of the works of F. Rosental and W. Watt, but they are not enough to resolve the problem mentioned above. In 1980 a new translation was published of the fundamental classic work investigating magic by the famous British expert on religion J. Frazer, "The Golden Bough. A Study of Magic and Religion." We would also like to see the propagandists get their hands on the works of E. Taylor, L. Ya. Sternberg, N. M. Nikol'skiy and others. Mention should also be made of the first publication in Russian (in the "Philosophical Heritage" series published by Mysl') of two volumes of Hegel's "Philosophies of Religion," which has become a major cultural event.

A number of relevant studies by scientists of socialist countries have come out: the Soviet-Polish work "Katolitsizm-77" [Catholicism-77], the Soviet-Bulgarian "Gumanizm, Ateizm, Religiya" [Humanism, Atheism, Religion], the USSR-GDR "Religiya v Vek Naukhno-Tekhnicheskoy Revolyutsii" [Religion in an Age of Scientific-Technical Revolution], "Ateisticheskoye Vospitaniye Studencheskoy

Molodezhi. Sbornik Trudov Uchenykh Sotsialisticheskikh Stran" [Atheistic Education of Student Youth. A Collection of Works by Scientists of the Socialist Countries], and others.

The foundation of success in atheistic education calls for close unity with other forms of educational work, an integrated, systematic approach to the process of overcoming religious influences. A key role in this is assigned to the party committees. Unfortunately, the publication of methodological literature to aid them is far below the requirements of our time. A number of books have become bibliographical rarities, for example "O Nauchnom Ateizme i Ateisticheskoy Vospitaniy" [Scientific Atheism and Atheistic Education], a handbook for party activists and organizers of atheistic work, and "Partiynaya Organizatsiya i Ateisticheskoye Vospitaniye" [The Party Organization and Atheistic Education], which have served and still serve as excellent guides for party committees. There are no plans to republish them in the near future, but there should be. There is also a lack of systematic and goal-oriented publication of literature for the network of party education and people's universities of atheism.

The booklets designed for propagandists of scientific atheism have an excess of generalities, examples and quotations that are repeated in work after work, but very little real understanding of life. The very titles of these works frequently make the propagandist disinclined to turn to them. Thus, more than half of the booklets designed for the atheistic education of young people have titles like "Atheistic Education of...", followed by the name of some category of young people or the all-purpose word "and." Only Politizdat is publishing an interesting and thematically varied series called "Atheist's Library," which presents living experience in atheistic education. And aren't the success and large sales of this series due to the fact that the authors are party workers who are well posted on the real state of affairs? One would think that other publishing houses would embark on the same course.

We could name whole sectors of atheistic education for which practically no literature exists at all. There is, for example, individual work with believers, the characteristics of atheistic education among retired persons (who constitute the mass of the believers, incidentally), atheistic education by place of residence, and so on. These fields are ignored year after year by the publishing houses. Their plans are formulated on the principle "what the author proposes." It is essential to radically change a state of affairs in which the publication of atheistic literature is left either to a few enthusiasts or comprises the necessary minimum in the publishing house's overall nomenclature.

With regard to problems of the quality of atheistic publications these days, we cannot ignore the fact that whereas in recent years there has been some success in the field of theoretical interpretation of the problems of atheism and religion and the publication of fundamental works on problems of scientific atheism, in the field of creating popular literature intended for the mass reader, accomplishments have been rather meager. There is the stereotyped notion that mass atheistic literature is designed for the kind of reader (including the believer) who has a low level of education and a narrow social and cultural outlook. It frequently suffers, as a result, from oversimplification and sometimes vulgarization. This, despite the substantial changes that

have taken place in the social profile of both the atheist and the believer, in their educational and cultural levels.

Popular, mass literature is needed not only by the believer (and perhaps not so much by him) but by the person who is choosing his life's path, who finds himself in a complex social and moral situation. As a rule, such people have a secondary or an incomplete secondary education. They should be appealed to with new, popular books which take account of this rising level of social maturity and education. It was not by accident that Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's report at the 26th Party Congress drew attention to the fact that "Soviet man is an educated, cultivated person. And when anyone begins to speak to him in thoughtless, stilted language, in general phrases instead of concrete links with life and real facts, he simply turns off the TV or the radio or puts aside his newspaper." Our publishing people and activist authors should pay more attention to this addressee of mass atheistic literature and think accordingly of other forms of appealing to him.

In surveying atheistic publications, we cannot but note that we have failed to resolve the matter of reviewing such literature in the press. The editors of NAUKA I RELIGIYA should revive the critical-bibliographical section. Where, if not in this journal, should the reader find competent reviews and criticisms of the atheistic literature that is coming out?

Another urgent problem is that of enlisting major natural scientists, social scientists and well-known public figures to write atheistic literature. Their names have appeared on the title pages of books and pamphlets less and less frequently in recent years.

A fruitful contribution to this effort was the publication of "Ya Ateist" [I Am an Atheist] (Moscow, Politizdat, 1980). It consists of a collection of 25 interviews with outstanding public figures, who answer the question: What led you to the materialist world view, what made you become atheists? Those who answered this question include major scientists and well-known military commanders, writers, artists, workers and kolkhozniks. Each one formulates his atheistic views in his own way. But there are common factors as well, which have an influence on the individual's spiritual world. These are revealed in the answers of people telling about their lives and careers. "Our life, our labor made us atheists," said Hero of Socialist Labor Mikhail Dovzhik, one of those who first plowed the Virgin Lands, more or less summarizing this shared path.

Mention must also be made of the collections "Voprosy Nauchnogo Ateizma" [Problems of Scientific Atheism], published by Mysl'. In recent times they have substantially increased their readership. The publication is sold by subscription, and the fact that the number of copies published has risen by 30 to 35 percent in a 5-year period is significant. An important factor in this was the conversion to the issuance of primarily thematic publications. Considerable interest was evoked among readers by Issue No 20, "Aktual'nyye Problemy Istorii Ateizma i Religii" [Current Problems of the History of Atheism and Religion], 1976, which includes articles by Academicians Ye. M. Zhukov, A. P. Okladnikov, B. B. Piotrovskiy, USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding Members

I. R. Grigulevich, V. I. Rutenburg and other well-known Soviet scientists; Issue No 21 is "Ateizm i Religiya v Usloviyakh Sotsialisticheskogo Obshestva" [Atheism and Religion Under Conditions of Socialist Society], 1977; Issue No 25, "Ateizm, Religiya, Tserkov' v Istorii SSSR" [Atheism, Religion, the Church in the History of the USSR], 1980; Issue No 28, dealing with current problems of criticism of contemporary Catholicism and problems of atheistic education (1981), and others. These publications are addressed precisely to the organizers of atheistic work, VUZ teachers, scientific workers, propagandists and lecturers in scientific atheism.

A positive, qualitative leap has been made in recent years in the publication of atheistic literature: the research base has become stronger, the range of problems has been broadened and the polygraphic design of the works has been made more attractive. Nevertheless, we cannot but note the presence of the cliches of the past, entrenched stereotypes and the lack of books dealing with a number of urgent problems.

Atheistic literature is a complex sector of the publishing business. Its readership is not simpleminded. Especially important tasks confront our publishing houses and active authors, tasks which are inseparable from the party's effort as a whole--the shaping of the world view of the working people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/16

FOREIGN POLICY AND IDEOLOGY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 82 pp 125-127

[Review by Docent A. Dubinin, candidate of historical sciences, and Prof N. Lebedev, doctor of historical sciences, of the book by Sh. P. Sanakoyev and N. I. Kapchenko "Vneshnyaya Politika i Bor'ba Idey" [Foreign Policy and the Struggle of Ideas], Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1981, 256 pp]

[Text] One of the most important factors of today's international development is the ever increasing influence of the constructive foreign policy of the USSR and the whole socialist commonwealth on the course of the class confrontation between socialism and capitalism in the world arena. The effectiveness of the CPSU's foreign policy course, which is expressed in concentrated form in the peace programs of the 24th, 25th and 26th party congresses, is to a crucial extent due to its genuinely scientific character and inseparable link to Marxist-Leninist ideology. The creative character of the theory of scientific communism entails the necessity of continuous development and enrichment, on its basis, of a genuinely scientific theory of international relations. Principled guidelines of the work being carried on in this direction are presented in the decisions of the party congresses and the works of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CC CPSU and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Recent years have witnessed the publication of works by Soviet scientists dealing with problems of foreign policy as a whole and the Marxist-Leninist theory of international relations. Standing out among such new scientific studies is Sh. P. Sanakoyev's and N. I. Kapchnko's capital monograph in which these matters are viewed both in the overall context of the interconnection between foreign policy and ideology and with regard to the specifics of the ideological struggle in the sphere of international relations in our time.

The monograph is characterized by systematic adherence to the class approach to the complicated and multifaceted phenomena of contemporary international life, elucidation of the inseparable link between the Marxist-Leninist world view and a genuinely scientific theory of international relations and the foreign policy of socialism, and the unmasking of attempts to replace Marxism as the methodological foundation of this theory with all kinds of speculative constructions. The book emphasizes, in this regard, that the class approach to the fundamental problems of international relations expresses an objective

evaluation of the situation, based on consideration of the actual interests of the different social forces. Whatever arguments the opponents of this approach adduce--whether an appeal to the "narrowness" and "restrictedness" of class criteria or allegations that changes in the world have also altered the content of these criteria themselves--the fact remains that the basis of the policies of states consists not of some kind of abstract concepts but real class interests. Hence the profound scientific sense of the postulate formulated by V. I. Lenin: "Policy is the relation between classes..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 43, p 72).

In this connection we cannot but focus attention on scientifically groundless attempts to revise as "one-sided" the definition of the current epoch as an era of transition from capitalism to socialism, the overall interpretation of history as the history of the class struggle, the attempt to declare unsound the "reduction" of complex conflicts and contradictions in the present world merely (or chiefly) to class contradictions and so on and to view the present era "in the light of the reality and legitimacy of national-state interests," as if they were devoid of class nature and content. As a result of this approach, allegedly freed of "obsolete dogmas," it turns out that, for example, "the main cause of underdevelopment is to be sought not only and not so much in the character of class relations so much as primarily in interstate relations, in the development of some countries and peoples at the expense of others, and wars as the main means of accomplishing such development come about in most cases through a definite configuration of correlation of forces among different states and groups of states." It is obvious that such a "methodology" entails complete rejection of Marxism and deprives those who profess it of any principled guidelines in the most complex mosaic of international life today. Instead of the class approach here they proclaim a long since discredited political pragmatism.

The work under review here focuses attention on an analysis of the methodological and practical inconsistency of bourgeois theories of international relations, in particular the concept of "deideologization" of international life and attempts to "reideologize" it by means of proposing some ideological and moral alternative to Marxism-Leninism.

The book constitutes a relevant and timely scientific response to a characteristic phenomenon of such great importance to our time as the sharply strengthened role of international relations in the world historical process, concomitant with the increasing importance of scientific understanding of the laws governing their development. The work contains a definition of the subject of the science of international relations, taking account of the results of the lively debates being conducted among Soviet scientists on this problem.

The authors' definition of the goals and tasks of the science of international relations could, in our opinion, be supplemented. Nevertheless, we cannot but agree with their main point--namely, that these goals and tasks include the study and development of a scientific history of relations among states; determination of the character of bilateral and multilateral relations among states, among groups of states representing different social-economic systems; analysis of the deployment of class and political forces in the world at each

historical stage, making it possible to plot the prospects of development of world events on a long-term basis; the study of methods, forms and techniques of diplomacy; and generalization of the experience of the struggle to resolve the problems of world policy (p 13).

Accuracy in the methodological statement of the problems and attention to a strictly scientific categorial apparatus have enabled the authors to successfully resolve their main task--that of tracing the characteristic traits of the development of international relations in the past 10 years and generalizing the experience of the struggle of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist comity to preserve peace and social progress and combat policies of aggression and war as well as all manner of ideological and propagandistic subversion by the imperialists.

The monograph presents a detailed analysis of the foreign policy program of the 26th CPSU Congress, emphasizes its effective and realistic character and convincingly substantiates its conformity with the vital interests not only of the Soviet people but of all mankind. "The worsening of the international situation, which is the fault of imperialism," the book points out, "has not placed in question the correctness and viability of the policy of detente, for which the Soviet Union, other socialist countries and all genuinely peace-loving forces in the world have steadily and consistently worked. It can be stated, moreover, that this complication has graphically demonstrated what the policy of undermining detente and whipping up tension and military confrontation can lead to. Once more the world has seen that there can be no rational alternative to peaceful coexistence..." (p 17).

The work devotes considerable space to the consistent struggle of the communist party and the Soviet state to implement the foreign policy programs of the 24th, 25th and 26th CPSU congresses. It also demonstrates clearly that these programs are truly scientific and prospective rather than expedient and pragmatic in character, based as they are on the unshakable foundation of the theory of scientific communism and, in turn, representing its creative development under present conditions. Extensive factual material is used to trace the continuity of the foreign policy course of the Soviet state from the time of Great October to our own days, the unchanging character of the goals and principles of the international activities of the party and government of our country, in combination with the rational flexibility of tactical devices in practical implementation. The pages of the book reveal in all its historic significance a picture of the multifaceted efforts on behalf of peace and social progress conducted by our Leninist Central Committee and its Politburo headed by that outstanding state and political figure of our time, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev.

One of the most interesting and important problems investigated in the work is the interconnection between foreign policy and ideology. Its relevance is due primarily to the role played by ideological and propaganda factors in the present worsening of the confrontation between the two systems. Elaboration of this particular subject matter is of considerable importance also in terms of the future, because in a number of aspects it has not yet become the subject of special scientific examination, the need for which stems from the

necessity of effective external propaganda support for the Leninist peace-loving course of the USSR and the fraternal socialist states. The authors emphasize that "the Marxist-Leninist concept of international relations decisively rejects as completely unscientific the notion that it is possible to have a foreign policy standing above ideology and free of its influence" (p 58).

Of great interest in this connection is the contrast presented in the book between Lenin's theory of foreign policy and bourgeois concepts of contemporary international relations which falsify their nature and trends of development. The factual material presented in the work leaves no doubt that bourgeois politics is organically incapable of determining the main tendencies which characterize the contemporary world situation. Its task is to facilitate the formulation of the "ideological principles" underlying the foreign policy of the imperialist states in order to seek out "arguments" justifying the attempts of the forces of reaction to turn back the course of world development. Under the influence of this, the role of bourgeois diplomacy has also changed, being transformed into an instrument of ideological campaigns and propaganda (p 99), which constitutes one more proof of the crisis and instability of the foreign policies of imperialism.

The monograph devotes considerable space to an analysis of the fundamental principles of the international activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state. In particular, much attention is focused on examining the ideological and political sources of proletarian internationalism. It convincingly demonstrates the importance of the theory and practice of proletarian internationalism to the success of the struggle for peace, for the preservation of human civilization. The arguments in the book completely demolish the attempts of the bourgeois falsifiers to depict proletarian internationalism as some kind of instrument of the policies of the Soviet state in the spirit of the notorious propagandistic myth about a "Soviet threat." At the same time the monograph facilitates a conclusive rebuttal of different revisionist and opportunistic tricks designed to "bury" proletarian internationalism and declare it "obsolete," to partition it by regions or replace it with bourgeois cosmopolitanism or some kind of vague "new internationalism" which is devoid of any class content. The authors note that the unity of the revolutionary forces of the world on the basis of the principle of proletarian internationalism constitutes a powerful accelerator of human progress.

The work also elucidates in detail another fundamental principle of socialist foreign policy--the peaceful coexistence of states with different social structures, and its role in resolving the crucial problems of our time, especially halting the arms race and ensuring disarmament. The authors demonstrate the positive influence of all-round cooperation based on the principle of peaceful coexistence, on the situation on the European continent, and they unmask the militaristic course of the Reagan administration, which is designed to undermine the cause of peace and detente. The book also reveals the reactionary nature of the foreign policies and external propaganda of the Beijing hegemonists. This part of the book is especially relevant because recently there has been a marked reactivation of attempts by bourgeois ideologues and propagandists to depict the geopolitical constructions of the Beijing leaders as a natural outgrowth of the socialist social structure.

The monograph is also interesting by virtue of its detailed analysis of the character of the present stage of ideological confrontation between the two social systems in the world arena and the most recent characteristics of the strategy and tactics of "psychological war" of imperialism against the socialist comity.

The monograph, of course, by no means exhausts all problems of the relationship between foreign policy and ideology. The problems examined in the book can and should be supplemented by new studies in the field.

Sh. P. Sanakoyev's and N. I. Kapchenko's monograph, which is intended not only for specialists in international affairs but also for a broad range of readers interested in problems of foreign policy and ideological confrontation in the world arena, makes a contribution to the theoretical treatment of current problems of contemporary international relations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/16

BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 82 p 128

[Text] 1. "Arkhiv Marksa i Engel'sa" [Marx and Engels Archives], vol 16. Prepared for publication by R. P. Konyushaya with I. A. Dmitriyeva. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 405 pp (CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism).

2. "Lenin o Markse" [Lenin on Marx]. A collection. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 111 pp.

3. "V. I. Lenin, KPSS ob Ekonomii i Berezhlivosti" [V. I. Lenin and the CPSU on Economy and Thrift]. Compiled by N. Ya. Klepach, L. N. Laponkina and M. N. Timokhin. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 608 pp.

4. "Uchit'sya Kommunizmu" [Learning Communism]. In two books. Book 1: "V. I. Lenin, KPSS o Partiyonom Rukovodstve Komsomolom" [V. I. Lenin and the CPSU on the Party's Leadership of the Komsomol]; Book 2: L. I. Brezhnev. "Molodym Stroit' Kommunizm" [The Young Will Build Kommunism]. Prepared for publication by K. M. Bogolyubov and V. A. Orlov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982. Book 1, 519 pp; Book 2, 423 pp.

5. "Internatsionalizm na Dele" [Internationalism in Action]. Visit by L. I. Brezhnev, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, to Tashkent for the ceremonies marking the presentation of the Order of Lenin to the UzSSR, 22-25 March 1982. A. M. Aleksandrov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 47 pp with illustrations.

6. Brezhnev, L. I. "Zabota ob Interesakh Naroda -- Delo Chesti Komsomola" [Concern for the Interests of the People Is a Matter of Honor for the Komsomol]. Speech delivered at the 19th Komsomol Congress on 18 May 1982. A. M. Aleksandrov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 16 pp.

7. Brezhnev, L. I. "O Prodoval'stvennoy Programme SSSR na Period do 1990 Goda i Merakh po Eye Realizatsii" [On the USSR Food Program for the Period Through 1990 and the Measures for Its Implementation]. Report submitted at the 24 May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. "CPSU Central Committee Plenum Decree." G. E. Tsukanov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 30 pp.

8. Andropov, Yu. V. "Leninizm -- Neischerpayemyy Istochnik Revolyutsionnoy Energii i Tvorchestva Mass" [Leninism -- An Inexhaustible Source of Revolutionary Energy and Creativity of the Masses]. Report submitted at the 22 April 1982 ceremony in Moscow on the occasion of the 112th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth. P. P. Laptev and V. V. Sharapov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 24 pp.
9. "Leninskoy 'Pravde' -- 70 Let" [Lenin's PRAVDA Is 70 Years Old]. Pages from the newspaper's history, 1912-1982. Edited by PRAVDA's editors. Editorial group: V. G. Afanas'yev, Yu. A. Sklyarov, B. Ye. Averchenko, et al. Compiled by M. I. Stepichev, G. V. Vasil'yev, K. Z. Devet'yarov, et al. Pravda, Moscow, 1982, 464 pp with illustrations.
10. "II S"yezd Kommunisticheskoy Partii Kuby" [Second Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba]. Havana, 17-20 December 1980. Translated from the Spanish. O. T. Darusenkov, general translation editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 383 pp (Documents and materials from foreign communist and workers parties).
11. Dahlem, F. "Nakanune Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny" [On the Eve of World War Two]. 1938-August 1939. Memoirs, in two volumes. Translated from the German. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982. Vol 1, 366 pp; Vol 2, 352 pp.
12. "XXII Natsional'nyy S"yezd Kommunisticheskoy Partii SShA" [The 22nd Congress of the U. S. Communist Party], 23-26 August 1979. N. V. Mostovets, general editor. Translated from the English. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 280 pp (Documents and materials from foreign communist and workers parties).
13. Zemskov, I. N. "Diplomaticheskaya Istoriya Vtorogo Fronta v Yevrope" [Diplomatic History of the Second Front in Europe]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 319 pp.
14. "Konstitutsiya Strany Sovetov" [Constitution of the Land of the Soviets]. Dictionary compiled by B. N. Topornin. V. N. Kudryavtsev, A. I. Luk'yanov and G. Kh. Shakhnazarov, general editors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 285 pp.
15. "Pyatyy S"yezd Pisateley RSFSR" [Fifth Congress of RSFSR Writers], 9-12 December 1980. Verbatim Report. YU. Bondarev, A. Aleksin, A. Volkov, et al., general editors. Sovremennik, Moscow, 1982, 351 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1982

5003

CSO: 1802/16

END