

JPRS 69154

25 May 1977

U S S R

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST
No. 6, APRIL 1977

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE

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

20000218 099

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, Springfield, Virginia 22151. 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 semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, 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.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET		1. Report No. JPRS 69154	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.	
4. Title and Subtitle TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST No. 6, April 1977				5. Report Date 25 May 1977	
7. Author(s)				6.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201				8. Performing Organization Rept. No.	
				10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.	
				11. Contract/Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above				13. Type of Report & Period Covered	
				14.	
15. Supplementary Notes Translations from KOMMUNIST, theoretical journal of the CPSU Central Committee, Moscow, published 18 times a year.					
16. Abstracts The report contains articles on political, economic, military and social developments and problems within the USSR and as they relate to communist and other countries.					
17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors USSR Political Science Sociology Propaganda Economics					
17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms					
17c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 5C					
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22151				19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	
				20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	
				21. No. of Pages 165	
				22. Price PC A08	

25 May 1977

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 6, April 1977

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year). Where certain articles, reprinted from other Russian-language sources, are not translated, indication of this fact is made in the table of contents.

CONTENTS	PAGE
From V. I. Lenin's Ideological Heritage	1
Genius of the Revolution	8
He Saw Far Into History; Writer's Notes (Yuriy Gribov)	20
Lenin's Example (A. Skochilov)	27
On Organizational Reserves for Upgrading Production Effectiveness (S. Kheyman)	41
Some Aspects of the Development of Artistic Culture Under Mature Socialist Conditions (Yu. Barabash)	53
Lenin and Dialectical Logic (Z. Orudzhev)	67
Leninist Course Toward a Socialist Revolution (K. Suvorov)	78
Historical Encounter (V. Sedykh)	92
From the Positions of Class Solidarity	106
Antonio Gramsci -- Proletarian Revolutionary	110
Allies of Socialism in the Anti-Imperialist Struggle	125

CONTENTS (Continued)	Page
Lenin -- Organizer of the Country's Defense (V. Fomichev)	141
Where Iskra Was Created (G. Obichkin)	152
From the Book Shelf	156
Student Enrollment in Higher Party Schools	159

PUBLICATION DATA

English title of journal : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST,
No 6, April 1977

Russian title of journal : KOMMUNIST

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo PRAVDA

Signed to press : 13 Apr 77

Copies : 984,000

COPYRIGHT: : Izdatel'stvo PRAVDA, KOMMUNIST,
Moscow, 1977

FROM V. I. LENIN'S IDEOLOGICAL HERITAGE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 pp 3-8

[CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism presentation of the full text of V. I. Lenin's 16 March 1920 speech]

[Text] Problems of organizing the masses in the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and the creation of a new economic and social system are extensively dealt with in V. I. Lenin's ideological heritage.

These ideas are formulated very forcefully in V. I. Lenin's speech which follows. It was delivered on 16 March 1920 at the Bol'shoy Theater, at a mourning ceremony held on the occasion of the first anniversary of the death of Ya. M. Sverdlov, a professional revolutionary and outstanding leader of the Communist Party and the Soviet state.

V. I. Lenin described Ya. M. Sverdlov as one of the greatest organizers who had dedicated his entire conscious life to the struggle for the victory of the proletarian revolution and socialism.

In this speech V. I. Lenin summed up the two year experience of the new and truly democratic system--the Soviet system. He proved that the dictatorship of the proletariat, established in our country as a result of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, had rallied the workers and peasants, insured successes on the military fronts and in the building of socialism, and involved the toiling masses in the active building of the new society.

V. I. Lenin warmly spoke of the cohort of organizers raised by the party whose significance was particularly great in the period of the building of socialism. He called for finding among the toiling masses new organizing talents and "to train from among workers and peasants all individuals capable of being organizers and administrators," properly placing them in the various sectors of the building of socialism.

A brief newspaper report on V. I. Lenin's speech was published in PRAVDA on 17 March 1920 (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 40, p 225). This is the first occasion on which the speech is published in full based on minutes kept at the Central Party Archive of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

The document has been prepared for publication in LENINSKIY SBORNIK
Number XXXIX.

CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism

V. I. Lenin's 16 March 1920 speech dedicated to the memory of Ya. M. Sverdlov

Comrades, we have gathered today, the anniversary of Yakov Mikhaylovich Sverdlov's death and, along with the personal recollections of many old party workers, everyone gives priority to the thought of assessing this greatest of talents which we lost and have been unable to replace and, probably, will be unable to exhaust for a long time. Thinking of the significance of this loss, unwittingly we think of the question of organization, of the importance of organization in general, and of the role of such outstanding organizers whose number is particularly small and whose life and activities should be an instructive example to us in clarifying our views on the significance of organization in general as well as a practical lesson, an edification, and an example of the type of organizational activities which we are carrying on and which constitutes and must constitute the main content of the activities of the party of the working class and, at the moment of the communist revolution, particularly while it is making its first steps, unquestionably, must constitute our principal activity.

In fact, organization is, unquestionably, the main weapon of the working class both in the course of its long history of preparations for the revolution and in the initial times of the revolution. The leading detachments of the working people would be unable to carry out the type of destruction of capitalism and the practical undertaking of the organization of a new, socialist society which has become particularly clear to us now, after a two-year experience, without singling out from the masses of the working people, scattered and suppressed by the capitalists, the type of class which learns how to organize, which builds itself this large scale industry and urban life, and all socialist culture and civilization. Casting a general view on the past and present correlation among main social forces and the main population mass in our revolution we would see immediately that the dictatorship of the proletariat which was able to perform real miracles in Russia in two years, under incredibly severe and difficult conditions, would be entirely impossible and internally senseless if the main motive force of the revolution was not the unity of the working people, precisely the type of unity which can draw to itself the tremendous majority of the toiling population.

We know from the experience of our revolution that the unification of the working people cannot be developed through electoral campaigns under the domination of private ownership, and that such unification may become the greatest force only in the struggle for the overthrow of landowners and the bourgeoisie. Now we can clearly see that the unification of the huge masses, of tens of millions of scattered peasantry, particularly suppressed

and ignorant, lagging behind the urban population as the result of capitalist oppression, not only in our country but in all big countries, would be impossible to implement without rallying the working people in the struggle against the attempts and aspirations of petty owners to restore capitalism. Yet, such attempts and aspirations on the part of the petty peasantry are inevitably inherent in them and cannot be avoided. Without the organization of the proletariat, socially this would be an impossible matter. Yet, the organization of the proletariat means the unification of the working people who draw toward themselves out of the entire peasant mass all working elements and, therefore, the tremendous majority, rallying the working people and thus acting against any unification and organization of the owners. We well know that the peasants account for the tremendous mass of the population and are half owners and half working people. Without an organized proletariat which, Comrades, has rallied everyone and has proved that the proletariat is merciless in the struggle against attempts to restore private ownership, and that it is capable of difficult sacrifices, there would be no such very close alliance between the proletariat and the toiling peasantry, and no experience would be gained by tens of millions of peasants who have realized that a state of landowners and capitalists, even the most democratic and republican, is a capitalist state; there would be no experience which would indicate to the peasants, sometimes at the cost of most severe trials, that they could only follow the proletariat; there would be no experience whose cause we are now implementing and which is being prepared in all countries: the cause of the socialist revolution would be impossible.

Speaking of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is quite frequently forgotten that without the unity of the working people who have decisively broken with the capitalist world yet, at the same time, have learned from those same capitalists how to organize and have waged a long struggle of strikes and demonstrations, the dictatorship of the proletariat would be impossible. There could be no revolution without this tie between the organized proletariat and the tens of millions of working people, without the respect felt by every working person for the selfless struggle of the proletariat which is destroying the old society, or without this unique influence gained by the proletariat and its leading party.

To us military successes are a guarantee that we shall resolve problems more difficult than those of a military nature, problems of economic construction and restoration of the wrecked country. The military successes are the only prerequisite and foundation for the fact that the proletariat was able to realize its strength as the strength of its organization, and that the leading detachment of the proletariat, the organized vanguard, is hundreds of thousands of times stronger than its size indicates, as it is linked with tens of millions of people. Today, where we consider such matters, it becomes particularly clear to us or should become clear to us or, at least, we should direct our thinking toward the significance and the role of the big organizers. We know that the importance of the leader, the practical organizer, is infinitely great in terms of the organization of

millions of people. We know that we, the entire working class, have had to and must undertake such an organizational project with an insignificant number of truly outstanding organizers. In this respect as well the history of Yakov Mikhaylovich Sverdlov's life and activities are particularly instructive, showing us with particular clarity the conditions in which the outstanding organizational talents, whose number is so little, were able to develop, the way they tempered, and the way they became very big organizational forces.

Yakov Mikhaylovich Sverdlov may have spent half of his short life as a practical worker in a primarily clandestine organization. At the age of 17 or 18 he was already in jail and began to work in worker organizations, began to participate in the revolutionary struggle and converted from his past and that of his family, a family of artisans, to the type of full absorption of the tasks of the working class and of the activities of its organization which enabled him to develop fully. No one, perhaps, is such a typical representative of the activities and efforts of tens, hundreds, and perhaps thousands of revolutionaries, members of the artisan and working classes--the intelligentsia accounted for an insignificant number--who, already under tsarism, for over ten years, trained themselves as revolutionaries capable of guiding the masses. Yakov Mikhaylovich did not have to go abroad in the course of such long activities. This enabled him to maintain his ties with the practical aspect of the movement. Even though he had to spend most of the 17 or 18 years of his brief life in party work in jail or in exile, there again his organizational talent showed itself. He was able to dedicate himself fully to the work, to observing the people, to his ability to recognize their qualities and the ability to put everyone in his proper place, an ability which is the main talent of the organizer. It is noteworthy that this ability had to be developed by a person who had dedicated himself to clandestine activities in which, naturally, the immediate circle of those with whom the clandestine worker met was quite small. Anyone among us with a respectable number of years spent in clandestine work, anyone familiar with hundreds of revolutionaries, could say that organizers who have been able to derive from such experience of constant contact in clandestine circles, in clandestinity, the type of general knowledge about people, and the skill of the organizer and administrator who could extend this to the activities of hundreds of thousands of people, and to relations among millions of people is insignificant, and could be numbered with one hand. In this respect the party faced an exceptionally difficult transition. A party which trained its best representatives, such as Ya. M. Sverdlov, could train the people in clandestine activities, in clandestinity, in circles. In a few weeks or, at the most, a few months, the party had to become a ruling party which had to manage or who had to assume the task of managing millions of proletarians who would build all their activities on the basis of inseparable links with tens of millions of working people, links which were no longer formal as in the past but which would inspire the working people, which would make of every worker, wherever he may live or wherever he may find himself, become an agitator, propagandist, and organizer, creating the type of situation

that even the most backward and suppressed peasant would consider every worker as a guide, a leader, a person leading him, giving the peasant an example of the struggle against the exploiters, landowners, and capitalists, an example of the greatest possible self-sacrifice. Such a self-sacrifice manifested in the activities of the old revolutionary workers was the example we see so clearly in Yakov Mikhaylovich's life, in the 35 years of his life one half of which was spent in clandestine struggle and many years, in all likelihood over one half of this entire life, on marking time in clandestinity. This is the type of self-sacrifice which has singled out the best and the few representatives of the artisans and an insignificant number of workers, and must be duplicated by the proletariat on a large scale.

When people speak of the dictatorship of the proletariat they frequently forget that this dictatorship was proved through the readiness and resolve to make the greatest sacrifices. When the dictatorship of the proletariat is accused of using violence, it is forgotten that this violence was directed against the exploiters, mensheviks, and capitalists; it is forgotten that the respect and total loyalty which the proletariat has gained among the toiling masses was gained only by virtue of the fact that its leading detachments assumed in the course of the past two years of the revolution, most of all the troubles of the revolution, the burdens of hunger and of the unparalleled difficulties which were imposed on us by the civil war, the burdens which affected mainly the urban population.

A most indivisible link exists between the self-sacrifice of the old revolutionaries who, during the more than ten years which preceded our revolution, developed their skillful activities and organizational skills, and the party nucleus capable of heading the proletariat, as well as between this self-sacrifice and that which became the main distinguishing feature and the most important source for the prestige and respect gained by the proletariat among the peasantry in the course of two years. It indicates that this revolution could not have developed the way it did, could not have withstood two years of incredibly severe trials without the embryos of unity and of inflexibly firm organization developed by people such as Yakov Mikhaylovich Sverdlov in the course of over ten years prior to the beginning of the revolution, and without which such an organizational talent and administrative abilities would not have linked with the activities of the masses sufficiently disciplined by capitalism, sufficiently united and solidary, sufficiently awakened from the old slumber to assume the continuation of this cause, train millions of fighters and lead them despite all difficulties imposed upon us by history.

Unquestionably, in countries with more progressive organizational traditions, following the initial victories of the revolution, the most difficult organizational stages will be easier. However, the initial steps of the revolution are hindered in such countries, among others, also because other countries would not have such a difficult training school for the vanguard of the revolutionaries and the working class as existed in our country, and

that in those countries there will be a more difficult and more costly revolution against capitalism and against a relatively peaceful period which raised not revolutionary fighters as leaders of the working class but opportunistic "fighters."

Among others, a comparison between our and the German¹ revolution leads us to this conclusion. The similarity is striking. Let us recall that in our country things began with a conciliation which led to the Kornilov movement, and that now the German proletariat is experiencing that same type of Kornilov movement.² It was reported to us today that the new cabinet of German monarchists which overthrew the old monarchists is already concluding an agreement with the old government and is restoring the monarchy jointly with the German mensheviks, Esers, and Scheidemann supporters.³

We are being told that at the other pole--it is as yet unclear but, obviously, such a pole exists--a bloc is already being organized whose only main task is the dictatorship of the proletariat and which is using the German Kornilov movement and the experience which such movement has left among the masses, using it precisely the way the Russian revolution was used by the adventurer Kornilov and was the threshold of the October Revolution. It is precisely now that a particularly large number of organizers and leaders of the proletariat, people tempered in the course of long revolutionary struggle, will be needed by the German proletariat. However great the importance may be of higher standards and better education and organization of the working class we can say that, looking at the Hungarian experience,⁴ that the shortage of leaders such as Yakov Mikhaylovich Sverdlov who spent 10 to 15 years preparing themselves for organizational work and entirely dedicated to preparing for a revolution and for the fight against any curtailment of the revolution, that occasionally this shortcoming could cause unparalleled casualties to the proletariat; it could increase the number of casualties and the pain but would be unable to stop the revolution.

It is particularly now, casting a general view on the revolution we experienced, and comparing it with the course of the revolutions in other countries, thinking of the significance of the organization developed by the most talented of our leaders in this field, Yakov Mikhaylovich Sverdlov, that we must firmly pledge to ourselves to pay ever-greater attention to this aspect of the work. Whereas in military activities which have been conducted in the country for two years and whose course of events could not fail to give priority, and whereas thrust, enthusiasm, and brief pressure could still accomplish a great deal in military activities, nothing can be accomplished in economic-construction and, primarily, organizational activities through thrust, pressure, and enthusiasm alone. It is only long-term and most lengthy organizational work that could bring us true victory here. Naturally, in the course of this work tens and hundreds of thousands of builders of the Soviet system must be familiar with the history of the outstanding leaders and guides of the revolution, with their personal experience, and with the recollection of the way organizational talents were developed.

We realize how insignificant is today our number of organizational and administrative talents. They have come to us from the old society. They are linked essentially with the prejudices of that society which are quite frequently semi-hostile. Yet, we must use them for we would be unable to increase rapidly the number of organizers from our own class. The main activity should be to train those among the workers and peasants who could be organizers and administrators. The circles of working people who have never spent their lives in the artificial circumstances of clandestinity, separated from the masses, and who understand far more quickly relations among people in this environment and in the environment of non-party workers and peasants, the number of organizational talents is incomparably greater than in any other class. However, we cannot find these talents. We have not learned how to place them in their proper positions and in conditions which would teach them how to guide the people and place them properly, rallying tens of thousands of people so that the results of their work would be assessed from the viewpoint of the needs and interests of millions of people. This is our main task.

We would be unable to implement it without carefully thinking of the activities of outstanding organizers of the past or without dedicating many years of activities to such adamant and patient work. However, recalling Ya. M. Sverdlov, and thinking of the conditions under which a progressive leader of the working class had to hide for decades in clandestinity, even though then as well people who could extend the activities of clandestine organizers to the activities of millions of people with incredible speed and success, we shall be able now, with far greater speed and effectiveness to develop on a real mass scale the number of conscious leaders of the working class, organizers following the steps of the great model. At that point the most difficult economic and organizational task of our revolution will be implemented successfully. We gain this confidence by thinking of what we have experienced and by our resolve to achieve this after this meeting, whatever the circumstances.

FOOTNOTES

1. Referring to the November 1918 revolution in Germany.
2. Referring to the Kapp Putsch--an attempt on the part of the German monarchists to organize a counterrevolutionary coup in March 1920.
3. Philipp Scheidemann (1865-1939): leader of the right opportunistic wing of the German Social Democratic Party; one of the organizers of the suppression of the German workers movement in 1918-1921.
4. A reference to the Hungarian Soviet Republic, which lasted from 21 March to 1 August 1919. The Soviet system in Hungary was overthrown by the joint forces of the foreign and domestic counterrevolution.

GENIUS OF THE REVOLUTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 pp 9-18

[Text] Vladimir Il'ich Lenin's birthday is one of the brightest holidays of the Soviet people, of the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries, or all fighters against imperialism, and of the true fighters for social and national freedom, progress, and peace. There is no corner on earth where the working people do not voice the name of Lenin with gratitude and love, with confidence in their better future, or with a nursed hope. This name has become the symbol of the revolutionary renovation of the planet and the assertion of human dignity and right to happiness for endless millions of people who are creating all social wealth through their toil, minds, and talents, and who are embellishing and enobling their native land.

We celebrate today's Lenin's 107th birthday, in the particularly solemn circumstances of preparations for the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution which was won under his leadership, the 60th anniversary of the worker and peasant Soviet system, carefully hammered by him, firmly set on its feet, and confidently guided to a great future. This is a revolution which initiated the recording of a new historical period, which radically changed the course of development of all mankind, and which developed into the tempestuous and irrepressible flood of the contemporary world revolutionary process. The Soviet system, under whose conditions the working people built a developed socialist society under the leadership of the Leninist party, is the highest accomplishment of social progress today.

Developed socialism, the world socialist system, and all revolutionary changes on earth are the direct continuation of Lenin's works and the implementation of his ideas. The foundations of the new social system he laid, whose birth and establishment was objectively determined by the entire course of history, has been already sufficiently tested for strength by time and circumstances. Leninism, as a strictly scientific prospect for social progress and as the way and means for the revolutionary re-organization of social relations, is displaying its vital strength to an ever fuller extent with each passing year. Leninism expressed the basic

needs of the contemporary epoch which became the epoch of transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism and communism, and has been justifiably acknowledged as the culmination of Marxism. Its international significance would be impossible to overestimate.

Lenin's personality--infinitely varied, deep, and purposeful--is an exceptional phenomenon, a superior flight of the human spirit. At the same time or, rather, precisely because of this, Lenin always behaved naturally, as a common man. His simplicity and modesty, intolerance of vaingloriousness and dislike of pose, his respectful attitude toward people and his sincere concern for his comrades are widely known. He was intolerable and cutting only toward class enemies and renegades. Mayakovskiy said, metaphorically and profoundly, that Lenin was the most human of men.

Speaking of Lenin we always find the warmest, the most accurate, the most significant words which could best express not only the extent of our love for Lenin but the extent of our pride in his accomplishments. Lenin is the brilliant theoretician, great revolutionary, creator of a party of a new type, leader of the October Revolution, founder of the first socialist state in history, leader and teacher of the working people the world over, and friend of the oppressed and unfortunate people. The features and qualities of his personality may be expressed in a concentrated fashion in this concise definition: genius of the revolution!

He was a revolutionary in theory, since, like K. Marx and F. Engels, he approached it as a theoretician of the revolution. It was precisely revolutionary requirements that stimulated, above all, this powerful, alert, and ubiquitous mind which, it seemed, could penetrate the secrets of social life unhindered and could bring to light, depict, and make understandable to the real makers of history--the popular masses--the hidden springs of its progressive development, who taught how to use objective laws in the interest of toiling mankind.

It is precisely his activities as a proletarian revolutionary that developed the purposeful, inflexible, and invincible will as a fighter for the happiness of simple people.

The course of Lenin's revolutionary life crossed class boundaries, making effective his love of mankind, closely linking him with the people, developing an inflexible confidence in the incalculable talents, inexhaustible creative forces, and historically significant constructive abilities of the working people. Conversely, in the revolution Lenin's genius was revealed to the people, illuminating the path to freedom, gaining universal recognition, admiration, and infinite trust.

The link between Lenin and the socialist revolution is so comprehensive and organic that one would be inconceivable without the other. Lenin's genius was revealed and established in the course of the revolutionary struggle while the struggle itself, particularly its apotheosis--the Great October

Revolution and the creation of the Soviet socialist state--bears the visible characteristics of the genius of the revolution and is justifiably considered as the embodiment of his ideas.

To mankind Lenin's life is a revolutionary exploit; to Lenin himself the revolution was life itself. In his own admission he could not imagine any other type of life. Lenin's life and activities blended with the struggle of the working class and the Communist Party.

If it is true that talent is 99 percent work, unquestionably, genius is gigantic purposeful work to the level of self-denial, bordering inspired sacrifice. However strong a natural mind may be, it is worth little without bubbling energy and a generous heart open to good and justice. Selflessness is part of any genius. However, only revolutionary selflessness can make such a genius the coauthor of history itself. Lenin proved this through his entire life.

At a time when many of the better people in Russia, sincerely concerned with the difficult life of its people, suppressed by autocracy and developing capitalism, seeking ways to liberate the working people jumped from "circulating among the people" to individual terrorism, the young Lenin said firmly: "No, we shall not follow this path. That is not the path to be followed." He entered the revolutionary movement immediately as a convinced Marxist. Even though Lenin was not the first to see in Marx a truly scientific revolutionary theory which had discovered and interpreted the objective laws of social development and substantiated the universal-historical mission of the working class, no one before him had taken so unconditionally, organically and, yet, creatively the doctrine of Marx and Engels as a manual for truly revolutionary action. Plekhanov, whose merits for the dissemination of Marxism in Russia and for the interpretation and elaboration of some of its individual concepts are universally known and acknowledged, substantiated the need for combining scientific socialism with the worker's movement. Nevertheless, he failed to become a truly proletarian revolutionary. Unlike him, unhesitatingly Lenin entered the working class, adopted its vital interests as his own, and merged with it not only in thoughts but in feelings, adopting as his only social and moral criteria its class position.

Therefore, there neither was nor could there be any separation between revolutionary word and revolutionary action in Lenin. His activities are an ideal example of the sincerity and inviolability of the Marxist concepts of unity between theory and practice, and of the party-mindedness of the social sciences. Having mastered to perfection the method of dialectical-materialistic analysis of social development and adopting firmly the aspiration of implementing the class objectives of the proletariat, reflecting the objective need of history, as early as the end of the 19th century Lenin assumed the leadership of the Russian revolutionary movement.

Aware of the real value of a theory which, conquering the masses, becomes the greatest material force, he launched a decisive struggle for a proper understanding and for the purity of Marxism, and against its open and concealed enemies and false friends. Lenin systematically debunked the groundlessness of Narodnik subjectivistic sociology. He proved the bourgeois seaminess of "legal Marxism," the narrow-minded and time-serving limitations of "economism," the political nonentity of "tailism" in the labor movement, and the mortal danger to the revolution of all and any manifestations of opportunism. Lenin's all-seeing eyes did not miss a single serious right wing or "left wing" revisionist feeble impulse of the "rectifiers" of Marxism. Lenin immediately pilloried any candidate renegade. He waged a particularly lengthy and practically uninterrupted struggle against the opportunistic and chauvinistic policies of the leaders of the Second International who had betrayed the real interests of the working class yet who zealously continued to provide literary embellishments to their unseemly behavior in the hope of passing for proletarian revolutionaries.

Naturally, problems of party construction and party work among the masses occupied a central position in this ideological struggle. The fact that a proletarian party alone could head the revolutionary worker's movement had been realized even before Lenin. Yet, he alone could answer the questions of what type of party should this be, and what would be the conditions under which it could truly perform the role of the battle revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat and all working people. He could provide both theoretical and practical answers to this question.

In works such as "Tasks of the Russian Social Democrats," "What is to be Done?," and "One Step Forward and Two Steps Backward," and others, he elaborated an integral theory of a party of a new type, radically distinct from the bourgeois parties within the Second International which were sliding to an ever-greater extent to the positions of reformism and conciliation with the bourgeoisie. It was no accident that the latter ignored, year after year, the objectives for which they had been established in their time. They were guided by a doctrine which was no longer Marxist, for it had eliminated the most essential aspect: the doctrine of waging the class struggle until the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the assumption of political power by the working class relying on the support of the popular majority, of the democratic forces.

"The proletariat has no weapon in the struggle for power other than organization," Lenin wrote ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 8, p 403). It had to be the type of organization guided by progressive theory, never losing its class image, engaged systematically in the pursuit of a revolutionary policy, clearly earmarking the tasks at any given stage of the worker's movement, bearing in mind its final objectives, providing precisely formulated political slogans with real practical content, and training professional workers-revolutionaries, theoretically literate and politically experienced, and ideologically convinced, disciplined, party

members, loyal to the cause of the proletariat, working in the thick of the toiling masses. This was to be an organization of bold revolutionary action, decisive and confident in victory, able not only to teach the masses but to learn from the masses and to sum up the experience of their struggle.

Lenin sternly rebuffed all the pseudorevolutionaries whose petty bourgeois individualism and uncontrolled anarchism threatened, from the very beginning, to convert the party into a politically and organizationally helpless association of volunteers, alienated from the broad masses. He comprehensively substantiated the need to base party construction on the principle of democratic centralism, the only one which made possible the creation of a monolithic militant political organization distinguished by unity of will and broad and free participation of all party members in the formulation and implementation of its policy and yet obligated to implement adopted party decisions. The fruitfulness of the Leninist principles of party construction and education of party cadres has been confirmed by the entire practical experience of our Communist Party.

Another characteristic feature of the ideological struggle persistently waged by Lenin was the fact that in the course of the struggle he tirelessly developed revolutionary Marxism, enriching it with new concepts and conclusions. Not a single one of his theoretical works is a simple repetition of a familiar viewpoint expressed by Marx and Engels, scientifically substantiated to one or another extent of completeness. Lenin considered mandatory, while defending and disseminating the Marxist doctrine, to study, on the basis of its methodology, new factual data, comprehensively sum up practical social experience and the achievements of the individual sciences, and to broaden and deepen proofs of the veracity and historical accuracy of communist ideology.

Lenin's approach to a scientific work is a standard of the thoughtful and substantive, thorough, exacting, and multi-leveled elaboration of a topic, and of a serious attitude toward preliminary work. He considered continuing self-education and the expansion and refining of knowledge through the critical study of the works of the great philosophers and the interpretation and reinterpretation of the ideological wealth accumulated by mankind particularly important. This is clearly confirmed by the numerous summaries, theses, drafts, and various types of preparatory data. Documents such as "Marxism on the State," "On the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," "Philosophical Notebooks," "Notebooks on Imperialism," "Notebooks on the 1900-1916 Agrarian Problem," and the summary of "Correspondence between K. Marx and F. Engels, 1844-1883" indicate that Lenin tried to lay reliable and deep scientific foundations under each theoretical concept and base any conclusion on a summation of all accessible facts. His brilliant mind could not be satisfied without a thorough clarification of everything.

It was precisely such scientific conscientiousness that developed the tremendous stock of knowledge which, multiplied by revolutionary zeal and tireless energy, enabled the leader of the working people, if necessary--a necessity

which, in the developments of the class struggle occurred frequently--to unravel with amazing speed even the most confused situations and to determine with profound accuracy the tactical assignments of the party and to direct its efforts along the proper channel. Many of Lenin's works, representing unsurpassed models of theoretical interpretation of a rapidly developing social reality, were written literally on the hot traces or even in the heat of events themselves; others were written as a program for revolutionary action based on an accurate scientific prediction reflecting a brilliant penetration into the essence of profound processes, and the discovery of social development trends.

Along with major works which demanded greater preparatory work and a great deal of time to write them, such as "The Development of Capitalism in Russia," "Materialism and Empiriocriticism," and "Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism," Lenin wrote works in numbered days and weeks based on the urgent requirements of revolutionary practice but which were, nevertheless, significant from the viewpoint of the development of Marxist theory, such as "Two Tactics of the Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution," the April Theses, "The State and Revolution," "The Forthcoming Tasks of the Soviet System," "The Infant's Left Wing Disease in Communism," "The Great Initiative," "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky," and many others.

In his preface to "Two Tactics..." Lenin wrote: "In a revolutionary moment it is very difficult to keep pace with events which offer a striking amount of new data for the assessment of the tactical slogans of revolutionary parties" (Poln. Sobr. Soch., vol 11, p 3). Yet, each of his works unquestionably proves that Lenin's genius not only was in step with events but always outstripped them.

Every thought contained in the tremendous Leninist ideological heritage is priceless to us. Leninism is the Marxism of our epoch. This brief definition also includes the inflexible loyalty to the basic concepts of scientific communism and an acknowledgment of the tremendous contribution made by Lenin to Marxism, comprehensively developing it on the basis of the study of phenomena in social life triggered by the new historical epoch. The doctrine of imperialism, the theory of the socialist revolution, and the theories of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the ways leading to the building of socialism and communism all occupy a central position in Leninism, for they are purposefully and systematically promoting the all-round substantiation of the main aspect of Marxism: the doctrine of the universal-historical mission of the working class. That is why communist ideology is justifiably known as Marxism-Leninism.

Lenin's revolutionary genius was manifested particularly extensively and comprehensively in 1917, a tempestuous year for our people, brimming with the bubbling lava of unforgettable historical events. The amazing fact

itself was that even though he was forced into foreign exile, the leader of the Bolshevik Party could feel so clearly the revolutionary pulse beat of Russia which, due to scarcity of information, had to be literally sounded by studying the deployment of class forces in the entire belligerent Europe. "Europe is experiencing a revolutionary situation. The war and the high cost of living are aggravating it." These words were written on the first day of the new year 1917 ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 30, p 259). Yet, on 18 (31) January, expressing his belief in the imminent overthrow of the autocracy, Lenin thought of what would happen to Russian political life should the proletariat turn out insufficiently ready to assume power: the tsar could be replaced by "a government headed by Milyukov and Guchkov, unless it is Milyukov and Kerenskiy!" (ibid, p 341). Was this a guess? No. It was a prediction based on accurate knowledge.

Learning of the February revolution, on the basis of very scant information coming out of Russian, Lenin imagined quite accurately the political situation which had developed there, and, considering the possibility for the growth of the bourgeois-democratic into a socialist revolution, hastened toward the homeland. While ways were being sought for coming home, he elaborated the new party tactic and the means for the organization and education of the revolutionary masses which had to be persuaded of the reactionary nature of the bourgeois provisional government. Lenin's "Letters From Afar," the harbingers of the famous April Theses, which played, as we know, a decisive role in the preparations for the Great October Revolution, became unique examples of political vigilance of their kind.

Returning to the homeland, Lenin was firmly aware of what revolutionary Russia was awaiting. The triumphal welcome organized for him by the Petersburg workers and soldiers at the Finland Station, became the best proof of the factual aspirations of the toiling masses, aspirations which Lenin could express with extreme clarity and fullness. However, even his loyal supporters-bolsheviks were unable to realize immediately the depth to which he could see and understand. Even though the party, with the exception of individuals, was clearly aware of the need and possibility for a socialist revolution, the ways for achieving it under the existing peculiar conditions of the "twin power" were far from clear. That is why a debate developed within the ranks of the Bolshevik Party as well on the subject of the April Thesis. Defending and explaining the concepts they contained, Lenin tirelessly addressed party conferences, the Petrograd Soviet, and worker and soldier meetings. He wrote a number of articles and pamphlets. Furthermore, he edited PRAVDA, and conducted tremendous organizational work. All this was taking place under extremely unfavorable circumstances: mensheviks, Esers, and bourgeois parties and their press launched a raging persecution against Lenin and the bolsheviks, accusing them of all mortal sins, and spreading most shameless lies and slanders.

No one could either crush the iron will of the leader of the working people or shake his authority. Lenin was always on the offensive: he patiently persuaded his comrades without retreating a single step from positions of principle; he rallied them through his convictions and inflexible will; he mercilessly exposed the conciliationists in the Esermenshevik camp, exposed the political machinations of the bourgeois provisional government, and removed the doubts of honestly mistaken defense supporters. His energetic efforts were not slow in yielding results: as early as April the Bolshevik Party strongly rallied on the Leninist platform of the struggle for a transition to a socialist revolution; the influence of the bolsheviks in the worker and soldier masses rose immeasurably; the faith of the working people in the provisional government and the petty bourgeois parties became considerably undermined.

At every sharp turn of political events in the period from April to October 1917 Lenin promptly elaborated and organizationally secured the implementation of the new party tactic consistent with the moment and invariably successful. Displaying an amazing strength of character, self-control, firmness, and farsightedness, invariably he took comprehensively into consideration the factual state of affairs and the deployment of class forces; he prevented the party and, with its help, the masses from taking unconsidered or hasty steps. Lenin demanded "...maximal calm, vigilance, restraint, and organization" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 32, p 331). The flexibility of this tactic was manifested, in particular, toward the soviets, in supporting or, conversely, cautioning against mass actions by the working people depending on the political circumstances, and in the selection of the ways and means of revolutionary struggle at its various stages.

Naturally, the period of preparations for the October armed uprising was extremely intensive for Lenin and the party. Reaching the conclusion that a revolutionary situation had fully ripened for the assumption of power by the proletariat, Lenin substantiated this conclusion in his works "The Bolsheviks Must Seize Power," and "Marxism and Uprising." Subsequently, in September and October, he developed it in a number of other articles, pamphlets, and letters to comrades. He developed extensively in his letter on the uprising the task of the transition to socialism, in his book "The Threatening Catastrophe and How to Fight It," in which the party's economic program was described in detail.

His forced clandestine stay in Finland did not allow Lenin operatively to guide the preparations for the uprising. He wanted to go to Petrograd but, protecting its leader from the bloodhounds of the provisional government, the party's Central Committee did not allow him to return. Used to obedience to party discipline, Lenin evermore adamantly sought permission. The incredibly tremendous theoretical and practical work he did in less than three weeks, after finally reaching Petrograd at the beginning of October, is not only impossible to describe briefly but even difficult to imagine. It would take someone else more than a lifetime to do all this.

Lenin's revolutionary genius was revealed here in its entire untamed power. The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution--the cause to which he had totally dedicated himself--made Lenin's name immortal forever.

To win Russia from the rich and for the poor, and from the exploiters for the exploited, to overthrow politically the ruling classes of landowners and capitalists, and to seize governmental power was a difficult matter of prime necessity. Lenin taught that the question of power is the basic question of any revolution. However, in order to resolve it successfully this worker-peasant system had to be strengthened, consolidated, and disseminated throughout the entire huge country, and protected from the counterrevolution; it had to be used as an effective weapon for laying the foundations of a new social order. Russia had to learn to manage and develop new forms of human social relations, until then known only in their general features, in theory. The constructive task, emphasizes the CPSU Central Committee decree on the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, is the main and most complex task of a socialist revolution.

Equipped by Lenin with a scientific program for action, the bolshevik Soviet government had a proper knowledge of how to handle the state power. Above all, without delay it began to implement adamantly and systematically this program, focusing its efforts on the solution of the most urgent problems. Having studied in detail the experience of the Paris Commune, Lenin ascribed particular importance to decisive revolutionary action, all-round reliance on the masses, and comprehensive development of their efforts. "Only he who has faith in the people, who plunges in the spring of live popular creativity can win and retain the power," he cautioned ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 35, p 61).

The CPSU sacredly safeguards and develops the Leninist revolutionary traditions and the style he developed for party and state management of the building of a new society, based on a creative attitude toward theory and practice, their unbreakable unity, unity of word and action, ability to see the future and work jointly, and guide the social activeness of the working people and organize them for the fulfillment of the plans.

The party carefully safeguards and studies Lenin's ideological heritage, guided by it in its daily activities and in the theoretical summation of contemporary social practices; it raises the working people in the spirit of a Marxist-Leninist outlook. "Marxism-Leninism," states the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th party congress, "is the only reliable foundation for the elaboration of a correct strategy and tactic. It provides us with an understanding of historical prospects. It helps us to determine the direction to be taken in socioeconomic and political development for many years ahead and to be guided accurately in international events. The strength of Marxism-Leninism lies in its continuing creative development. This was taught by Marx and Lenin. Our party will always remain loyal to their legacy!"

Continuing now, already under the conditions of developed socialism, to resolve the constructive problems of the socialist revolution, as it has always done, the CPSU focuses its main attention on the further growth of the economic power of the country, seeing, as Lenin did, in successful economic construction the key to the reaching of all basic social objectives. The 10th Five-Year Plan, over whose implementation today the Soviet people are enthusiastically working, is a new major step toward the creation of the material and technical foundations for communism. This also means a new upsurge in the material and cultural standards of the people, the evermore comprehensive development of man himself, and the further gradual growth of socialist into communist social relations. Lenin's requirement of a scientific management of society under socialism is expressed, above all, in the planned and comprehensive development of the entire social organism, and in the ever-closer interconnection and simultaneousness in the solution of topical economic and social problems.

The party always remembers that Lenin called for comprehensively developing the creative initiative of the masses and for involving them in the administration of all social affairs. This initiative, displayed above all in the socialist competition, as well as in the various forms of social activities of the Soviet people, expresses the extent to which they are aware of their personal responsibility for governmental affairs and their developed feeling of masters of the country. The CPSU Central Committee and all party organs and organizations see in the socialist competition one of the main motive forces for the building of communism. Relying on the Komsomol and the Soviet trade unions, they always concern themselves with upgrading the effectiveness and educational role of the competition and of the movement for a communist attitude toward labor.

In his speech to the 16th congress of USSR trade unions Comrade L. I. Brezhnev again noted the tremendous significance of the socialist competition and the great role played by the trade unions in its development. "Let me remind you," said he, "that as early as 1920 the ninth party congress entrusted the trade unions with organizing the competition. Today as well they remain responsible for this important project."

The further development of the social activeness of the working people takes place also thanks to improvements in the political system of mature socialism, the ever fuller implementation of the principles of socialist democracy, the broadening of citizens' rights, and the strengthening of discipline and public order. Linking in a Leninist manner the problems of the observance of the law, discipline, and responsibility of the individual to society, the party and the Soviet state insure the true freedom of the individual and create conditions for the utilization of the abilities of the people as workers for society.

Lenin ascribed particular importance to the leading position of the working class and the leading role of the Communist Party in the revolution and the building of socialism and communism. He pointed out that the working

class alone can be systematic to the end in the implementation of such great objectives, and that the dictatorship of the proletariat is possible only through the Communist Party. The elaboration of the theoretical concepts on the increased leading role of the working class and of the party under the conditions of a nationwide socialist state, as our society progresses toward communism, elaborated at CPSU congresses, represent a direct extension of Lenin's conclusions.

The Great October Revolution marked the beginning of the just solution of the national problem in our country and the implementation of a truly internationalist Leninist national policy. Its outstanding results are universally known: elimination of national oppression and national discord and of the former inequality in the development of the nations in the country on the basis of total equality, mutual aid, and comprehensive cooperation; and the blossoming of socialist nations and their all-round rapprochement and the establishment of a new historical community--the essentially international Soviet people. In accordance with Lenin's legacy, the Communist Party considers in detail in its policies both the common interests of the peoples of our country as well as the specific and national characteristics of each one of them.

Our party's loyalty to Marxism-Leninism also means its loyalty to proletarian internationalism in the broadest meaning of the term. "We, Soviet communists, consider the defense of proletarian internationalism the sacred duty of every Marxist-Leninist," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 25th CPSU Congress. Factual internationalism is the inviolable Leninist principle always supported by the CPSU in its domestic and foreign policies.

Creating a communist society, the Soviet people are fulfilling their primary international duty to the international working class and the entire world's revolutionary and liberation movement. The Soviet Union is the biggest force of the world socialist comity. Strengthening the economic and defense power of their country, the Soviet people are making an invaluable contribution to the creation of favorable conditions for the building of a new life by the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries, and are doing everything possible to strengthen their solidarity and develop relations of reciprocal aid. Our country invariably provides political and moral support and, if necessary, material aid to the fighters for freedom, independence, and social progress.

The birth of the Soviet system was marked by Lenin's Decree on Peace. Today as well the USSR is to mankind the flagbearer of peace and the most systematic fighter for peace; it is the initiator of detente and of the strengthening and development of equal and mutually profitable cooperation among all nations. Thanks to the systematic peaceful policy of the CPSU, the implementation of the peace program, elaborated at the 24th and developed at the 25th congresses, the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence among countries with opposite social systems, and respect for the sovereign right of each nation to decide its own destinies are gaining ever-greater

acknowledgment in international relations. The Soviet communists have never concealed that they consider peaceful coexistence a battleground for the class struggle and for the historical competition between socialism and capitalism. However, they want this to be a struggle without the use of military power, conducted under circumstances which would exclude from the life of society war as a means for the solution of the historical dispute between the two world social systems. This precisely is the great humane mission of Soviet international policy.

The contemporary world communist movement is as much an offspring of the genius of the revolution as is developed socialism and fraternal cooperation among socialist countries. Lenin was at its origins and it became the most influential political force of our time thanks to Leninism. The objective laws governing the development of capitalism at the imperialist stage, and the laws governing the revolutionary struggle of the working people, discovered by Lenin, remain effective. Understanding this truth invariably contributes to the success of the revolutionary struggle. The communist movement has won many historical victories under the Marxist-Leninist banner. It is under this banner that, in the final account, it will create the universal communist brotherhood among nations.

Lenin's name will live into the centuries. Grateful humanity will never cease to admire the power of his revolutionary genius.

5003

CSO: 1802

HE SAW FAR INTO HISTORY; WRITER'S NOTES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 pp 19-23

[Article by Yuriy Gribov]

[Text] Vladimir Il'ich Lenin...as they pronounce this great name it sounds to me like a password to that historic night in October, in Smol'nyy, filled with the sound of human voices. In front of them on a podium is Lenin's stocky figure. He waves his hands energetically and states that the worker-peasant revolution, the need for which had always been mentioned by the Bolsheviki, had been accomplished.

I did not see Lenin in Smol'nyy. Simply, I was not born then. However, all our lives are the extension of the great October days. That is why I keep the memory of Lenin on the revolutionary watershed epoch of the history of mankind. This is a young epoch, which began in October 1917. However, what tremendous successes it achieved, created through Lenin's tireless energy! In 60 years we have covered a path equaling centuries. However hard the enemies may try to defame the greatness of the accomplishments of the Leninist party they will be unable to do so. Facts may be forged and figures distorted but the accomplishments of the Soviet system, inspired by Lenin's ideas, are part of each of our lives. The labor joys and spiritual flight of hundreds of millions of people, of an entire nation, cannot be deleted!

Vladimir Il'ich Lenin...I mention this great name and childhood images come to mind. A rural street, a new truck surrounded by a thick crowd and on top of the truck cab a big portrait of Lenin. Il'ich wearing a cap, with a red ribbon on his coat. He is smiling and there is a good and happy gleam in his narrowed eyes. This is an Il'ich close and understandable, as though one of our rural people pressing around the truck. Side by side with it, gleaming in their lacquer and fresh paint, were two more one and one-half ton trucks produced at the Gor'kiy motor vehicles plant. The trucks had stopped by the school and the people were running to see them. A spontaneous meeting took place. The sides were removed, and someone brought a bench to gain easier access to the platform. Then, our muzhiks began to make speeches. I can see in front of me the excited and happy faces, this entire street holiday as though all this took

place yesterday. That was the second year following the establishment of a kolkhoz in our village. The new life, the feeling of ownership of all farmland and meadows, collectivism, the tractors and motor vehicles coming from the cities, and reports on the successes of the First Five-Year Plan filled the human hearts with pride, giving the people strength and the spirit of youth. In order to express all this, and share the thoughts which poured out of their hearts, old men who had spent their entire lives without going any farther than Borisovo, the marketplace village, and women from all three brigades climbed on the platform. It seemed as though all speeches began with the words, "Well, Comrade Lenin said that..."

And everyone referred to Il'ich as being alive, as living among them, living with their concerns and accomplishments. The people knew that everything new comes from Lenin whose behests were being followed by the party. All this was real, visible, and tangible to all. There appeared in Bugry, our village, its first red army commanders, shock workers from the motor vehicles plant, tractor drivers, and fliers. No person here had ever risen above the position of carter yet, suddenly, our boys began to show up on the rural streets with lieutenant insignia in their blue summer tabs.

The work then was happy, with songs, even though a great deal was lacking: cotton print, glass for kerosene lanterns, and shoes. However, the people had faith in the new life. They knew that now happiness and prosperity were in their own hands. If they could make trucks, tractors, and combines, it meant that they would also weave calico and Il'ich bulbs will replace kerosene lanterns.

Now, in the 60th anniversary of the Soviet system, the television is showing a series of films entitled "Our Biography," reproducing documentaries of that time. Many people, particularly the elderly, are crying unashamedly. These are tears of pride, of happiness: were we really able to accomplish all this ourselves? Yes, ourselves. Armed with Il'ich's ideas. Lenin's ideas, embodied by the party, were the ones which led our people to the exploits.

Reading Lenin's works one is amazed by the scope of his knowledge and brilliant mind. He saw the future of history. Each of his articles and works, even a small sketch, is a vision of the future, a firing force. Il'ich's works are topical, sharp, and aggressive. Lenin's works resemble bursts of unparalleled energy and time cannot exhaust their study. A great variety of people find in Lenin's works what they need, gaining the logic and strength of his convictions. How frequently I have seen books by Lenin with bookmarks in offices, private premises, and even trains. Once I visited the office of the Rossiya Kolkhoz, in the Pskov area, finding there its chairman Dmitriy Ivanovich Ivanov, my old acquaintance. It was late in the day, the movie at the club had just ended, and the people had gone home while Dmitriy Ivanovich was sitting under the light and, looking at an open book by Lenin, was copying something in a notebook.

"Preparing for a talk?" I asked him.

"When it comes to the kolkhoz I know everything by heart, I could speak for an hour."

"What then? I see Lenin on your desk..."

"True, Lenin. I always keep him on hand. The moment a confusion develops I pick up Vladimir Il'ich's work. Yesterday an argument developed in our rayon executive committee: should multiple story homes be built in the countryside? The discussion also dealt generally with central farmsteads, and rural life..."

"Were you looking for the answer in Lenin?"

"Naturally, not necessarily for this. How to say it...Lenin allows me to think, gives me courage. Only Lenin must be read patiently. He cannot be read hastily. Haste will not do. One has to stop on every sentence, think, and make notes."

Dmitriy Ivanovich has not had much education. He studied "on the run," sporadically, but he read a great deal, Lenin in particular, his latest works, and was famous among kolkhoz chairmen as a thinking person, with real peasant talent, and like a statesman.

Everything that Vladimir Il'ich Lenin dreamed about and fought for his entire life has been and is being accomplished. Mentioning Lenin we built the national economy, turned agrarian Russia into a powerful industrial state, plowed the virgin lands, built bridges across rivers and erected along them the most powerful electric power plants in the world, were the first to reach outer space, developed the Tyumen' area, are building the Baykal-Amur main railroad, and creating industrial-territorial complexes the size of entire countries...The banners of our party which was created, nurtured, and armed by Il'ich's great doctrine state: everything for the sake of man, for the good of man. It is on this that the party members are focusing their efforts.

Recently, on the eve of spring, I visited two kolkhozes in the nonchernozem area--imeni Lenin, headed by Hero of Socialist Labor Sergey Ivanovich Bizunov, and imeni Pyatidesyatiletia SSSR, headed by Leonid Mikhaylovich Malkov, also hero of socialist labor. I was very familiar with both these farms ten years ago, prior to the historical March Central Committee Plenum and the publication of the party's and government's decrees on the further development of agriculture in the nonchernozem zone of the RSFSR. Now I was very interested in my visit, for I had heard a great deal of the changes which have taken place in the kolkhozes in the past 10 years. However, what I saw exceeded all expectations. New settlements, entire streets of beautiful and comfortable homes, animal husbandry complexes, grain conveyer belts, spacious palaces of culture, and cafeterias where a person could eat tasty and plentiful food for 25 kopecks.

More than anything else, however, I was amazed and pleased by the pile of statements on Leonid Mikhaylovich Malkov's desk. These were not requests for materials but for kolkhoz membership. About 100 requests had been received from forestry farms, plants, the armed forces, and construction sites. In the past, I recall, Malkov was always complaining that there was a shortage of manpower and that mechanizers and young people were few. Now this has become a youth kolkhoz. Boys and girls wear fashionable clothes. One can look at them and forget that one is in the countryside where 10 years ago there was not even a decent club...

"Leonid Mikhaylovich," I asked Malkov, "how were you able to develop so?"

"How not to now? Now one can expand. The state provides extensive help. All it takes is to use it sensibly and work properly. Today one-half of the successes achieved by the countryside are decided in the cities, at the plants. Everything, all industry, is progressing and the villages are progressing as well. We raised grain yields to 40 quintals per hectare; we produce a great deal of milk and our earnings are high. In the 10th Five-Year Plan we shall raise considerably all indicators and eliminate the remaining small villages. Life will become even better..."

The same mood of efficiency and optimism dominated the kolkhoz imeni Lenin. Surplus housing is being built and three or four houses are always empty. The moment a soldier is demobilized and gets married he is given the key to a new apartment. The houses have natural gas and running water; a children's complex and a new public bath with swimming pool are nearby...

When I met Sergey Ivanovich Bizunov, at the kolkhoz's board premises, he was considering the establishment of a kolkhoz museum to labor glory.

"The young people must know who strengthened here the Soviet system," Bizunov said. "Our kolkhoz is named after Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. We are proud of this and try to work like him..."

Gathering materials for a book on Lenin, I traveled around our country and recently visited Switzerland and Finland. The work was easy: the people not only preserve documents related to Vladimir Il'ich's life but stories by his fellow workers; they maintain the houses where he lived and worked. Everything is already known about Lenin, studied, researched, and described. However, finding oneself in Lenin's places, the unique character of Il'ich bursts out in one's soul with a new light. It is as though one becomes involved in his life. This was precisely the feeling I experienced when Roger Dafflon, member of the Politburo of the Swiss Labor Party, took me to the old quarters in Geneva, the University, Caouge and Maraichais streets, Cafe Landolt, frequently visited by Lenin, and the library of the Society of Readers, in which Il'ich worked for almost two years. He reached it walking from David Dufour Street. The distance was not small. We walked the same distance. I walked and recalled the notes made by Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya on "early every morning

the Russian revolutionary arrived, with the cuffs of his inexpensive trousers folded like the Swiss, to avoid the mud, and which he forgot to unfold, picked up the book he had left the previous day dealing with fight at the barricades or the technique of the offensive, sat at his usual place behind a table facing the window, smoothed his hair over his balding head, and plunged into his reading."

Today as well this library is one of the biggest in Geneva. The building is old, three stories high, with high shelves, broad halls and greeting rooms. Learning that we were interested in Lenin, the elderly librarian Jacques (Pikko) showed us a photograph of Il'ich on the front page of the book of the society's honorary members. He then took us to the hall where Vladimir Il'ich worked. With his permission we leafed through the books used by Lenin. Vladimir Il'ich had made pencil notes on the margins. We looked at the reading card filled with the fast, as though running, Leninist writing. The librarian described that distant time when Lenin worked in the library and spoke of his tremendous capacity for work, and modesty. I recalled the lines from the memoirs of Geneva resident Alfonse Bernou, doctor of sciences, and permanent Society visitor since 1901: "Our tables were side by side...usually Ul'yanov read and took notes on loose leafs. I frequently saw him copy extensively from the material he had read. Once we fell into conversation when Mr Ul'yanov asked my advice on how to procure a just-published book. Ul'yanov spoke French excellently, with a sing-song accent and elongated "r." Had I only known that my modest acquaintance, Mr Ul'yanov, would become the great Lenin..."

Yet, already then he was great, he was the leader of our revolution. Lenin headed the Russian labor movement from Switzerland. Studying the revolutionary situation in Russia, Vladimir Il'ich was elaborating the strategy of the October class battles. He described it clearly and accessibly to the broad masses: "The particular task of the moment, consistent with this transitional state, is the organization of the proletariat. However, not a routine organization which the betrayers of socialism, the social patriots, and opportunists of all countries, and the supporters of Kautsky find satisfactory, but a revolutionary organization. Such an organization must be, first, nationwide; secondly, it must combine military with governmental function."

Lenin's following works were printed in Switzerland: "The Tasks of the Russian Social Democrats," "One Step Forward Two Steps Backward," "Two Tactics of the Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution," and the brilliant philosophical work "Materialism and Empiriocriticism." The newspapers ISKRA, VPERED, and PROLETARIY were published under Lenin's management. Jacob (Lekhlyayter), secretary of the Swiss Labor Party Central Committee, described to me those years of bolshevik emigration as we were visiting Lenin's places in Zurich. We saw the Spiegelgasse where a memorial plaque has been placed to commemorate Lenin. We visited the suburbs where Lenin liked to walk...A feeling of joy fills the person as he walks along those streets and lanes walked by Il'ich...

"We Swiss communists are proud of the fact that Comrade Lenin lived and worked in our country," Jacob (Lekhlyayter) said. "We are learning from Comrade Lenin how to fight for the cause of the people."

"We try to work like Lenin," I was told by Sergey Bizunov, a Soviet party member from the Smolensk area. We learn from Lenin how to fight for the cause of the people," I was told by the Swiss communist Jacob (Lekhlyayter). How frequently I have heard these words in Finland, the Ukraine, in Bulgaria, in Armenia, and many other places. The people are learning from Lenin how to transform the world...The great truth of his ideas, his life's exploit for the sake of the happiness of the working people rally the best people of different countries and nationalities, teaching them how to fight for the bright future of man.

I think of this whenever I go to Red Square and approach Lenin's Mausoleum. Thousands of people are standing in a line which stretches somewhere behind the History Museum in the direction of Aleksandrov Park. The people are going to Il'ich. People who are learning from Lenin industriousness, love for the fatherland, loyalty to communist ideals, and firmness in the battle with the enemy go to see Lenin.

The single family of nations flows like a wide river into Lenin's Mausoleum. Many attempts have been to divide this family and defeat it. I remember this. I recall pictures of the war and the approaches to Berlin. The gray dusk bursts in the fiery flames of my company's machine guns. Somewhere to the left the squad commanded by the Belorussian Yurchenko is engaged in battle. Ahead, the Mordvinian Pertsov, with the Uzbek Nurmatov by his side, are facing death. We rise to the attack and, running with me, are the members of my regiment--Tatars, Yakuts, and Ukrainians. We capture a line just abandoned by the fascists. We are tired and silent. However, the moment the fatigue is over a feeling of triumph takes over. We have reached Berlin. Hitler hoped to defeat our country. He had a splendidly equipped army with experience in lightning wars. He also relied on a discord which would develop among our nations. The family would break down. However, each one of us lives with the feeling of being member of a single family. The family may break down only by destroying all of us. Fascism was unable to accomplish this. We reached Berlin. A brief halt between attacks, yet we are already feeling the victory. We thought of going home. We recalled our villages, cities, forests, steppes, and rivers...Everyone remembered his precious native land. However, all that represented a single entity--the homeland. And Lenin was within each one of us. We defended the homeland and reached Berlin carrying the name of Lenin...

...a spring sun is flooding Red Square. Step by step the people's chain moves. The people are going to Lenin...Even if the mausoleum had remained open round the clock this flood of people would not have diminished.

Walking more slowly, we go down the steps of the mausoleum. Solemn silence...here is Il'ich...his big and brilliant head is softly lit. The face is tranquil...this is the expressive face of Lenin, familiar to millions of people...

One does not feel like talking after visiting the mausoleum. One wishes to remain alone, to think...even in a crowd. One's entire life passes in front of one's own eyes...how have you lived and how are you living? One remembers M. Gor'kiy's words: "The best way to honor his tremendous work and the best way to thank him for everything he has done not only for Russia but for all mankind is to engage in honest labor, in intense labor, and to love labor..."

At home I put a record with Lenin's speeches on. The seconds during which the needle was still turning on an empty groove seemed long. Finally came the living voice of Lenin, slightly muffled, familiar: "What is the Soviet system? What is the essence of this new system which most countries are either unwilling or unable to understand? Its nature, attracting more and more the workers of all countries, is that in the past the state was managed one way or another by the rich or the capitalists, whereas now, for the first time, it is precisely the classes oppressed by capitalism that are managing the state in large numbers."

It is as though Il'ich is delivering his famous speech in the neighboring room, explaining the nature of the Soviet system, a people's system, a most vital and necessary system now celebrating its 60th anniversary.

Side by side with Il'ich...with us! We live and conquer with Lenin's name. We are marching toward communism with Lenin's name. "Time passes," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 16th USSR Trade Unions Congress, "circumstances change, ever-new tasks appear; however, the way given by Lenin was, and remains the only true, the only correct way."

5003

CSO: 1802

LENIN'S EXAMPLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 pp 24-34

[Article by A. Skochilov, first secretary, Ul'yanovskaya Oblast CPSU Committee]

[Text] The gigantic figure of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin--the philosopher, revolutionary, and man whose exploit will always remain an inspiring example for the communists and for millions of progressive people on the planet, stands at the origins of the Great October Revolution and of all revolutionary accomplishments in our country and abroad.

The years fly by but the links between the party and the people with Lenin remain just as unbreakable and strong. The great energy of Lenin's mind, and the beating of the warm Leninist heart continue to live in the party's accomplishments. Lenin's ideas, training, and science are conquering. They are the inexhaustible source from which the communists and all Soviet people draw confidence in their forces, courage, optimism, and will to win.

I

The education of the working people and the youth in the example of V. I. Lenin's life and activities is one of the most important tasks of our party and there is nothing more lofty and noble than to follow it, selflessly fighting for the cause to which he dedicated his entire life.

To us, the people of Ul'yanovskaya Oblast, this is a particularly honorable and responsible task. It was in Ul'yanovsk, formerly Simbirsk, that Lenin was born. It was here that his revolutionary awareness was awakened and his immortal genius, will, and desire to find a way for saving man from oppression and exploitation strengthened and matured.

In our oblast the efforts to educate the working people in Lenin's example have been conducted over many decades.

As early as 1920, on the occasion of Vladimir Il'ich's 50th birthday, the Simbirskaya Guberniya committee recommended to the party organizations to develop immediately and as broadly and extensively a campaign among the worker and peasant masses to explain the significance of Lenin's historical personality in the Russian and international revolutionary movements. Not a single remote hamlet or village, no single enterprise, the gubkom decision stated, should be left out, without peasants and workers hearing the words of our party on who Lenin is and what he had accomplished for the struggle of the working people of Russia and the entire world.

Since then this work has been steadily improved and enriched with new forms and content. It was developed particularly extensively in the period of preparations for the celebration of the centennial of Lenin's birth. In subsequent years the party obkom, gorkoms, and raykoms have done everything possible to consolidate the forms of work with the people which had proved their usefulness. We take into consideration that educating people in Lenin's example is an exceptionally complex and comprehensive problem which demands a scientific and comprehensive approach.

Living and working in the native land of the great leader we have tremendous opportunities for making use of Lenin's example in daily educational activities.

The city has a number of Leninist memorial places which we maintain as shrines.

Lenin's museums in Ul'yanovsk have become important centers for the political education of the masses and the dissemination of Marxist-Leninist ideas. Every day they are visited by thousands of people of different ages and professions coming to us from all parts of our immense homeland, and tourists from many parts of the world. In 1976, for example, the Leninist museums were visited by over 1.5 million people; in the seven years which followed the inauguration of the Leninist memorial, the branch of the Lenin Central Museum was visited by over 5 million travelers and tourists.

Visiting the Lenin memorial, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, wrote the following in the visitor's book:

"The memorial complex erected at the place where Vladimir Il'ich Lenin was born is a tribute to the tremendous love and gratitude of the Soviet people for the great leader of the working people who dedicated his entire outstanding life of struggle to the triumph of communism.

"May this tremendous monument always serve the noble cause of the dissemination of the immortal Marxist-Leninist ideas!"

The premises of this branch include over 3,000 exhibits and, among them, photocopies of Lenin's manuscripts, first editions of his work, originals of the newspapers ISKRA, VPERED, PROLETARIY, and PRAVDA, containing articles by Lenin; duplicates of objects used by Lenin, very rare photographs, paintings, sculptures, and graphic works. The materials of the 25th CPSU Congress and the chronicle "60 Years of Soviet Power" are extensively represented.

Every day propagandists, lecturers, political informants, and agitators use for their work the extensive documentary exhibits of the branch. This enables them to acquaint their audiences, with vivid and clear facts, with the basic stages of Lenin's heroic life and revolutionary activities, and the great history of the party he created, and to trace the struggle waged by the Soviet people for the fulfillment of Lenin's legacy and the influence of Leninism on the world's revolutionary process.

The exhibits displayed at Lenin's House-Museum and Apartment-Museum recreate the domestic circumstances in which Vladimir Il'ich spent his childhood and adolescence. They help the young people to realize more profoundly that one of the sources for the molding of his personality as a person and revolutionary was the Ul'yanov democratic and highly cultured family saturated with a spiritual atmosphere.

The lectures-trips involve the use of technical propaganda facilities and are accompanied by the showing of documentaries. In addition to Lenin's biography, they cover a broad range of topics on party history, problems of Marxist-Leninist theory, and topical problems stemming from the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress.

The visits to the Leninist museums, the lecture-trips, and the viewing of documentaries enable the audiences to experience history visibly, to feel as participants in these remote events. This contributes to the better mastery of the material and has a tremendous emotional impact.

The rich possibilities of the Leninist museums in Ul'yanovsk are extensively used by the oblast party and Komsomol organizations in the education of the working people in the example of Lenin's life and activities and the revolutionary, combat, and labor traditions of the party and the Soviet people. Last school year lecturers gave 660 lectures-trips on Lenin's biography, CPSU history, individual Marxist-Leninist problems, problems of party domestic and foreign policy and the international communist movement, to assist students of Marxist-Leninist theory alone.

The museum visitors are, above all, workers, employees, and specialists of Ul'yanovsk plants and factories, university and high school students, military school students, and fliers. Frequent visitors include people from other oblast cities, and farm workers and high school students from Karsunskiy, Ul'yanovskiy, Tsil'ninskiy, Baryshskiy, Melekesskiy, Inzenskiy, Maynskiy, and many other rayons.

In their work with the propagandists many party committees use the materials of the Leninist museums. Thus, the Leninskiy, Zheleznodorozhnyy, Teren'gul'skiy, Maynskiy, Surskiy, Veshkaymskiy, Kuzovatovskiy, Starokulatkinskiy, and Karsunskiy rayon party committees and some party committees of big Ul'yanovsk enterprises sponsor seminars with propagandists at the branch of the Lenin Central Museum. Frequently, following the lectures sponsored at the oblast Political Education Home, the students undertake topic and problem trips based on branch exhibits; they see the documentaries "Vladimir Ul'yanov," "The Living Lenin," and others.

The Leninist museums also sponsor various mass measures. For many years the branch has operated a Leninist university attended by the boys and girls of vocational-technical school number six. Here Leninist readings are regularly sponsored for the town working people, along with meetings with party and labor veterans, production leaders, and artists.

In the halls of the Leninist museums the party and Komsomol organizations present awards, internal passports, and Komsomol cards. It is here that school children are accepted as pioneers while adolescents who have joined enterprises are dedicated as members of the working class in solemn circumstances.

In the branch of the Lenin Central Museum lecturers, propagandists, and students may consult on the leader's biography and CPSU history.

All major sociopolitical measures--city and oblast party conferences, aktivs, meetings, and seminars--take place in the Lenin memorial. Recently the oblast rally of the winners of the 1976 socialist competition was held here. A group of its participants made the following entry in the visitor's book: "The example of the life of the great leader of the October Revolution whose 60th anniversary is being celebrated by our country this year is inspiring us to constructive labor to implement the great program of building communism."

We celebrate 22 April--Vladimir Il'ich's birthday--as the greatest of holidays. Everywhere solemn meetings of working people and the youth take place at which the results of the competition in honor of Lenin's birth are summed up; lectures and reports, talks, readings, motion picture festivals on Leninist topics, school parades, and a variety of mass cultural and sports measures are organized everywhere. The streets of cities and rayon centers and of villages and settlements assume a holiday appearance. There is particularly large attendance that day at the Lenin memorial and Home-Museum, and the central square of the city named after the leader. In an endless stream, column after column, workers and employees, and high school and university students come here to place fresh flowers at the pedestal of Lenin's monument as a symbol of infinite love for and gratitude toward their great native son. Lenin's favorite songs, performed by a huge combined chorus and orchestra, are heard on the square. That day thousands of people from Ul'yanovsk and guests watch with interest the traditional

solemn parade of young Leninists. The pioneer units report on their accomplishments and on the way they are fulfilling Lenin's legacy. The people of Ul'yanovsk sacredly honor Il'ich's memory, checking their accomplishments and actions against Lenin, and try to study, work, and live in a Leninist, a communist fashion.

II

The party organization in Ul'yanovskaya Oblast is doing a great deal to educate the leading cadres and all party members in the spirit of the strict observance of Leninist norms of party life and principles of party management, and in mastering the Leninist style of work.

As was noted at the 25th CPSU Congress, an atmosphere of creative construction, trust in cadres, and high party exactingness and principle-mindedness has been solidly established in our country. The unity between party and people is strengthening steadily. The celebration of the 70th birthday of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, the tireless continuator of the great Leninist cause, was a vivid manifestation of the infinite trust and love of the Soviet people for the Leninist party, its Central Committee, and the Politburo.

Receiving the high award of the homeland--the Order of Lenin--and his second Gold Star Medal, Leonid Il'ich assured all members of our party, all Soviet people, and our friends and supporters abroad that he will always try to follow steadfastly Lenin's doctrine and his immortal example. "...the image of Lenin," Leonid Il'ich said, "the greatest person of our epoch and the most precious person to us, to the working people the world over...is precious to us not only because he is the banner of our revolution, founder of our party, and builder of the first socialist state in the world. He is close and precious to us also because and, perhaps, particularly because his sharp creative mind, invincible logic, depth of analysis, boldness of conclusions and actions, and tireless revolutionary passion and, at the same time, greatest humaneness, simplicity, and responsiveness have all been and will remain for us a guideline in life, a priceless support and aid in our current affairs."

Our party has always followed and will continue to follow Lenin's behests and master the Leninist style of work. A particularly important feature of this style is the proper selection, placement, and education of cadres. In the selection of cadres, Lenin taught, we must take into consideration their political, practical, and moral qualities. We must patiently test and recognize the real organizers, the people with a sober mind and practical cunning who combine loyalty to socialism with the ability to organize noiselessly joint work by a large number of people. Following Lenin's behests, the party has always ascribed great importance to cadre policy.

By the end of December, at an obkom plenum, we discussed thoroughly the question of the tasks of the oblast party organization on further improvements of the work with cadres in the light of the requirements of the 25th CPSU Congress. Some of the results of the work done in the past 10 years were summed up and measures to improve it further were earmarked. Since the tasks of the oblast party organization have become considerably more complex today requirements concerning cadres have become stricter. The overwhelming majority of our managing workers are displaying creative initiative, profound knowledge, and a conscientious attitude toward assignments; the qualitative structure of cadres has improved. Notable changes have been made in the age structure of party, soviet, and economic cadres: more young people are being appointed to leading positions along with active and politically mature representatives of the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry, and the people's intelligentsia.

Every year the best production workers who have actively proved themselves at work and in social life are sent to the higher party schools. Thus, V. Rydayev, a fitter-electrician at the plant for heavy one-of-a-kind machine tools, delegate to the 25th party congress, is attending the Higher Party School of the CPSU Central Committee; obkom party member and weaver at the factory imeni Lenin, T. Nechayeva, is attending the Saratov Higher Party School; M. Yunusov, leader of a complex brigade at the Rassvet Kolkhoz and member of the Starokulatkinskiy Rayon party committee bureau, is attending the Saratov Higher Party School, and so are others.

The rayon party committees and many party committees of industrial enterprises, construction projects, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes are engaged in purposeful cadre selection, training, and education work.

Naturally, not all party organizations are displaying adequate exactingness toward cadres. Some managers fall out of step with life and display a passive attitude. The CPSU Obkom studies such shortcomings and adopts measures for each manager and specialist adamantly to master the Leninist style of work and Leninist science of management, and to be an active fighter for upgrading production effectiveness and quality, a promoter of scientific and technical progress, and a good educator of the collective.

As we know, V. I. Lenin ascribed great importance to the links between the leaders and the masses. "Live in the thick of the mass. Know its feelings. Know everything. Understand the mass. Be able to approach it. Gain its absolute trust," he wrote ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 44, p 497). Vladimir Il'ich frequently went among and addressed the workers on political matters. He believed that "personal influence and talking at meetings are terribly important in politics. Without them there are no political activities..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 47, p 54).

Practical experience indicates that a healthy atmosphere of creative labor is developed and good results are achieved in the primary organizations whose leadership always remains in touch with the masses.

Speakers from the Leninskiy Staromaynskiy, and Radishchevskiy rayons, and the Dimitrovgrad City Party Committee systematically address the population. Days of business meetings and lectures in the course of which the heads of the rayon and the plants meet with the working people at their jobs and agitation centers are held regularly in Zavolzhskiy Rayon. The suggestions and remarks expressed at such meetings are then considered by the rayon party committees and corresponding measures are adopted.

Naturally, the organization and topics of such addresses suffer from shortcomings as well. The work of the groups of speakers is not always efficiently planned and their instruction and training are not properly organized. Few lectures are given on economics, Soviet law, labor discipline, and morality. In this connection the oblast party committee secretariat passed a special decree directing the party committees to insure the regular information of the working people on the most important events in the country and abroad and to explain extensively the party's domestic and foreign policy.

The oblast has set aside one political day for speeches by speakers from the CPSU obkom, gorkoms, and raykoms. This has improved the organization of the work of information groups, considerably broadened political agitation and upgraded its effectiveness. Thus, on 10 February alone 1,105 people presented lectures and reports on political topics to the working people. Most of them spoke directly in the shops, and brigade and livestock farm study rooms.

The main topic of the lectures and reports was the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution" and the tasks of the party, soviet, and public organizations and collectives of working people for welcoming properly this noted anniversary.

The force of the Leninist example is a powerful means for upgrading the level of all ideological-educational and agitation-propaganda work of the party organizations. As we know, Lenin ascribed exceptional importance to progressive revolutionary theory and the ideological and theoretical arming of the party. He considered the political education of party members and nonmembers a necessary and a very important prerequisite for the building of communism and constantly called for improving propaganda and upgrading its effectiveness. The Leninist ideas on the political education of the masses were developed further in the party documents. "The mass study of Marxism-Leninism is the most important characteristic in the development of social consciousness at the present stage," stated the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th party congress. "Now, in the new stage entered by the party, without lowering the attention to involving in party training the ever-broader masses of party and non-party members, it is important to display particular concern for the content of this work and for upgrading its theoretical standard."

In the current school year over 300,000 working people in Ul'yanovskaya Oblast are involved in the various forms of political education and economic training; of these 115,000 are within the party's educational system.

In accordance with the Central Committee decree "On the Tasks of Party Training in the Light of the Decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress," we direct the attention of the party organizations and the propagandists to the need for mastering profoundly the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism as the only international theory, and the historical experience of the Leninist party whose creative contribution to theory is found in the decisions of the latest party congresses and Central Committee plenums, the speeches by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and other leaders of the party and the Soviet state, and the documents of the international communist movement; we direct their attention to the importance of the study of CPSU theory and policy in their organic unity and close link with practical work, and to the conversion of such knowledge into an active position in life, and the development of communist convictions manifested in the people's actions and accomplishments.

Within the economic training system a transition has been made to the second stage: the deeper study of individual theoretical and practical problems of economic construction and of upgrading production effectiveness and work quality.

In recent years, two obkom plenums have dealt with problems of Marxist-Leninist education and economic training. They always remain within the field of vision of the obkom bureau and the party gorkoms and raykoms. Guided by the CPSU Central Committee decree on the Belorussian party organization, we ascribe primary importance to ideological cadres and to work with them, for in the final account the structure of the propagandists and lecturers determines the content of propaganda and its ideological direction. The sociopolitical certification of the heads of courses, seminars, and circles, already granted to some 8,000 people, is largely contributing to improving the selection, training, and upbringing of propagandists.

To an ever-greater extent political training is becoming a course for ideological tempering and for the labor and moral education of the people. Many students make skillful use of the theoretical knowledge they acquire in their practical activities. With the help of the propagandists they elaborate counterplans and socialist pledges for the ahead-of-schedule fulfillment of the five-year plan and participate in rationalization and invention work. Over 66,000 students undergoing various forms of training are communist labor shock workers; over 77,000 are struggling to gain this high title; 15,500 are lecturers and reporters, and over 32,000 are political informants and agitators.

The oblast party organizations offer a number of examples of a truly skillful and inspired propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, of CPSU policy, and of a comprehensive approach to the solution of ideological-educational and production problems.

V. Pipenko, director of the silicate-concrete plant of the Dimitrovgrad Construction Administration, has been engaged in active propaganda work for over 20 years. Even though he has a great deal of experience, he is constantly improving his knowledge and teaching method. He directs in particular the attention of the participants in the seminar on "Managerial Labor"--chiefs of shops and departments and foremen--to the study of Lenin's works and party documents, the use of progressive experience, and the organization and quality of the work; he promotes in them a feeling of responsibility, interest in new and progressive developments, and concern for social affairs. All seminar participants are political informants and agitators; they carry out other social assignments as well, and half of them are rationalizers.

The training of production leaders greatly contributed to the successful fulfillment of the Ninth Five-Year Plan and the first year of the 10th Five-Year Plan and the growth of labor productivity at the enterprise. The experience of seminar instructor V. Pipenko was summed up and disseminated among the city's propagandists. For the results of his work the plant director was awarded the "Shock Worker of the Ninth Five-Year Plan" badge; he was awarded an honorary certificate by the CPSU Gorkom for his many years of propaganda work.

Some of the best propagandists in the oblast include Yu. Sergutov, director of the Karlinskiy Sovkhoz, V. Zolotukhin, chief engineer of the prestressed reinforced concrete plant number one of Glavul'yanovskstroy, Yu. Biryulya, engineer at the Machine-Building Plant imeni Volodarskiy, V. Demekhin, engineer-technologist at the Automotive Vehicles Plant imeni V. I. Lenin, V. Kuz'min, deputy chairman, Cherdaklinskiy Rayon executive committee, A. Lazarev, principal of the eighth grade school in Koptevo, Novospasskiy Rayon, A. Kiselev, chairman of the Kolkhoz imeni Kalinin, Veshkaymskiy Rayon, and many others.

The role of the night Marxism-Leninism university of the Ul'yanovsk CPSU Gorkom and of the seminars and schools for the party aktiv has been increased in the training of propagandists and in the Marxist-Leninist training of cadres. The important training methods used here include the defense of papers, course and diploma projects, theoretical and practical science conferences and seminars, and the implementation of practical assignments. Positive experience has been acquired in this respect by Ul'yanovskiy, Veshkaymskiy, Zasviyazhskiy, Cherdaklinskiy, Melekesskiy, and other rayons.

The obkom has organized an oblast school for professional ideological cadres. It offers classes in problems of the effectiveness of the ideological and political education of the working people, improvements in the party management of the socialist competition, and the study and dissemination of progressive experience in the organization of propaganda and mass agitation work.

III

We pay particular attention to the youth in our work to educate the people in the example of Lenin's life and activities. Such work is being conducted particularly energetically and purposefully within the Komsomol training system. Mastering the Leninist theoretical heritage, the young people acquire a fuller and more vivid idea of the character of the great leader. Leninist lessons and examinations have made the political education of the youth more active and effective. In the past five years some 20,000 Leninist classes have been taught in oblast Leninist circles and seminars. They help to develop in the boys and girls a communist idea-mindedness--a blend of knowledge, convictions, and practical action. The very title of the lessons: "The Five-Year Plan is Me and I Am the Five-Year Plan," "We are Strong with our Leninist Friendship," "We study Communism and are Building Communism!," "What Living and Working like Lenin Means," and "To be a Revolutionary Now!" show the profound purpose of the big and meaningful dialog with the youth.

Leninist classes are frequently attended by party and economic leaders, heroes of socialist labor, and instructors of the youth. A characteristic dialog between generations develops. Thus, 10 delegates to the 25th CPSU Congress, 685 order bearers, and 950 party and Komsomol veterans and heroes of the Great Patriotic War attended the Leninist lesson on "The Party is the Mind, Honor, and Conscience of our Epoch."

The current school year within the Komsomol political education system began with the Leninist lesson "The Five-Year Plan of Effectiveness and Quality is the Enthusiasm and Creativity of the Young!" This marked the beginning of numerous patriotic initiatives in honor of the great anniversary of the Soviet system.

Last February, during the All-Union Komsomol Meeting, a discussion was held on the implementation of the resolutions of the 25th party congress and the October 1976 Central Committee Plenum, and the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU, and Komsomol Central Committee decree "On the All-Union Socialist Competition for Upgrading Production Effectiveness and Work Quality and for the Successful Implementation of the 10th Five-Year Plan," as well as the tasks of the Komsomol organizations in honor of the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution. The work on developing in every young person an active vital position and a conscientious attitude toward social duties was analyzed at meetings.

Currently the oblast Komsomol organization is preparing for the next Leninist lesson entitled "Keep a Revolutionary Step," which will complete the 1976/77 school year within the Komsomol political education system.

The party organizations make extensive use of the various forms of mass political propaganda in educating the working people and the working and student youth in the example of Lenin.

For example, very popular in the oblast are the performances by A. Ustyuzhaninov, performer with the Ul'yanovsk philharmonic orchestra. On the basis of Leninist documents and with great professional skill and high pathos he recreates the image of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin--the leader, the person of exceptional moral purity, simple and responsive to the people.

Leninist popular readings which include feature films or documentaries on Lenin, listening to recorded speeches by Vladimir Il'ich or his fellow workers, book exhibits, meetings with party veterans and production leaders and innovators, and special programs for amateur artistic performances have become a long tradition in the oblast. Their main content is the dissemination of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and of the achievements of the Soviet people in the implementation of Lenin's behests.

The oblast culture and art institutions have become strongholds in the dissemination of the ideas of Leninism and in raising the working people in the example of Lenin and the great traditions of the Communist Party and the Soviet people. The collective of the Ul'yanovsk drama theater has done extensive work on the creation of Leniniana for the stage. It stages shows in the rural areas with this topic, and performs in clubs, and palaces of culture of industrial enterprises and construction projects.

Works on Lenin by Ul'yanovsk painters have been exhibited at Bol'shaya Volga Oblast and zonal exhibits, the Soviet Russia exhibit, and the all-union anniversary exhibit. Exhibitions of paintings and reproductions on Lenin's life and activities and on the triumph of his immortal ideas are organized with their active participation in the work of worker and rural houses of culture, clubs, and libraries.

Every year the oblast organization of the USSR Union of Journalists sponsors a photographic exhibit on "Il'ich's native land today," reflecting our achievements in economic and cultural construction. The works of photography amateurs are shown in cities, rayons, and enterprises.

Extensive work is being done by the Ul'yanovsk art museum, founded in 1920. The museum has a permanent exhibit entitled "V. I. Lenin in Graphic Art," located at the Lenin Home-Museum. The works assembled here are Leniniana in the works of artists of many nationalities in our country.

Ten-day periods and days of the culture and arts of fraternal republics play a great role in the ideological life of the oblast working people. In 1966 the first celebration of the culture of Soviet Lithuania took place in Lenin's native land. Subsequently we have been visited by artists from Belorussia, Estonia, the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Armenia, Latvia, Bashkiriya, Tatariya, Chuvashiya, and other republics. The dozens of concerts, hundreds of creative encounters with young people at the Lenin memorial and at enterprises, kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and schools developed into a vivid manifestation of the friendship among the peoples of our country.

Leninist topics have firmly become part of the work of cultural and educational institutions. Here Leniniana has assumed a great variety of types and genres: Leninist readings, topic evenings and concerts, meetings with party veterans and bearers of the order of Lenin, evening-portraits of communists-Leninists, dramatized performances, sports measures, holidays of streets, enterprises, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes named after the leader, reviews of amateur art performances, and others.

The book palace imeni V. I. Lenin, and the oblast children's library sponsor Leninist readings, and readers conferences on Leninist works; every year they sponsor major reading exhibits. Similar measures are being organized by the other oblast libraries. Together with the Komsomol organizations the library workers try to promote the young people's interest in sociopolitical literature.

A movement under the slogan of "A V. I. Lenin Book in Every Family!" was born in Ul'yanovsk, initiated by Komsomol members. With their assistance book trading organizations are disseminating tens of thousands of books.

The annual movie festivals, the projection of motion pictures on Lenin's life and activities, motion picture lectures, motion picture quizzes, and meetings with talented actors, movie directors, and other artists are a very partial list of the methods applied in using motion pictures in ideological and educational work.

As we know, the foundations of a spiritually rich and morally mature personality are laid during the high school and university years. That is why the CPSU obkom and party gorkoms and raykoms pay particular attention to raising the students in the example of Lenin's life and activities. This question was discussed at a plenum of the Ul'yanovsk City Party Committee and in November 1976 at the regular oblast practical science conference at which the practice of involving the children in the study of Lenin's ideological heritage, established in the schools, was approved. Interesting is the organization of such work at the Ul'yanovsk school number one imeni V. I. Lenin, which was attended by high school student Volodya Ul'yanov. "To Live, Study, and Work Like Lenin!" is the slogan of the school faculty and students. In the Ninth Five-Year Plan many of its teachers graduated from the Marxism-Leninism university; Lenin's works and documents on

education and communist upbringing are extensively studied in a theoretical seminar. Here the training process is skillfully combined with extra-curricular work. The school collective is an exhibitor at the Exhibition of the Achievements of the USSR National Economy on the topic of "The Moral Education of the Students in the Example of V. I. Lenin's Life and Activities." The school museum materials are used in working with the city and oblast students. It is visited by thousands of travelers and tourists.

Other schools as well have set up Leninist museums and rooms. Thus, school number six has the I. N. Ul'yanov museum; school number two has the M. A. Ul'yanova museum; school number 34 has the Aleksandr Ul'yanov museum, while school number three has the Anna and Ol'ga Ul'yanov museum.

Optional courses such as "The Works of V. I. Lenin on the Three Revolutions in Russia," "V. I. Lenin and Literature," "V. I. Lenin and Simbirsk" have become quite popular in work with the senior classes. For many years a university for the young Marxist-Leninist has been successfully functioning at the Ul'yanovsk Pedagogical Institute imeni I. N. Ul'yanov.

It would be difficult within the limits of a single article to cover exhaustively all the aspects of our work for the education of the working people in the example of Lenin's life and activities and the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, and the molding in every Soviet person of Leninist ideological convictions. Naturally, our work is not always smooth. Many omissions remain in organizing the study of Lenin's ideological heritage and of party documents, along with cases of a formalistic attitude toward the implementation of one or another measure. This, unquestionably, lowers the effectiveness of educational work.

The working people of Ul'yanovskaya Oblast accepted as their battle program the decisions of the October 1976 Central Committee Plenum and the speech delivered at the plenum by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. The Central Committee letter on agricultural problems, and the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU, and Komsomol Central Committee decree "On the All-Union Socialist Competition for Upgrading Production Effectiveness and Work Quality and for the Successful Implementation of the 10th Five-Year Plan," as well as the party decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution" triggered a new influx of political and labor activities.

Competition is spreading for the fulfillment of the five-year assignments by the 110th anniversary of Lenin's birth and of the assignments of the first two years of the five-year plan by the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. Over 230,000 boys and girls in the oblast are fighting for the right to sign the report of the Leninist Komsomol to the CPSU Central Committee for the anniversary of the Soviet system; 16,000 young workers have pledged to fulfill their individual five-year plans by 22 April 1980.

The participants to the rally of production workers held in February at the Lenin memorial assured the CPSU Central Committee and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev that on the basis of the extensive development of the socialist competition under the slogan of "Work Better and Upgrade Effectiveness and Quality!" the working people of Ul'yanovskaya Oblast will achieve new successes in the development of the economy and culture, make a worthy contribution to the implementation of the great plans for the building of communism, earmarked at the 25th party congress, and welcome the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution with new labor victories.

5003

CSO: 1802

ON ORGANIZATIONAL RESERVES FOR UPGRADING PRODUCTION EFFECTIVENESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 pp 35-44

[Article by S. Kheyman, doctor of economic sciences, published as a basis for discussion]

[Text] Among the many basic tasks of economic strategy, the 25th CPSU Congress indicated the need for improving further the organization of public production. In this connection the question of the correlation among the technical and organizational effectiveness and intensification factors becomes very topical, theoretically as well as practically. Systematically implementing a course toward the further systematic upgrading of technical equipment, the party ascribes particular importance to organizational reserves for enhancing labor productivity and production effectiveness. Improving the organization of the work is a necessary prerequisite for the effective utilization of the equipment and its possibilities.

The faster growth of labor productivity compared with the growth of the capital-labor ratio is an indicator of the improved utilization of organizational reserves. In recent years such a faster growth has been achieved in the chemical and petrochemical industries, machine-building and metal processing, and the glassware and porcelain and some other sectors. As a whole for the entire industry, however, the growth of labor productivity is lagging behind the growth of its capital-labor ratio. Between 1971 and 1975 the correlation was 134 to 142. It is obvious that extensive possibilities remain to improve the organization of output. They could and should be utilized. This method is relatively less capital intensive.

Orienting the Consumer Toward "His Own" and National Economic Effectiveness

At the present level of socialization and scale of output the problem of effectiveness has long exceeded the limits of the individual enterprise. Today it is no longer sufficient for each enterprise to struggle only for "its own" effectiveness, i.e., to increase output and correspondingly reduce outlays. This task cannot be implemented successfully even on the sectorial scale. A national economic approach is needed.

Let us illustrate this by taking machine building and metal processing as an example. According to USSR Central Statistical Administration data the output of this sector rose 4.2 times between 1950 and 1960, and 5.4 times from 1960 to 1975. The dynamics is impressive! Why is it then that many even priority demands by the consumers remain unsatisfied? In our view this is due to a number of reasons.

First, systematically increasing its volumes of output in the interest of "its own" effectiveness, the machine-building industry does not always try to produce a sufficient set of spare parts and assemblies for the machines it has created.

Secondly, the need for a certain number, sometimes very small, of non-standard special technological equipment arises in any sector of the national economy in the course of technological development and growth. Such equipment frequently represents the achievements of leading technology and could, subsequently, become the base for the better equipment of a given enterprise or sector. Yet, there are practically no machine-building enterprises ready to meet this need. What is the result?

The Soviet Union has considerably outstripped the United States in the number of metal-cutting machine tools. To a certain extent this is explained by some differences in the quality and productivity of the equipment but not by this alone. The fact is that in our country a large number of various machine tools are being used outside machine building and metal processing. Naturally, this means that a corresponding number of people are operating them.

This tremendous fleet of machinery is essentially used in the isolated, nonspecialized, and frequently amateurish manufacturing of spare parts and the production of nonstandard technological equipment. Thus the national economy pays for the fact that the machine-building ministries are not sufficiently oriented to meet the requirements of the sectors consuming their output. As a result, to meet their own needs, these sectors have developed essentially a "second machine-building industry," whose number of machine tools is equal to the first. According to the latest equipment census the ministries of light, food, meat, and dairy industries and fishing resources have 1.9 times more machine tools than the Ministry of Machine-Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances; the ministries of the chemical and of petroleum refining and petrochemical industry have 20 percent more machine tools than the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building; the Ministry of Power and Electrification and Free Fuel and two metallurgical industries have 2.4 times more machine tools than the Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building, and so on. Furthermore, we should take into consideration that about 30 percent of the machine tools of the plants under the machine-building ministries themselves are outside the main production shops.

Therefore, the extremely important social requirement of insuring the uninterrupted work of the production apparatus in all economic sectors and for the high-level and sufficiently economical production of various types of nonstandard equipment is far from being completely satisfied under the present conditions of machine-building sectorial specialization. However, the requirement remains and society uses unjustifiably high resources to satisfy it. We believe that a number of organizational and economic measures must be taken to resolve this problem.

First of all, the adamant requirement arises of gradually developing sub-sectors to produce nonstandard equipment on customer orders. At their initial stage such production facilities could satisfy intrasectorial and, subsequently, intersectorial requirements. Resources for the solution of this problem are mostly available, since machine tools, labor, and materials are being used for a decentralized, individualized, and insufficiently qualitative output of such equipment! Therefore, it is a question of the considerably more efficient utilization of essentially available resources.

Secondly, obviously, it would be expedient to include in the standards on the completeness of deliveries of machine-building output deliveries of the necessary quantities of spare and replacement parts. Without this it should not be considered that the equipment meets quality requirements.

Thirdly, a scientific approach is needed to the establishment of the capacity, dimension, and grade of parameters of equipment produced and taking into consideration the nature of the work which will be performed by the consumer with this equipment. Frequently the machine-building plants try to increase such parameters exclusively on the basis of "their own" cost accounting interests.

We are equally well familiar with the adverse influence on machine-building effectiveness of the use of limited varieties of rolled metal, the small percentage of lighter weight structures, and so on. Even though metallurgy is increasing "its own" effectiveness, this is affecting substantially the effectiveness of consuming sectors such as machine building, construction, and the economy as a whole. Similar problems arise in designing machine systems. The durability of each, even a small part should be linked to the durability of the assembly of which it is a part. Wherever this is ignored frequently the dismantling of an assembly for purposes of replacing this part is tens or hundreds of times more expensive than the part itself.

In our view, in order to correct this situation, the rights and requirements of the consumers must be most strictly guaranteed, above all, by the system of planning and accounting indicators. Therefore, the activities of production enterprises must be assessed in terms of the adequacy to the requirements which must be satisfied by one or another output. This may seem elementary. However, indicators expressed in tons, pieces, and rubles, unrelated with the results of the utilization of one or another

commodity, continue to occupy a predominant position in planning and accounting data. Thus, the production of grade and sheet rolled metal is planned and reported as before, in tons. It is obvious, however, that a steel sheet should be measured in square units and grade metal in length (naturally, with a specific strength). A conversion to the planning and accounting of the production of rolled metal goods with such yardsticks would encourage the factual improvement of consumer results.

In accordance with existing planning methodology indicators characterizing, one way or another, the effect of the equipment are used as yardsticks for only some commodities. A number of items (metallurgical equipment, petroleum apparatus, and sewer pipes) are measured in tons. Most commodities are measured in pieces and rubles.

Obviously, the price of any type of tool should be directly linked with the unit of consumer effect. The growth of the consumer effect must be stimulated through the price of the product which must reflect the principle of optimal consideration of the interests of both consumer and producer. Without this, under present conditions, we cannot substantially upgrade economic effectiveness. Let us take ferrous metallurgy as an example. Converting to the production of heat tempered rails additional specific capital investments per ton equal 40 rubles while the increased price per ton of improved quality metal equals 21 rubles. Similar indicators for a heat tempered thick sheet are 35 and 11 rubles; for bent metal shapes, 70 and 7 rubles, and so on. It is natural that with such prices capital investments aimed at upgrading quality yield considerably lower returns than in the production of traditional non-tempered rolled metal.

We know that machine building needs a broad range of shapes produced not only in hundreds of thousands of tons but in smaller series as well--in hundreds or tens of tons. Such volumes are unprofitable to the rolling metal shops but are vitally needed by the machine builders. In this connection it would be interesting to consider the practice of the United States in which differentiated markups are used for low-tonnage output. They are as follows: 3 percent for a shipment weighing 9.1-13.6 tons; 7 percent for a weight ranging from 4.5 to 9.1 tons; 23 percent for 1.8-2.7 tons; and 53 percent for 0.91-1.8 tons.

Major and exceptionally important organizational reserves, also linked with a consideration of consumer requirements, may be found in capital returns as well. As we know, in recent years they have not increased for industry as a whole and in many sectors. Considerable possibilities for their growth exist in reducing the duration of the construction cycle and the time needed for the mastering of new capacities.

It seems to us that the long-term process of mastering new equipment, demanding governmental compensations for outlays are admissible only for enterprises manufacturing prototypes and initial mechanism series.

Naturally, the production of new commodities, based on serial equipment, could also require a certain time for the adaptation of the personnel and for equipment adjustments. However, this must be prepared in advance and the time for such a "mastering" should be measured in months rather than years. Clearly, the lengthy period of mastering the use of serial equipment is not in the least a mandatory stage of the technical retooling process. Frequently such "mastering" is synonymous with disorder. A frequent reason for this is the fact that in many cases the serially produced equipment is supplied to the consumer without adequate preliminary refining and testing and, sometimes, with missing parts. As a result, the elimination of defects, tuning, and reaching normal technological and operational parameters, i.e., everything which the equipment producer must carry out before delivering it to the consumer, turns into a lengthy mastering process and becomes one of the main factors for low and, occasionally, even reduced capital returns.

Obviously, if the equipment installed at enterprises is produced serially it should work faultlessly rather than be "mastered" over a number of years. Equipment-manufacturing plants should be held liable for this as well. If a purchased refrigerator does not refrigerate it is described as faulty and must be unconditionally repaired (or replaced) by the manufacturer. It is hard to understand why the need to take many months and, sometimes, years for a purchased serially manufactured equipment to reach planned capacity is described as mastering and is compensated out of special state funds. The following was said on this subject at the 25th CPSU Congress: "To plan the organization of deliveries of sets of complex equipment for the entire technological production process with assembly and industrial testing and delivery to the customer after reaching capacity (productivity) in accordance with the design."

Such possibilities for upgrading capital returns are also not entirely without investments, even though it is a question of accelerating the time for reaching planned capacity in which the funds have already been invested. The successful implementation of such possibilities, in our view, calls for building at main enterprises, creators of new equipment, the necessary production areas and the creation of conditions needed for the adjustment of the equipment and for reaching its planned capacity even prior to its delivery to the consumer. It would be proper to legalize the procedure of guaranteed supplier obligations for tuning and, for a stipulated time, for repairing the produced equipment. The related outlays would be more than compensated for in the course of the exploitation process. It would be also pertinent to formulate and systematically resolve the problem of the organization of a "machine tool service" and, in general, of a "machine service." This is the most reliable method for the creation of a feedback which will make possible the fundamental solution of the problems of upgrading the quality of equipment. It is no accident that the leading enterprises, improving their organization of output, are taking the path of merging the marketing and quality control services.

The 25th congress emphasized the very great importance of directing the production process toward end national economic results and comprehensively satisfying consumer requirements, "whether it is a question of raw and other materials, machines, or equipment, or else consumer goods..." It seems to us that the end result in machine building is insuring the highly effective and economical functioning of the manufactured equipment by the consumer. The manufacturing plant, selling new equipment, must secure its assembling, tuning, and total readiness before delivering it to the consuming enterprise; it must contribute to its uninterrupted exploitation by improving deliveries of exchange and spare parts and assemblies or, wherever necessary, programs, special tools and fittings, and guaranteed repairs and servicing. The establishment of a "machine service" will enable the machine-building industry not only to produce equipment but to assume factual leadership in the technical retooling of the USSR national economy.

The solution of such problems has been already undertaken. Thus, the Kirov Plant has organized a network of centers to help the consumer insure the proper operation and repairs of produced equipment. The Ministry of Machine Tool and Tool-Building Industry has already undertaken the organization of combined centers for the elaboration of programs for machine tools with digital programing (ChPU). The consumers of Ivanovo machine tools with ChPU send the most complex parts to the assembly and tuning section for work tests. Representatives of the customer and engineers from the manufacturing plant jointly develop the technology, formulate the program, choose the tools, and conduct the tests. This represents an examination for the manufacturer and a training course for the customer. "We are selling machine tools," said V. Kobaidse, the plant's director. "Yet, we must sell technology."

The example of the Krasnyy Proletariy Plant is instructive. The collective assigned itself the task of providing the tuning of the specialized machine tools with digital programing it produces and to organize their subsequent servicing. As practical experience proved, the consuming enterprises purchasing such equipment used to spend from six months to one year in finishing, refining, and tuning it. Such operations performed by the producing plant are 50 percent less expensive. Here is the way O. Korolev, association director, describes this system: "It includes the assembling, tuning, and launching machine tools with digital programing, vertical semi-automatic and specialized machine tools, observing the work of the machine tools during the period covered by the guarantee and, if necessary, providing additional tuning, and training the personnel of the consumer in operating the machine tool." Naturally, a corresponding solution to problems of planning, price setting, and incentive must be provided to insure the broad dissemination of this practice.

Production Specialiation and Concentration Are Organizational Reserves

One of the biggest organizational reserves for upgrading effectiveness is to raise the level of production specialization and concentration. The need to accelerate this process is dictated by the tremendous increase in the scale of output and the creation of big territorial-production complexes. Only the extensive development of highly specialized intersectorial production facilities and services, including transportation, could be a base for the successful management of such complexes.

The development of specialization depends to a great extent on progress in production cooperation. These are two aspects of a single entity. The solution of the specialization problem presumes, as a most necessary condition, the insured uninterrupted cooperation, most strictly observed in terms of quantitative, qualitative, and time parameters. Unfortunately, it is lagging behind substantially; this, in turn, greatly hinders development and specialization. Such a situation can be clearly traced in machine building.

Despite its fast growth our machine building cannot satisfy all the demands of a developing economy. Its effectiveness and productivity levels are not entirely consistent with the size of its available resources. Shortcomings in specialization, both in basic production and auxiliary services, play the main role in this disparity.

At the present time our machine building is controlled by 19 ministries and includes over 100 different sectors and production lines. The variety of equipment produced is growing systematically and is replaced more rapidly. This leads to the building of new specialized production facilities.

Despite such characteristics modern machine building is a single complex. Its output and production facilities are frequently combined by the functional and structural similarity of assemblies and parts used for various technical systems, an essential homogeneity of technological processes and labor objects, work instruments and fittings, and a similarity in the organizational structure of enterprises. This situation creates all the necessary prerequisites for the implementation of a unified general machine-building technical policy. It is precisely in this area that the advantages of socialism could and should be manifested particularly emphatically in organizing public production aimed at reaching a level of specialization and cooperation inconceivable under capitalism.

However, a study has indicated that the major organizational reserves are not used to a sufficient extent in the machine-building sectors. The share of complex plants with a large number of procurement, auxiliary and, particularly, instrument shops, many of which are small, is substantial. Few enterprises are engaged in part and technological specialization. Intersectorial production facilities are being developed very slowly. Under such circumstances identical production facilities are frequently

duplicated in big territorial machine-building centers, as a result of which resources are not used with proper effectiveness. In Moscow, for example, last five-year plan 1,404 shops and sectors were engaged in the production of 52 separate items and services for intersectorial use. Yet, as the study made by the state planning authorities with the assistance of the Moscow City Party Committee shows, this work could be concentrated in 126 specialized enterprises and 118 base shops. A similar situation prevailed in Leningrad. With maximal concentration this would enable us to release by 1980, in Moscow and Leningrad alone, as many as 60,000 people, save 1 billion rubles per year as the result of lowered production costs, and lower capital investments by 20-25 percent compared with outlays for the decentralized installation of capacities. The capital investments themselves would be redeemed in less than two years.

For the time being, this program is being fulfilled with great delays. Between 1971 and 1975 out of 95 measures planned for Moscow and Moscow Oblast 16 were implemented fully and 12 partially, as follow: development of capacities for specialized casting production--22 percent; forged ingots, 51 percent; parts and assemblies, 56 and 49 percent, and so on. A similar situation prevails in other machine-building centers.

In our view, this situation is related to the same old problem--relations between producer and consumer and, particularly, legal guarantees protecting consumer interests. This was most sharply pointed out at the 25th CPSU Congress: "This is what happens: many economic managers try to secure everything they need by themselves, claiming this to be more reliable than procurements from someone else. Such a mentality is due to the fact that in our country planning and contractual discipline is still frequently violated by many units."

Insuring the strict balancing of plans, not only in terms of cost and variety, but of time as well, in accordance with specific calendar deadlines for the production and delivery of individual commodities, is a major prerequisite for improving production cooperation. Bearing in mind today's very complex intersectorial and intrasectorial relations, it is as important to observe the time production parameters as the technical ones. A high socialization level also means that each public production unit must be aware of its link with the whole and consider the maintaining of such a link its prime and main task. This calls for the elaboration of an effective system for moral and material incentives combined with strict and unavoidable penalties for the violation of planning and contractual discipline. We believe it expedient to use the financial mechanism as well so that the supporters of a "barter economy" have their desire for autarchy linked with certain financial losses. It seems to us that goods belatedly shipped to the consumer should not be included in the sum total of sales considered in awarding bonuses to production workers. Legal measures are needed as well. In this connection it would be proper for no single instance--sectorial or territorial--to be given the right to revise enterprise plans for aspects involving obligations related to cooperated

supplies. It is only on the basis of such guarantees that the tremendous organizational reserves which exist for upgrading effectiveness through expedient specialization of output could be utilized.

Let us discuss yet another very important organizational-technical problem in the field of machine-building specialization. In addition to its generally accepted forms--specialization by item, technology, or part--very topical for this sector is functional specialization. Engines, transmission mechanisms, air, water, and cooling systems, transportation, control, and management systems, and so on use a great variety of technical systems. This opens extensive possibilities for the establishment of intersectorial specialized production facilities and for providing new highly progressive technical solutions. What should be done in this direction?

Above all, we should determine the common functional assemblies and parts shared by many technical systems (this is largely a task not only of machine-building ministries but of machine-building experts). We should then determine the need for such assemblies and parts. After that, gradually, we should establish specialized production facilities for their manufacturing. Such output should be of an intersectorial nature if possible. It seems to us, in this connection, that the science of machine building must become the realm of action not only of engineers but of economists who must jointly interpret trends in the development of machines, and of the structure of present and foreseeable technical systems from the viewpoint of the best possible organization of the entire machine-building complex as a whole.

The manufacturing of bearings is a classic example of functional specialization. Such items are used by absolutely all machine-building sectors who would not even think of organizing "their own" production of bearings. This is precisely the model to be followed by socialist machine building. Only in such a case would the consumer make extensive use of ready and technically progressive parts, props, metal covers, and others, as well as of functional assemblies such as motors which are currently manufactured by enterprises under a number of ministries. Naturally, such a reorganization is a complex yet necessary matter. It is a question of insuring a substantially more efficient utilization of already used production resources for purposes of accelerating technical progress and developing a more progressive organization of output.

Intensifying specialization and developing cooperation in machine-building output is a problem of national economic rather than sectorial significance. In 1975 our machine-building and metal-processing industries employed 13.8 million people (over 40 percent of all industrial workers) and accounted for 21.5 percent of all capital assets in industry. In this connection the demand formulated in the report by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to the 25th CPSU Congress is very topical. He called for resolving "the problem of creating management systems for groups of homogenous

sectors..." This directly applies to machine building which has 19 ministries. It seems to us that the creation of governmental authorities on an even higher level is extremely necessary if we are to unite their efforts and intensify production specialization. Such authorities could be in charge of general machine-building technological policy, the development of intersectorial production facilities, and the coordination of the work within big machine-building centers. Such improvements in the organization of output would enable us to make a considerably more efficient and productive use of already used production resources.

In our view it would be expedient to set up under such authorities institutes to work on major general machine-building problems: main directions of functional specialization, the most rational structure of output, trends in the development of the technology of the future, and means for upgrading the social effectiveness of equipment. This would enable us to raise to a higher level the technical standard and national economic effectiveness of our socialist machine building.

As our economy expands problems of production specialization and concentration are assuming priority in all economic sectors.

Enterprise Organizational Reserves

Along with sectorial and intersectorial organizational reserves major possibilities exist in this respect directly at the enterprises.

Technical preparations, which largely determine resource utilization effectiveness, are the initial link in the organization of the production process. The experience of leading enterprises (as well as foreign experience) in this area has been summed up and a standard for a unified system for technological production preparations (YeSTPP) has been elaborated for machine building and instrument making. Unquestionably, its application and strict observance will yield positive results.

It is believed that the use of this unified system will upgrade the use of standard technological processes by up to 60 percent; of standardized and easily retunable equipment, by up to 80 percent; and of combined technological equipment, by up to 15 percent. According to rough data overall savings would equal 2.5 billion rubles. The time needed for the preparation of production facilities for the production of a new commodity would be reduced 2-2.5 times. Labor productivity will increase substantially as well, which would make it possible to release a larger number of workers from production preparations.

The standardization of assemblies and parts and technological processes is a radical organizational and economic problem in the acceleration of technical progress and in upgrading production standards. Only on this basis could we combine the fast pace of technical progress with the utilization of the advantages of mass and large serial output. Under

socialist conditions standardization could develop extensively and assume not only plant or sectorial but general machine-building scales. It would yield tremendous technical and economic results in equipment design, production, and operation. Thus, a "family" of highly productive machinery for the comprehensive mechanization of cultivated crops was developed on the basis of the Minsk MTZ-50 tractor model. Standardization based on the basic model reached 84.98 percent for wheel and 60-65 percent for caterpillar tractors with a high technical standard maintained for the entire "family."

Yet, the size of unused reserves in this area remains high. As reported by I. Ksenevich, the general designer of GSKB plowing tractors, the standardization of base models of general purpose plowing tractors of two related classes--T-40 and MTZ-50 has reached only 2.7 percent (within a single ministry at that), even though the values of the basic parameters of these tractors--power, weight, traction, and others--are quite similar. What are the economic consequences of such a purely organizational shortcoming? The variety of original spare parts and assemblies supplied to agriculture for the T-40 and MTZ-50 tractors are, respectively, 323 and 346. What a great amount of unjustified labor is being spent in this connection by designers, machine builders, supply organs, tractor drivers, repair base storekeepers, and repair workers themselves!

The enterprises have substantial organizational reserves for upgrading the effectiveness of the work of their auxiliary services as well. We know that in USSR industry nearly one half and, in machine building, frequently more workers are engaged in auxiliary operations. The mechanization and automation of such operations and their better organization make it possible to enhance effectiveness and make the work more meaningful.

Substantial reserves for improving output exist in the activities of enterprise transportation services as well. At the end of 1975 the length of railroad tracks of industrial enterprises and organizations totaled 130,500 km, while those of the Ministry of Railways totaled 138,300. The amount of freight hauled was as follows: 9.9 billion tons on spurs and 3.6 billion tons on the tracks of the Ministry of Railways. It was no accident that the CPSU Central Committee especially considered and approved the experience in centralizing industrial railway haulage at Elektrostal'. Here again it was a question of concentration and most efficient utilization of available resources.

Millions of workers are engaged in intraplant transportation; the movement of semi-finished goods, parts, and assemblies is delayed by many millions of hours. This lengthens substantially the production cycle. Improving the planning of shops and sectors in terms of space, streamlining, and shortening the routes along which semi-finished goods move play a most important role in saving on such resources.

Considerable reserves exist in the repair service as well. For example, the chief mechanic service was organizationally restructured at the Perm Telephones Plant. All shop repairs were assigned to the machine repair shop which converted to a cost accounting system. Reciprocal material liability was introduced: a production shop pays a fine of up to 30 percent of the cost of the work for delays in delivering a machine tool for repairs; the other side is held liable as well should repairs be delayed. Other innovations were applied as well. As a result, the equipment utilization coefficient rose in three years from 72 to 80 percent while unplanned equipment idling dropped by 22,000 hours. The number of repair personnel was reduced.

These are merely a few of the problems related to the utilization of quality growth factors. Determining, studying, and applying the entire set of organizational reserves for upgrading production effectiveness is a major task facing practical workers and scientists.

5003

CSO: 1802

SOME ASPECTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF ARTISTIC CULTURE UNDER MATURE SOCIALIST CONDITIONS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 pp 45-56

[Article by Yu. Barabash]

[Text] The more time passes after the 25th CPSU Congress the clearer the scales of this event, and its significance to the history of our party and state and entire people become, and the more obvious becomes its growing positive impact on the course of the world's revolutionary process.

The congress earmarked a broad and inspiring program for the further economic, social, and cultural development of the country. Its materials emphasized the thought of the indivisible link between cultural construction and the entire comprehensive activity of the party in domestic and foreign policy and with the overall tasks of the building of communism.

Such is the starting position from which problems of artistic culture are considered in the party's program documents.

It is particularly important to emphasize the organic continuity between the decisions of the 25th and those of the 23rd and 24th congresses. We are faced with the links within a single, streamlined, and strategically directed concept of a cultural policy and with stages of the party's tireless work on the implementation of the Leninist principles of managing the artistic process.

Today life itself, the achievements of Soviet culture, the successful surmounting of previous shortcomings, and the healthy and truly creative atmosphere developed in art circles clearly confirm the fruitfulness of our party's Leninist course. "...the approach taken by the 24th Congress to problems of literature and the arts proved to be fully justified," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted.

Justified above all was the steady party consistency in the implementation of the Leninist principles of cultural policy to which all inconsistencies

and extremes are profoundly alien, whether "liberal" evasiveness or any oversimplification or bureaucracy.

The scientific, thoughtful and creative approach taken by the party to the management of artistic culture has been justified.

As we know, the basic theoretical principles of the cultural policy of the Communist Party rely on the Marxist understanding of the nature and essence of art. They were substantiated by K. Marx and F. Engels and developed, under the new historical conditions, by V. I. Lenin, particularly in his work "Party Organization and Party Literature".

However, these inviolable and strictly scientific principles are not something given once and for all. They are constantly intensified, enriched, and fructified by the very rich experience of party practical activities. The specific tasks of the building of socialism and communism at any specific historical time, and the level and characteristics of the development of culture give priority to new problems, making one or another aspect of cultural policy particularly topical, forcing us to seek the most effective ways and means for its implementation. The principles governing the party's guidance of the arts do not represent in the least prescriptions and recipes suitable for all occasions (as our ideological opponents claim), for this guidance itself is a living, developing, and creative matter.

The constructive nature of the party's cultural policy, a policy in which principle-mindedness and exactingness are combined with a responsive attitude toward the artistic intelligentsia, its requirements, and readiness to help it in its creative efforts. This truly Leninist approach is based on the profound understanding of the specific nature of the work of the artist, respect for his talent, and faith in him. "Real talent," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 25th congress, "is rarely encountered. A talented work of literature or art is national property."

The Leninist party leadership of artistic creativity is built, above all, on the methods of persuasion and ideological education. The party organizations see as the meaning of their activities not to create a self-satisfying system of all kinds of bans and restrictions, as is ascribed to us by various types of anti-communists and opportunists, but, above all, to lead the artist, to inspire him, and to help his talent to develop in a fruitful direction.

Naturally, high principle-mindedness in the approach to the results of creative toil and the assessment of failures, and intolerance in the struggle against various types of foreign influences and ideological confusions have been, and remain a mandatory prerequisite for art guidance.

Nevertheless, the dominating task is positive: to lead the creative workers into the very thick of social life, making them full and profoundly interested participants in the common cause, and inspiring them with the

noble objective of serving the people and the revolutionary reorganization of the world, and to insure broad scope for bold innovational searches based on the method of socialist realism and on the Leninist principles of party-mindedness and nationality of art.

The party relies in the solution of this problem on the artists themselves, the experts in literature and the arts, on the aestheticists, and on the creative unions and press organs. The familiar CPSU Central Committee decree on this matter contributed to a tremendous extent to enhancing the influence and authority of literary-artistic criticism and to the strengthening of its ideological and methodical foundations. One could confidently say that the party's orientation toward involving the broad creative and scientific public to participate in the solution of the main problems of the development of the arts has also been fully justified.

The most important characteristic of the present stage in the development of the multinational Soviet artistic culture is that it is taking place under the conditions of the mature socialist society, when the historical advantages of socialism over capitalism are becoming ever more obvious, while the process of the steady growth of the role of the cultural factor in society is proving to be, to an ever greater extent, an objective law.

As early as 1920 V. I. Lenin said that after the October Revolution life itself and revolutionary reality linked together "the common upsurge of culture and knowledge with the most urgent economic needs" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 40, p 164). He was convinced that these two processes--the development of culture and economic growth--were closely interlinked. On the one hand, "in order to be cultured one needs a certain development of material production facilities and a certain material base..." (Poln. Sobr. Soch.", Vol 35, p 377). On the other, the successful solution of vital economic and social problems is impossible without the making of a cultural revolution. As recalls Klara Tsetkin, Lenin emphasized that it was precisely "the upsurge of the general cultural standard of the masses that creates that solid firm ground from which will grow powerful and inexhaustible forces for the development of art, science, and technology" ("V. I. Lenin o Literature i Iskusstve" [V. I. Lenin on Literature and the Arts], Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, Moscow, 1969, pp 666-667).

Now, at the mature socialist stage, the interconnection and inseparability of the economic, social, and cultural aspects are manifested even more clearly. Unquestionably, the achievements of our economy, and the improved prosperity of the people are contributing to the progress of artistic culture. The opposite exists as well: our further progress depends, to an ever greater extent, on the cultural level and its increased impact on social life, and on the molding of the Soviet person and of his ideological and moral convictions.

Such is one of the main objective prerequisites of the process marking the increased role of artistic culture under developed socialist conditions.

Essentially, this is the direct antithesis of a most characteristic feature of the bourgeois society such as its hostility to "some sectors of spiritual output, such as art and poetry," about which Marx wrote (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch" [Works], Vol 26, Part I, p 280). Whereas in the bourgeois society the power of "enslaving necessity" is offering the threat of lack of spirituality and of man's surrender to objects, no such danger exists or could exist under mature socialist conditions.

Our party is making tremendous efforts to increase the economic power of the country and upgrade the material and cultural living standards of the working people. A communist society cannot be built without a solid economic base. However, in this case we are infinitely far from gauging our concepts of progress and human happiness only through the quantity of things available for personal consumption. We are developing not a sated, prosperous, and indifferent petty bourgeois but a harmoniously developed individual, a truly free man who brings to light in the process of the building of communism the entire wealth of his creative possibilities and talents.

Under socialism prosperity does not lower but, conversely, increases the spiritual potential of the people, intensifying the attraction of the masses for aesthetic values. With the growth of material living standards, the progress of socialist culture becomes, to an ever greater extent, a truly nationwide matter.

Today we have grounds to speak of the intensive development of artistic culture, and of upgrading the role of the aesthetic principle in all fields of life of the socialist society. Culture is acting as one of the powerful factors in molding the socialist way of life and as one of its most important components. The task of molding the aesthetic environment which would be maximally consistent with today's requirements of the Soviet person, is being formulated ever more urgently and broadly.

Yet, such requirements have increased immeasurably along with the general cultural and educational standards of our people. This leads to an unparalleled increase of readership and audience, and to an increased demand for culture, so to say.

Naturally, this is not a question of a merely quantitative aspect. Perhaps the most important thing is that the level of requirements formulated by the working people concerning works of literature and art and their ideological trends and artistic merits is rising. This means, for example, not simply a "book hunger" (which, by itself, is rather a noteworthy phenomenon), but "hunger" for the greatest examples of literature and for world and domestic classics. Hence the sold-out notices for highly artistic and innovational theater shows which provide food for thought, and concerts of serious music. Hence the inordinate upsurge of amateur arts which have become in our country one of the most important means for exposing millions of people to cultural values and for awakening the artist in man.

The development of culture under contemporary conditions is most closely linked with an objective process which is developing extensively throughout the world: the scientific and technical revolution.

In this connection various viewpoints, equally alien to us, have been expressed in the West. Some theoreticians proclaim, for example, "the end of the human era;" allegedly, man will be pushed into the background by technology and excluded from the future "technotronic" world. We reject this anti-humanistic myth. We reject it as a manifestation of panic faced with the rigid structures of the contemporary monopolistic forms of economics and culture.

However, to us, Marxists, proceeding from the objective laws of social development, also unacceptable is the blind and irrational protest against the so-called "dead technology", and against all systems, as well as anarchic appeals for imaginary "freedom" from all norms and laws, and blank rejection of scientific and technical progress.

We are convinced that the organic combination of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of socialism, as pointed out in our party's program documents, is an important lever in the building of communism, offering new possibilities in the economic and social areas and in the realm of artistic culture.

In fact, the intensification of labor, its automation, and higher labor productivity increase the amount of leisure time and create favorable prerequisites for the steady and more intensive contact between man and art and, therefore, for the all-round and harmonious development of the individual and the manifestation of all his talents. Relieving man from routine forms of labor, the scientific and technical revolution opens to him, under socialism, the broadest possible horizons for creativity, demanding a higher level of culture, and the use of innovational principles in work and all activities.

Bearing in mind that art and culture is precisely the realm of activities which develops the universal creative potential of the individual and is a powerful incentive for awakening in man a "production imagination," we could claim with full justification that the growth of their role under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution developing under mature socialist conditions is an objective factor.

Naturally, leisure time could be used in a variety of ways, including the development of "lack of spirituality," while technical progress could become not only an incentive for spiritual growth but an instrument for the cultural alienation of the broad masses. Those are precisely the dominating trends in the West. Yet, this is not in the least an inevitable consequence of the scientific and technical revolution, but the result of the real contradictions in this development within the system of capitalist social relations. The mass communication media provide an example. In bourgeois society they are closely linked with the so-called "mass culture,"

contributing to the standardization of artistic awareness, the manipulation of the individual, and others.

The mass information media have an essentially different function in the development of socialist culture. The latter, as we know, is oriented by its very nature toward the multimillion strong masses of toiling people. It stores within itself the historical and cultural experience of the people, transmitting this experience from generation to generation. Under contemporary conditions such an orientation of culture is hardly possible without the help of modern communications facilities. Under socialism they constitute a kind of technical guarantee for the mass and democratic nature of this culture which they retranslate and, to a certain extent, mold as well. In other words, they are performing not only a reproductive but a productive function. This creates additional prerequisites for the further intensification of the national principle of art and the embodiment of Lenin's dream of an art which would serve millions and tens of millions of working people representing the "flower of the country, its force, and its future" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", Vol 12, p 104).

A certain switch in the emphasis of its functions is linked with such characteristics in the development of artistic culture in the mature socialist society.

Once, at the dawn of the Soviet system, the opening of two or three grammar schools in the far corners of Russia was considered by Lenin (not without a certain political acuteness) as a more significant fact than, for example, a ballet performance or the most superb item in an exhibit, for under the then prevailing conditions he ascribed prime significance to upgrading the overall cultural level of the broad masses and to surmounting the backwardness inherited from the old world.

Today we are in a new stage of cultural construction. The steady upsurge of the socialist economy, the elimination of major disparities between town and country and between mental and physical labor, the steady growth of the prosperity of the working people, the enhancement of their general educational and cultural standards, the strengthening of the sociopolitical and ideological unity of the Soviet society as a new historical community, the blossom of national cultures, the equalization of their levels, and their rapprochement and reciprocal enrichment are all factors which legitimately develop qualitatively new incentives for the spiritual activities of the broadest possible masses.

Now, when in our country, a country of universal literacy, publishing has reached an unparalleled scope, when theatrical and musical groups famous the world over, representing the culture of the Soviet republics, are performing in the most remote corners of our homeland, when the population of any tayga settlement can regularly see new motion pictures and television transmissions and, thus, when under such conditions the very concept of "cultured province" has become a term of the past, the educational and informative functions of art have assumed a relatively lesser significance.

The functions of art as a means for the study and revolutionary reorganization of reality, for the study of its laws and contradictions, the transmission of social experience, and the assertion of the values and norms of the socialist way of life, and as an instrument for awakening the creative and aesthetic principles in man and for stimulating his social activeness are assuming an ever growing significance.

Ideological and moral education, and participation in molding the individual are becoming the most important integral functions of artistic culture. It was no accident that the 25th CPSU Congress supported the topic of morality and moral search in literature and art and the aspiration of the cultural workers to develop in man the best features of communist morality.

Actively participating in the molding of the socio-aesthetic ideal of its time, art has the truly unique ability to transform the social experience accumulated in this ideal into individual experience, to convert social ideas, moral norms, and aesthetic values into part of the spiritual world of the individual, into an organic feature of the character, the inner "I" of man, involving the individual with the social entity, "socializing" him.

In this connection the aspect in the functioning of artistic culture in the mature socialist society to which, it seems, our theory of culture, literature, and art do not as yet ascribe the necessary significance seems particularly topical. By this I mean the dissemination and perception of art and of the end results of its influence on the people or, as it is occasionally referred to somewhat conventionally, the consumption aspect.

It is no secret that today as well society is not fully able to satisfy all the spiritual needs of the individual; on the other hand, the varied needs and demands of the various population strata do not always express a sufficiently high level of spiritual culture. We encounter within the framework of the moral and political unity of the people various depths to which the social experience has been mastered, various levels of civic and spiritual maturity and aesthetic development and artistic taste. All this calls for a differentiated and scientifically substantiated approach to the solution of the problem.

This problem is quite complex. Obviously, here we should single out several levels.

First of all, we have the level of the factual consumption of culture and its individual forms, information about which is provided by social statistics on attendance of theaters, concert halls, museums, and so on.

Secondly, the level of needs for culture which does not coincide with the first, for it also includes existing yet unsatisfied needs, for one or another reason; only specific sociological studies could give an idea of this level.

Finally, there is the level of consumption effectiveness which determines the factual social effect of the exposure of the masses to artistic culture; naturally, it is not covered by the other two levels, for the fact that someone has gone to a theater or a concert or even any interest displayed in works of art does not in itself show what precisely the person gained from this.

As studies have indicated, occasionally even examples of high art are perceived most superficially. Some readers, viewers, or listeners do not go beyond recalling the plot, the simple thesis, the prescription for a behavior, and so on; their popularity does not equal in the least their real effectiveness. Relations between such concepts are more complex. Therefore, attendance hardly covers the characteristics of the consumption of art.

Whereas in terms of social statistics the situation in our country is relatively good (even though such statistics are not sufficiently complete in all realms of culture), difficulties exist in the field of sociological research on artistic needs, related to obtaining reliable "representative" data; unresolved methodological problems remain as well. The studies conducted are uncoordinated and frequently not comparable because of method differences.

The biggest difficulties are related to the third consumption level. They are determined, above all, by the variety and complexity of the functions of art itself, and the comprehensive and fine nature of its impact on the spiritual world and way of life of man. All this could hardly be measured quantitatively and formalized adequately (at least on the contemporary level of scientific development). Here we must resort to indirect methods and criteria based on the study of the structure and nature of interests and on tracing the more general and indirect consequences of the influence of culture.

We must bear in mind that in addition to the idea of the factual consumption of cultural values in the country, and in addition to its "factual model", we must have a certain "ideal model" which would be used as a starting point in assessing the existing situation and its trends and, in the final account, a criterion of the effectiveness of culture. The task is not simply to meet spontaneously developing needs (this is consistent with the concepts of a culture of a purely commercial and consumer nature, for the elitist ideological trend presumes the "aesthetic preservation" of the broad masses), but of developing them in the necessary direction, in accordance with the overall social objectives of a specific society, in this case the developed socialist society.

The clear orientation toward such objectives and, at the same time, the consideration of the existing cultural standards of the different population strata, audiences, and others, are necessary prerequisites for the scientific guidance of the development of artistic culture.

Neither the intuitive preconceived approach to the solution of the socio-cultural problems arising in society nor the strictly administrative and voluntaristic approach can insure an optimal direction and necessary intensiveness in the development of artistic culture under mature socialist conditions. They do not allow us to forecast the general trends of this process, to determine the volume, structure, and content of the spiritual demands of the working people, or elaborate a strategy and tactic for a cultural policy. Only the Leninist principles of management, and only the scientific management of culture in accordance with its inner laws and specifics can open a truly effective path to achieving the objectives of cultural construction and provide the only reliable key to the fullest possible determination of the advantages of socialism and the utilization of its possibilities and resources for the acceleration of progress in all areas of social-spiritual life.

It is obvious that this approach presumes, as a mandatory prerequisite, the further and ever more profound and comprehensive knowledge of the objective laws governing the development of artistic culture under mature socialist conditions, and the mechanism of their effect and practical utilization.

From this viewpoint a number of basic problems of the theory of art culture, without which a truly scientific management of its development and determination of its prospects would be impossible, require a deeper scientific elaboration. The following could be classified as such problems:

The structure of artistic culture as a complex and dynamic hierarchical system and the interaction among its components as well as between this culture as a whole with other systems of the spiritual life of society (ideology, science, education, and so on);

The characteristics and mechanism of functioning under mature socialist conditions of artistic culture as a whole and of the individual arts;

The population's need for culture and the basic trends in the consumption of cultural goods in accordance with the characteristics of the different socio-cultural areas and the factual disproportions; the establishment of corresponding scientific classifications;

The criteria of the social effectiveness of artistic culture;

The principles and methods for forecasting processes in culture: operative, related to the elaboration of practical recommendations, as well as long-term ones.

Naturally, this list of topical problems could be extended. Here it is important to emphasize something else. It is not in the least a question of focusing exclusively on the tasks of an applied, so to say strictly "managerial" nature. A truly scientific management is based on a broad range of basic research which provides an all-round idea of the current status and laws governing the development of the world's artistic process

in its entire fullness and complexity, research which considers socialist culture within the context of this development.

In this connection radical problems such as basic laws of artistic development in the 20th century, in the life of the Leninist theory of the two cultures, culture and the international workers movement, culture and socialism, culture and ideology, culture and the scientific and technical revolution, art as an active factor in the revolutionary reorganization of the world and man, the contemporary anti-imperialist movement and its influence on cultural progress, the correlation between the class and all human, national and international, and general and specific factors in art, problems of the theory of socialist realism, and so on, assume primary significance.

This logically leads to the thought of the topical and fruitful nature of the adoption of a systematic and comprehensive approach to the study of artistic culture.

Such an approach to the phenomena of nature and society and their study, taking into consideration all their aspects, and their complex variety and interaction, is one of the basic methodological principles of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. It is precisely dialectical and historical materialism, and it alone, that was able to provide a truly scientific analysis of the systems nature of categories, concepts, and laws as reflecting the objective laws of reality. We know that Marx considered capitalist production relations as a complex, integral, and dynamic system consisting of a number of specifically streamlined and constantly interacting components (this characteristic of Marxian analysis was convincingly described, in particular, in the book by V. Kuz'min "Printsip Sistemnosti v Teorii i Metodologii K. Marksa" [The Systems Principle in K. Marx's Theory and Methodology], Politizdat, Moscow, 1976). Lenin, who invariably emphasized the importance of considering such phenomena in their objective integrity, approached the phenomena of nature and society from the same positions.

The view expressed in one of M. Khrapchenko's works that the systems approach "is not a new method but the concretizing and further development of the principles elaborated by the founders of Marxism-Leninism, whose concretizing and development takes into consideration the new processes and problems of contemporary social reality" (VOПРОSY LITERATURY, No 3, 1975, p 91) must be considered applicable and methodologically promising.

The complex approach to all realms of social life becomes particularly important under mature socialist conditions, when priorities are given to the problems and tasks of an integral and all-systems nature. This is predetermined by objective factors such as the growth of the economy, culture, and science, and the increased complexity of their structures; the need to improve the system of management on a scientific basis in all fields of social development, including ideology; the vital need for a scientific forecasting of economic and social processes presuming the

comprehensive consideration of a large number of interrelated criteria and the study of various alternative solutions. That is why the comprehensive approach to the problems of communist construction is so topical today, as reflected in the program documents of our party and the decisions of the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses.

Life teaches us, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized, that "the larger the number of problems to be resolved simultaneously, the more adamant becomes the need to resolve them on an interconnected basis, systematically and purposefully, taking into consideration the complex and varied dependences among the individual parts of the country and national economic sectors, and among all realms of social life. In a word, a comprehensive systemic approach is needed to the elaboration of responsible decisions. We have adopted such an approach and will implement it systematically."

What does this mean in terms of artistic culture?

It means, above all, the need to consider culture as an integral system of multiple and widespread components, including various levels and structures which maintain with one another complex, direct or indirect dynamic relations, not rigid in the least but variable, and dynamic.

Such an approach radically contradicts the various types of disintegrating bourgeois concepts based either on arbitrary absolutizing of one of the aspects of culture (M. McLuhan's theory of "visual culture") or the concept of culture as a result of "trials and errors" (A. Moll's "mosaic culture").

Marxist-Leninist science proceeds from the fact that the objective prerequisites for a comprehensive approach are inherent in the very nature of artistic culture as an integral system. Such an approach enables us to determine the characteristic features and basic laws governing the artistic culture of mature socialism and to determine the internal correlations--correlations of interaction and subordination, and coordination and subordination--in one or another structural system.

In our view, this approach can be achieved through the flexible combination of historical and empirical research with research of a comparative-typological nature. This enables us to see the individual as well as the general laws of the artistic process. By this I have in mind the problems such as, for example, the development of Soviet multinational culture at the present stage; the study of the artistic culture of the socialist countries based on ideological and aesthetic unity; the interaction among the different types of art and art dynamics and the trend toward art synthesis; the general laws of art and the creative individuality of the artist, and so on.

Of late such studies have been energized in our country and in the other members of the socialist comity. However, the scale of what has been accomplished so far is not as yet fully consistent with the tasks demanded by contemporary conditions.

Another aspect of the comprehensive approach is related to a characteristic of art such as its poly-functional and comprehensive nature, and its various relations with other forms of social awareness and spiritual life. This makes us realize even more clearly the possibility and even the necessity of integrating the theory of culture, literature, and art with the other social sciences, above all with philosophy, sociology, psychology, history, ethnography, and even economics (bearing in mind problems such as determining the aesthetic aspect of labor and of scientific and technical creativity, and the aesthetic component of the problem of quality under mature socialist conditions). We must also establish closer cooperation with the natural and technical sciences. As was emphasized at the 25th CPSU Congress, "new possibilities for fruitful research of a general-theoretical, fundamental, and applied nature arise at the points where different sciences cross, natural and social in particular. Such opportunities should be used to the fullest extent."

The successful implementation of this task largely depends on the skillful and flexible use of the entire variety of methods and approaches in the study of problems of artistic culture, including those recently developed. Rejecting groundless attempts to ascribe to such methods a universal nature, we must not exclude the possibility to apply them in the study of individual aspects of artistic culture or in combination with other methods. It is a question, in particular, of the structural-semiotic, probability-statistical, communicative, theoretical-information, and other approaches.

It is important to emphasize here that unlike the pluralism inherent in bourgeois science, the methodological eclecticism of Marxist comprehensive analysis is characterized by a profound monism, for here the leading role is played by the only scientific and truly universal research method--dialectical materialism. This puts in our hands a powerful methodological weapon which, combined with scientific initiative and the ability to note on time the problems raised by life and find new and most effective ways to resolve them, predetermines the unquestionable superiority of Marxist-Leninist social science compared with bourgeois science, not to mention with speculative and eclectic revisionist currents of different coloring.

Some essentially important aspects in the development of socialist artistic culture at the present stage and the related tasks facing the theory of culture, literature, and art are based on the characteristics of the ideological situation prevailing in the present world.

The characteristic aspect of this situation is largely determined by the new trends in international circumstances, particularly the results of the Helsinki Conference. The documents of the conference and its Final Act reflect the positive changes which became possible on our planet as the result of the systematic peaceful policy of the members of the socialist comity.

We, Marxists, however, have no doubt that the desire to block the threat of a military conflict, as well as our readiness to cooperate with all

countries in the fields of economics and culture, do not eliminate in the least the basic class differences in the fields of ideology and social systems. Detente does not mean ideological disarmament in any case. On the contrary, the sharpness and intensiveness of the ideological struggle do not abate but rise.

In this confrontation between the two ideologies socialist culture, which has inherited the best humanistic and democratic traditions acquired by mankind, is called upon, and does play a most important role. Strengthening the positions of socialist culture in the international arena and its influence on making the process of detente irreversible largely depend on the correctness of our orientation in the contemporary circumstances, the elaboration of the most effective means for the utilization of newly arising opportunities, and our activeness in the ideological struggle and in disseminating the achievements of Soviet art.

Our ideological opponents are trying to distort the stipulations contained in the section of the Final Act which deals with cooperation in the humanitarian and other areas. As we know, it was noted by the participating countries that the purpose of such cooperation is to contribute to a consolidation of the peace and reciprocal understanding among nations and the spiritual enrichment of the individual regardless of race, sex, language, or religion. It is precisely such highly humane objectives that determine the position of the socialist countries concerning the so-called "third basket". We shall never agree to allow in the socialist society, under the false screen of "exchange of spiritual values" the propaganda of ideas hostile to us, of a cult of profit and violence, cruelty, racism, pornography, and so on. We shall never follow the self-proclaimed promoters of "human rights" who, promoting anti-communist hysteria, are trying to organize an ideological and political pressure on our country and on the socialist world. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev properly rebutted such attempts in his speech to the 16th congress of Soviet trade unions.

In recent years the tactic of the bourgeois propagandists, including culture "specialists" has begun to assume great flexibility and adaptability. Coarse communist sallies and noisy propaganda campaigns are combined with more refined, so to say "scientific" methods aimed at "eroding" the foundations of our socialist culture.

A characteristic feature of the present moment is the active involvement of culture in the realm of bourgeois governmental policy with a view to using it in the global confrontation with socialism. Actually, we are faced with attempts to establish a certain hegemony of the capitalist countries in the cultural life of the contemporary world. This is a deeply imperialist policy in the spiritual sphere.

Under such circumstances the unified positions held by the scientists and cultural workers of the socialist countries, and their active and coordinated efforts in the struggle of ideas which is developing today in the field of artistic culture become ever more important.

The 25th CPSU Congress paid great attention to the process of the gradual rapprochement among socialist countries, and the development of common elements in their policies, economics, and social life with the further blossoming of each socialist nation and the strengthened sovereignty of the fraternal countries. This natural and legitimate process finds its further development and intensification in the multilateral and bilateral cooperation among the members of the world's socialist comity in all fields of life.

The strengthening of daily relations among fraternal parties, successes in economic and scientific and technical integration, joint solution of major national economic problems, and coordinated actions undertaken by our countries internationally are all natural incentives for the ever closer and fruitful cooperation in the ideological area, including the scientific elaboration of topical problems of the development of artistic culture.

In recent years the scientists in the fraternal countries--aesthetists, and literary and art experts--have done a great deal to study both the literature and art of each of these countries as well as the creative connections among them. Bilateral cooperation is developing fruitfully, resulting in the joint elaboration of a number of historical-cultural and theoretical topics.

However, today we can no longer limit ourselves to this. Life raises the type of questions in the development of artistic culture whose most effective solution can be achieved through closer coordination and unification of the efforts of the scientists of the socialist comity.

The recently created multilateral commission of socialist countries on the theory of culture, literature, and art earmarked a broad long-term program for joint research in this area.

All this is consistent with the vital demands of the time and the spirit and direction of the historical decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and the congresses of the other ruling fraternal parties in the socialist comity.

5003

CSO: 1802

LENIN AND DIALECTICAL LOGIC

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 pp 57-66

[Article by Z. Orudzhev, doctor of philosophical sciences]

[Text] V. I. Lenin's activities related to the preparations for and making of the Great October Socialist Revolution cannot be imagined without gigantic theoretical work in the field of philosophy. The vital tasks of the labor movement, the complex circumstances of the pre-revolutionary period, and the nature and scale of the problems which faced the party in the new historical epoch made adamantly necessary the further improvement of the methodology of revolutionary thinking and revolutionary action, and the creative development of the Marxist science of thought--dialectical logic.

It is noteworthy that Lenin's most intensive work on problems of dialectical logic took place between 1914 and 1916. It seems paradoxical that during such complex times Lenin paid particular attention to problems which at first glance seem remote from immediate revolutionary practice--history of dialectical logic, its place within the system of a materialistic outlook, and its principles and categories; Lenin outlined a program for the systematic elaboration of the topic. However, the remoteness was only superficial, for Marxism and dialectical logic are concepts so close to each other that, in a certain sense, they should be considered as one and the same.

"Marxism means dialectical logic." This Leninist expression is not a stipulation but a considered thesis expressing the essence of the matter. Dialectical logic insures the inner connection among Marxist-Leninist ideas. It is a method for the development of Marxism-Leninism and, as a specific theory, a contemporary theory of thinking and of the forms and laws governing the process of reflection of the outside world in the human mind and in the logic of concepts. Dialectical logic--one of the greatest accomplishments of the human mind--acquired its truly scientific and materialistic nature in Marxist-Leninist philosophy. It was established as an answer to the historical need for the study of the laws governing social development and the use of the results of theoretical thinking in the practice

of the revolutionary workers' movement. At the same time it expressed the need of science to interpret the nature of theoretical knowledge.

As early as the 19th century the classics of Marxist philosophy pointed out that dialectical logic is an essentially new level reached in the study of the forms of human thinking compared with traditional formal logic. "Unlike the old, purely formal logic," F. Engels wrote, "dialectical logic is not satisfied with the enumeration and placing side by side, with no relation whatever, of the forms of movement of thinking, i.e., the various forms of judgments and conclusions. On the contrary, it derives these forms from each other, establishing between them relations of subordination rather than coordination. It develops higher from lower forms" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 20, p 538). This "subordination" of forms of thought is related to a superior scientific-theoretical level of human knowledge in which the laws of dialectics operate as the content of thinking, i.e., the laws of the dialectical development of objective reality itself and of the categories representing the central aspects of this development.

The significance of dialectical logic has increased immeasurably in the contemporary epoch, in the course of the revolutionary renovation of the world and the 20th century scientific and technical revolution initiated by the Great October Revolution. The scientific and technical revolution revealed the internal connection among viewpoints which were entirely heterogeneous among each other and between them and objective reality from the viewpoint of the traditional concepts of areas of scientific knowledge, raised to a new level empirical research methods, armed science with new facilities for theoretical analysis, including a powerful mathematical apparatus, and proved even more convincingly the effectiveness of dialectical logic as a way of thinking based on the profound knowledge of the contradictory nature of any object and phenomenon in reality. The contemporary epoch, the epoch of the victorious advance of the ideas of socialism, brought new convincing proofs of the veracity of the dialectical-materialistic method of thinking and practical action.

K. Marx and F. Engels were at the origins of the scientific dialectical-materialistic logic. Critically reworking the ideas of the representatives of German classical philosophy of the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries, they converted dialectical logic from a means for the formulation of speculative structures into a tried method for scientific-theoretical research and a methodological tool for the practical transformation of society.

"Das Kapital," Marx's main work, is a vivid proof of the creative force of dialectical logic, and a model of the conscious systematic use in scientific research. Lenin's theoretical works are on the same level as models of the creative application of the principles of dialectical logic.

In his works V. I. Lenin raised the development of dialectical logic to a new level. Developing Marxist philosophy under new historical conditions,

he did not ignore a single important aspect of dialectical logic. Lenin studied profoundly and critically the theoretical heritage of the great predecessor of Marxist philosophy, Hegel, pointing out the rational ideas concealed under the husk of the rationalistic ideas on which Logic (with a capital L) is based. Lenin always ascribed tremendous importance to the materialistic reinterpretation of Hegelian ideas. Today one cannot be a real specialist in the field of philosophy and the methodology of scientific knowledge without studying the contribution of the great predecessors of contemporary dialectics and dialectical logic the way one cannot be a major specialist in physics without knowing the contribution made by Galileo, Kepler, Newton, or Maxwell, or in chemistry without an awareness of the contribution of Boyle, Dalton, or Mendeleev. Lenin emphasized that "the dialectical method is the result and the summary, the last word and the essence of Hegelian logic" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 29, p 215).

One of Hegel's most significant contributions was his desire to determine the active nature of human knowledge and the significance of practical activities in molding the human mind (this is particularly clear in his "Phenomenology of the Spirit," "Lectures on the Philosophy of History," and the final part of his "Science of Logic"). In this connection Lenin drew the conclusion that Hegel uses practical experience as a link in his study of the cognitive process. Hegel's interpretation of the dialectics of the object and the subject did not prevent him, however, from formulating the profound idea of the coincidence between the subjective and the objective in knowledge.

Lenin's approach to Hegel's understanding of the nature of logical laws and logical relations is another example of the truly rational use of Hegel's heritage. The laws of logic are necessary relations reflecting the relations of objective reality and constituting the most important element of the thinking content. This concept in dialectical-materialistic logic is the result of the critical use of Hegelian ideas in surmounting the "dualism" of the objective and the subjective in understanding the nature of thinking. "Quite profound and intelligent!" wrote Lenin on this subject. "The laws of logic are the reflection of the objective within the subjective knowledge of man" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 29, p 165).

The nature of the dialectical logic of Hegel's philosophy is of invaluable importance in understanding the nature of logical relations. Therefore, Lenin scrupulously and carefully extracted from it everything meaningful and viable which could be used as a source for the further progress of dialectical logic. He considered Hegel's understanding of logic fruitful and very rational. Unlike the Kantian separation of logic forms from the content of knowledge, Lenin pointed out, Hegel "demands a logic with meaningful forms, forms having a living, real content, inseparably linked with a content" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 29, p 84). These ideological postulates enabled Lenin to reject Hegel's idealistic concept of the autonomy of logical forms and their separation from man and draw the fundamental conclusion that logic is the result of the history of the

knowledge of the world. "Logic is a doctrine not of the superficial forms of thinking but of the laws governing the development 'of all material, natural, and spiritual objects', i.e., the development of the entire specific content of the world and the knowledge of it, i.e., the result, the sum total, the conclusion of the history of the knowledge of the world" (ibid.).

Lenin's understanding of dialectical logic as a product of the development of socio-historical practice, science, and technology, and as a specific way of thinking for the epoch is the further development of the tradition which originated with Marx and Engels who put an end to the anti-historical absolutizing of one or another logical form of thinking. Here again we must note the significance which Lenin ascribed to the method used in Marx's "Das Kapital": "Whereas Marx did not leave us a 'Logic' (with a capital L), he left us the logic of 'Das Kapital'..." (ibid.).

As a thinking method dialectical logic was systematically applied by Marx precisely in "Das Kapital." As Lenin proved, the essence of the method used in "Das Kapital" is to convert from the analysis of the simplest and most basic relation in which, as in an embryo, all the contradictions of the studied object are included, to a consideration of the entire system of relations of the analyzed object. In this system each relation (and category expressing this relation) must assume its strictly determined position as a stage in the development of the nature of the object and its basic contradiction. "Such should be the method for the explanation (or study) of dialectics in general (for Marx considers the dialectics of the bourgeois society merely a separate case of dialectics)" (ibid., p 318).

Lenin's basic idea which runs through his entire attitude toward the methodological content of "Das Kapital" consists of the all-round determination of the universal significance of the logic of this great work. According to Lenin the research method used in "Das Kapital" is a methodological model for all sciences, including the natural. A scrupulous analysis and summation of the achievements in the natural sciences at the turn of the 20th century (the works of Poincare, Pierson, Duhem, Einstein, and others) enabled Lenin to draw the conclusion that the dialectical-materialistic way of thinking should be the basic method for the development of the natural sciences under the new circumstances.

The peculiarity of Lenin's assessment of the method used in "Das Kapital" is also that he not only determined and developed its principles on the basis of the thorough study of all the other works of Marx and Engels, but also creatively applied these principles in his own scientific studies and revolutionary activities.

The most vivid examples of Lenin's creative application of dialectical logic are his works "The Development of Capitalism in Russia," and "Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism." In these works Lenin made brilliant use of the principles of unity between history and logic,

the ascension of theoretical thinking from the abstract to the concrete, and others. The revolutionary nature of dialectical logic was manifested with particular emphasis in the theoretical conclusions he drew from his entire analysis of imperialism as being the eve of a socialist revolution. Lenin particularly blamed those who like K. Kautsky act in the name of Marxism yet distort its revolutionary nature. "Kautsky's theory, which has nothing in common with Marxism, is to ignore existing contradictions and forget the most important among them rather than exposing them in their entire depth" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 27, p 391). The characteristic of the dialectical logic as a way of thinking is that it combines internally a strictly scientific with a revolutionary approach.

This was manifested also in Lenin's works on the establishment of the new society, particularly in his work "Once Again on the Trade Unions, on the Present Moment, and on the Errors of Comrades Trotskiy and Bukharin," in which Vladimir Il'ich formulated the main requirements of dialectical logic and provided examples of their scientific application in the practice of the building of socialism. They include, above all, the requirement of the all-sided consideration of the object and, above all, the correlation of its conflicting aspects; the requirement of considering the object in its development and change, in its "self change" and so on; the requirement of considering practical experience as a criterion of truth and as the most important prerequisite for determining the nature of the object; the requirement of establishing the concrete truth, and so on. These requirements, naturally, do not cover the entire concept of dialectical logic. Without them, however, it would be impossible in general to elaborate any satisfactory idea about it (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 42, p 290). The methodology of Lenin's theoretical works is used by all social scientists as a model of a scientific and profoundly party-oriented analysis of social phenomenon, an example of the type of exclusive blend of logic and facts in which truth can be born.

One of the main principles of dialectical logic is that of contradiction.

Developing Marx's theory of the unity and struggle of opposites, Lenin specifically established the position of the contradiction and its role in thinking: "relations (= transitions = contradictions) of concepts are equal to the main content of logic. Such concepts (and their relations, transitions, and contradictions) are depicted as reflections of the objective world" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 29, p 178). Contradictions in thinking are merely reflections of the contradictions influencing inter-dynamics objects in objective reality: the dialectic of objects creates the dialectic of ideas, rather than the opposite" (ibid.).

The opponents of Marx's philosophy have always objected above all precisely to the theory of contradictions as being the essence and meaning of all movement and development, including the thinking process. We could list among them (G. A. Vetter, V. Taymer, R. Khayss, and E. Khuber), as well as many other "critics" and "students" of dialectics. Referring to the fact that a contradiction considered as a combination of opposite statements

made simultaneously and within the same context is forbidden by formal logic, they claim that as a logic which acknowledges the objective contradiction of phenomena, dialectics conflicts with formal logic as a science.

Yet, Marxist logic does not identify formal-logical contradictions with dialectical contradictions. Lenin repeatedly cautioned against confusing dialectical contradictions with "the logical contradiction" which violates proper logical thinking (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 30, p 91). In dialectical logic it is a question of a reflection of objective contradictions in the logic of concepts and the specific development of the definitions of the object in their reciprocal dialectically conflicting relations and indirect relationships.

In order to be a contradiction, a formal or a dialectical contradiction must represent a link of opposites considered in the same context. In his "Philosophical Notebooks" Lenin particularly singles out Plato's words cited in Hegel's *Lesser Works* "Lectures on the History of Philosophy": "The difficulty and the truth consist of proving that that which is something else is the same, while that which is the same is something else in that same respect" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 29, p 253). Lenin agreed with this thought, noting on the margin opposite these words the letters "NB".

Starting with the works of Marx and Engels the dialectical contradiction is presented as a complex, indirectly linked structure. Thus, Engels himself wrote: "In a stage in the development of the natural sciences in which all differences merge in intermediary stages and all contradictions convert from one to the other through intermediary terms the old metaphysical method of thinking is no longer adequate. A dialectics which...recognizes in suitable cases, along with the "either-or" also "this as well as the other" and which links opposites indirectly is the only and superior method of thinking consistent with the current stage in the development of the natural sciences" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 20, pp 527-528). The typical metaphysical position of the person "who thinks in terms of unrelated opposites" is criticized in "Anti-Duhring" (ibid., p 21). Naturally, on the level of ordinary thinking opposites could be established and even directly pitted one against the other. However, this does not bring us closer to determining the nature of the object. "The usual concept," Lenin wrote, "distinguishes the differences and contradictions but not the transition of one to the other. Yet, this is the most important thing" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 29, p 128).

This was precisely the line developed further by Lenin in understanding contradictions. His contribution to the development of dialectical logic on this level was, above all, that he linked the problem of the dialectical contradiction with the principle of the all-round consideration of the object. In the course of the process of knowledge the object must be reflected in its entire variety, in accordance with the factual correlations which have been established in reality among its various aspects. "If... we take two or several different definitions and combine them entirely at

random...we would obtain an eclectic definition pointing out different aspects of the object and no more" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 42, p 290).

In his argument with Bukharin who tried to reconcile the different positions held by Lenin and Trotskiy on the problem of the trade unions by making eclectic statements that the trade unions were both a school for management and a management apparatus, Vladimir Il'ich emphasized that the nature of dialectics does not consist in the least of the simple indication of the existence of conflicting characteristics in an object. An object has innumerable such characteristics and in practical terms not all of them can be taken into consideration. What is important is precisely to combine opposites in such a way as to establish the objectively existing contradictions between them. "...In our revolution, in three and a half years, we have repeatedly combined opposites," Lenin said. "...Such conflicting concepts could be combined in such a way as to produce either a cacophony or a symphony" (ibid., p 211).

In objective dialectics the correlation between opposites cannot be direct, for such a link would not be homogenous and would make possible a variety of ways and means for correlating them. This thought has both a methodological and a great practical significance. In the process of building socialism and communism we must find intermediary links (measures, phenomena, and organizations) through which the opposite aspects of an entity could interact most effectively.

The nature of the method of intermediary links in theoretical analysis is that it establishes the indirectly linked unity of mutually exclusive opposites. The intermediary links are conceived as phenomena (or concepts expressing them) different from the terminal parts of the relation yet, at the same time, combining some of their characteristics and features. Thus, man and nature could be considered as two opposites in the sense that man is the subject of activities while nature is the object. However, the labor tools through which man affects nature are not only different from him (to a certain extent they themselves are natural objects), but are also the bearers of some of his qualities: the labor tools represent "humanized nature." While philosophers abstractly pitted man against nature their interpretation of the development of man and society could not be fully scientific. They proclaimed man a supernatural being or, conversely, part of nature, and so on, but not a product of socio-historical development. Should the latter be considered, it was applied only to the spiritual qualities of man--morality, language, art, and thinking--rather than to the method of production in which man is directly linked with nature.

Taking into consideration the role of intermediary links in the factual dynamics of contradictions is of tremendous significance for the practical activities of our party as well under the conditions of a developed socialist society.

Thus, the resolution of the factual contradictions between mental and physical labor and the elimination of the essential disparities between

them would be impossible without an intermediary link such as production mechanization and automation thanks to which the physical labor of the people is becoming ever more saturated with an intellectual content, coming closer to mental labor. Naturally, automation is not the only intermediary link in resolving this contradiction, since a major role is played by intermediary links such as public education, vocational-technical training, and the entire set of measures aimed at improving labor conditions, developing the creative principles of labor, and promoting the harmonious development of man himself.

No less effective is the use of the method of analysis of intermediary links in the contemporary natural sciences. For example, the Soviet scientists write that "the ability to single out within the system of elements characteristics which would determine contradictions related through intermediary links is the most important requirement in the utilization of the general systems approach to the study of biological phenomena" (A. M. Chernukh, P. N. Aleksandrov, and O. V. Alekseyev, "Mikrotsirkulyatsiya" [Microcirculation], Moscow, 1975, p 407). It is quite clear that genetics in particular, which leads the development of contemporary theoretical biology, revealed in the concepts of the gene and the genetic code precisely the mechanism of the reciprocal transition of contradictions such as heredity and mutation which, in the past, were frequently directly pitted one against the other.

Therefore, the understanding of contradictions within one or another complex system consists not of adding to the description of one set of phenomena by describing the opposite one, or determining the falseness or inaccuracy of one of the conflicting claims, but finding the intermediary links thanks to which this contradiction is developed and resolved.

The question of theoretical proof plays a significant role in Lenin's elaboration of the problems of dialectical logic. His works themselves--ranging from major writings to minor notes on various economic, political, ideological, and other problems--are examples of provability, substantiation, and extreme clarity of interpretation of the Marxist theory. For example, his work "Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism" is a model of proof of the idea of the inevitable doom of capitalism and of the victory of the socialist system.

Lenin's news on the problem of proof in dialectical logic and in philosophy in general as well as his numerous statements on provability and on the strictness of the Marxist theory are of invaluable theoretical and methodological significance. It is particularly important to bear this in mind, for the Marxist-Leninist theory of proof in dialectical logic has hardly been studied in its entire depth. In our view, generally speaking, insufficient attention is being given to problems of proof, substantiation, and control of the accuracy of knowledge in the philosophical literature dealing with dialectical logic.

The topic is exceptionally broad: it covers questions of proof of individual theoretical concepts, proof of the veracity of theoretical systems of knowledge, substantiation of initial and derived scientific concepts, the role of induction and deduction, analysis and synthesis in the theory of proof, the question of the criteria of veracity at different levels of knowledge, and so on. We shall pay attention here merely to some of its aspects.

Being precisely a logic, dialectical logic must include the theory of the proof of a truth in the broadest possible meaning of the term. From the very beginning of its appearance formal logic developed a corresponding theory of proof which by now has reached a rather high level in the work of Soviet and foreign logicians. However, this theory is applicable only in the case of individual claims as well as logically interrelated statements. Yet, proof and substantiation demand not only individual statements and their direct relations but theoretical concepts, categories, and scientific theories which include a variety of forms of transition from one category to another, and so on. The entire complexity of thought dynamics in theoretical knowledge can be expressed only through dialectical logic.

Emphasizing the characteristics of theoretical knowledge, Lenin proved that the elaboration of any system of scientific categories is not only induction or "purely" deductive. The study of the problems with which a theoretical research begins presumes the combination of both methods of thinking. Lenin wrote the following on the method used by Marx in "Das Kapital": "This is a double analysis, deductive and inductive--logical and historical (forms of value)" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 29, p 302).

The concepts of the development of scientific knowledge in bourgeois philosophy absolutize either one or another form of thought dynamics, ignoring, as a rule, the main characteristics of theoretical knowledge--its integrity and the indirect nature of the transition of one category into another within its structure. However, an individual formulation could be obtained from another formulation or by several ways of applying one of the rules governing the conclusion. However, such a transition from one scientific category to another is impossible. All or at least the basic forms of thought dynamics participate in this process: deduction, induction, analysis, synthesis, and so on. Yet, the unified system of all such forms of theoretical knowledge may be found in the method described by Marx and Lenin as the ascension of knowledge from the abstract to the concrete.

Such dynamics of theoretical thinking is proof in itself, i.e., represents a proof of the veracity of the idea expressed in the categories of the elaborated theory. That is precisely why Lenin emphasized that "a category must be derived (rather than taken arbitrarily or automatically) (not "telling," not "assuring," but proving)...., proceeding from the simplest basic ones..." (ibid., p 86).

The problem of proof in dialectical logic also presumes the most thorough study of the problems of correlation between theoretical and empirical knowledge, confirmation, refutation, and so on. Dialectical materialism enjoys unquestionable advantage and priority in its resolution compared with bourgeois philosophy, even though of late such problems have been discussed quite actively in Western philosophical literature in connection with the obvious crisis of the neopositivistic methodology of science. Characteristic of such debates is either the ignorance or deliberate concealment of familiar views expressed by Marx, Engels, and Lenin who presented the most vast and profound methodological solutions to the problem of proof as early as the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries.

For example, the question of the role of empirical facts in the proof and substantiation of ideas, laws, theories, and concepts was given an extremely clear solution in the works of the classics of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Engels himself wrote that "empirical observation by itself can never prove a necessity adequately" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 20, p 544). Naturally, the facts guarantee the reliability of knowledge. By themselves, however, they can neither prove nor disprove a theoretical concept. They assume the force of proof if taken together, within a specific system of interpretations which takes into consideration the totality of information related to a given problem.

V. I. Lenin sharply criticized the sophisticated methods through which bourgeois ideologues fight the scientific concepts of Marxism. He proved that the proper use of facts depends precisely on the depth of the theoretical positions taken in science, and on their accurate logical elaboration which consists of the overall consideration of the object itself. "In the field of social phenomena," Lenin wrote, "there is no more widespread and more groundless phenomenon as the consideration of individual petty facts or examples...facts, if taken in their entirety, in their relationship are not only a "stubborn" but an unquestionably provable matter. Petty facts, if taken out of context or out of their relationships, if they are separate and arbitrary, are precisely nothing but a toy or something even worse" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 30, p 350).

Our ideological opponents are adamantly finding in empirical facts all sorts of "counter examples," allegedly refuting Marxism. These are vain attempts, however, for in reality each fact (even a fact which initially may seem to be conflicting with Marxist-Leninist theory), considered comprehensively, in all its relations and indirect links, will, unquestionably, become yet another proof of the justice and vitality of Marxism. In their time the bourgeois ideologues presented the defeat of the 1905 revolution in Russia, for example, as a refutation of the Leninist theory of the socialist revolution. Studying the reasons for the defeat, Lenin proved that the first Russian revolution was precisely a confirmation of the correctness of Marxism. It strengthened even further the belief shared by the Bolsheviks and the broad toiling masses in the need for decisive revolutionary actions for the overthrow of autocracy, the need for a strong alliance between the

working class and the peasantry, the need for unity within the revolutionary party, and so on.

By its nature dialectical logic is the theoretical manifestation of socio-historical practice at its highest level--the level of the revolutionary-transforming activities of the working class; that is why it necessarily includes as a most important requirement a consideration of "all human practice" as a criterion of truth (see V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 42, p 290). Lenin emphasized that it is precisely "through practice that man proves the objective correctness of his ideas, concepts, and knowledge, and science" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 29, p 173). At all stages in the struggle waged by the Marxists against bourgeois and revisionist ideology dialectical logic has been a reliable tool for exposing all possible distortions of the nature of Marxism and a method for the further development of Marxist-Leninist theory. Dialectical logic provided a truly scientific understanding of the nature of theoretical thinking. It revealed the basic forms and laws governing its dynamics and development and formulated ways and means for the struggle against any kind of sophistry, subjectivism, and eclecticism.

The CPSU and its central committee ascribed tremendous importance to the creative development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, one of whose most important aspects is dialectical logic. The party documents on the development of the social sciences and the materials of the 25th Party Congress showed, in a concentrated form, its concern for the intensification of Marxist-Leninist theory and upbringing based on the dialectical method of using the most progressive scientific thinking by the Soviet people. Dialectical logic plays an invaluable role in the progress of all Soviet science and in molding a communist outlook, high thinking standards, and the all-round development of the individual.

5003

CSO: 1802

LENINIST COURSE TOWARD A SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 pp 67-78

[Article by K. Suvorov, doctor of historical sciences, on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's April Theses]

[Text] In the struggle waged by the Bolshevik Party for the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, a short work by V. I. Lenin "On the Tasks of the Proletariat in a Given Revolution," which became historically known as the "April Theses," played an exceptionally important role. In this work, which reflected the entire wealth of Marxist revolutionary thinking and international revolutionary experience, Lenin profoundly analyzed the change in Russian political circumstances following the victory of the February bourgeois-democratic revolution. He assessed the international situation and earmarked a set of party tasks for the transition to a socialist revolution.

The April Theses were to the party the type of program document whose adoption marked a sharp change in all party activities. They brilliantly substantiated the specific course of the socialist revolution in Russia. "The April Theses, clearly earmarking the prospects for a transition to a socialist revolution," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary, "are not only a turning point in the political history of our country but a new step in the development of the Marxist theory of the revolution as a whole."

The April Theses are one of the most important documents of the Marxist-Leninist treasury. To this day they are the methodological base and model for the elaboration of an effective revolutionary strategy and tactic.

Following the victory of the February revolution, the Bolshevik Party continued its revolutionary line. It rallied the party masses in the struggle against the restoration of the monarchy and for the consolidation of the gains of the revolution. Under the new historical circumstances the party role grew sharply. It was faced with the most complex strategic and tactical tasks: determining the future of the revolution and the means for resolving problems raised by life itself and, above all, the problem of war and

peace, and the stand to be adopted toward the soviet, the provisional government, and the petit bourgeois parties. Until then no single proletariat party in any other country had faced such tasks.

At that time the party's Central Committee Russian Bureau was directly in charge of the Bolshevik organizations. In the course of March 1917 the composition of the bureau changed and the bureau expanded as new comrades arrived from abroad or were released from jail and exile. A more or less stable composition of the bureau developed in the second half of March. The composition of the PRAVDA editorial staff changed as well. This was reflected in its work.

The Central Committee Bureau immediately tried to formulate the party's political line under the new conditions. Resolving this main problem, at its very first session on 4 (17) March 1917, it noted that the provisional government, formed as a government of big capitalist and landowners, was unable to resolve the problems formulated by the revolution, by virtue of its class nature, and it was essentially counterrevolutionary, for which reason no agreements whatever could be reached with it. This was a correct class assessment which played a great role in the party's struggle for the further development of the revolution. This Central Committee Bureau assessment was reinforced further by Lenin's 6 (19) March cable which called for total mistrust of and no support whatever to the new government (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 31, p 7).

Yet some of the conclusions drawn by the Central Committee Bureau were based on previous positions. Thus, it deemed necessary the struggle for the creation of a provisional revolutionary government which, in terms of its class content, would represent the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. Based on the experience of the 1905 revolution, from the very first days of the February revolution the Central Committee Bureau directed the masses to the immediate creation of soviets of worker, soldier and peasant deputies. However, there was no general party stipulation on transferring the entire power to the soviets. The Central Committee Bureau considered the soviets only as embryonic authorities or as an authority which was called upon to create a provisional revolutionary government whereas such a government was actually extant, represented by the soviets. Offering a general assessment of the party's attitude toward the soviets prior to April 1917, Lenin noted that they had been properly supported but that the majority had not as yet realized their class significance. Above all, it failed to understand that the soviets "represent a new form or, rather, a new type of state" (Ibid., pp 109, 162).

The absence of a clear concept of the significance of the soviets triggered, under the conditions of twin power, the erroneous tactic of "pressuring" the provisional government, particularly on the question of war and peace. The possibility for effectively influencing the government on all other matters this way was accepted. In principle, the "pressure" tactic is entirely admissible and, in some circumstances, even necessary. However,

under the conditions of the existence of strong soviets which could assume full power and resolve all problems in the interest of the people such a tactic was wrong, for it drew the attention of the masses away from the soviets and limited their role to the use of measures to influence the provisional government. It increased petit bourgeois illusions that under the pressure of the masses the provisional government could make peace and resolve other vital problems since its actions could be controlled.

Proving the erroneousness of these views, Lenin said that "in revolutionary times such control is fraudulent," and that "no control is possible without power. To control revolutions and others is pure mistake" (Ibid., p 250).

The biggest error which some leading workers and party organizations committed was the use of the so-called "conditional support" tactic of the provisional government. In PRAVDA Kamenev tried to promote a semi-Menshevik line toward the government, the war, control, and other matters.

In a number of cases the party organizations used the obsolete slogans of the 1905 revolution without having sufficiently clarified the radical distinction in the political circumstances following the overthrow of the autocracy.

A number of party committees -- Kronshtadt, Khar'kov, and others -- raised the civil war slogan which was wrong under the twin-power conditions, i.e., of armed struggle against the bourgeois provisional government.

Therefore, until Lenin returned to Russia, the Central Committee Bureau and the local party organizations had held a correct position on a number of problems and an unclear or even erroneous one on some rather essential matters.

The party felt acutely the absence of its leader. It needed his perceptive assessment of revolutionary prospects. The Central Committee Bureau tried to promote his speediest return by all possible means. Lenin himself was rushing toward Russia and, after surmounting numerous obstacles, reached Petrograd on 3 April 1917.

The party and the working class warmly welcomed the leader and tens of telegrams were sent to him. Thus, the greeting of the general meeting of Vyborgskiy Rayon Bolsheviks, in Petrograd, held on 4 April, read: "We are convinced that Comrade Lenin's firmness and loyalty to the cause of international revolutionary socialism, now that he will be among us, will facilitate the implementation of the most difficult and the greatest of tasks facing our party in leading the Russian revolution to its completion..." ("Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biograficheskaya Khronika. 1870-1924" [Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biographical Chronicle. 1870-1924], Vol 4, Politizdat, Moscow, 1973, p 64).

Standing on an armored car on Finland Station Square, Lenin proclaimed the slogan of "Long Live the Socialist Revolution!" On 4 (17) April, in his report to a meeting of Bolshevik members of the All-Russian Conference of soviets of worker and soldier deputies, he provided an all-around substantiation of the party's course toward a socialist revolution in the 10 theses known as the "April Theses." Lenin developed their concepts in other works as well: "On Twin Power," "Letter on Tactics," and "The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution."

As a brilliant thinker, political strategist, and person of energetic revolutionary action, Lenin indicated to the party the path leading to the victory of the socialist revolution. He defined the significance and characteristics of the February Revolution and proved that even though it had failed to resolve all problems it had gone beyond a usual bourgeois-democratic revolution by having set up the soviets of worker and soldier deputies and brought about a historically unparalleled intertwining of two powers: bourgeois dictatorship represented by the provisional government, and proletarian and peasant dictatorship represented by the soviets. Lenin determined the principal criterion for the completion of the revolution: "Transition of state power from the hands of one to another class is the first, main, and basic characteristic of a revolution both in the strictly scientific as well as the practical-political meaning of this term" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 31, p 133). Guided by this methodological concept and taking into consideration that as a result of the February revolution the power had shifted from the hands of the landowning class to the bourgeoisie, he drew the conclusion that the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia had been carried out.

These conclusions were grounds for an entirely new formulation of the question of the future of the revolution. Elaborating his views on the continuing revolution and the possibility of the victory of the socialist revolution in the epoch of imperialism initially in several countries or even in a single country, in his April Theses Lenin substantiated the view that all the necessary prerequisites for such a victory had developed in Russia in 1917. "The characteristic of the present moment in Russia," he wrote, "is the transition from the first stage of the revolution, which gave power to the bourgeoisie by virtue of the insufficient consciousness and organization of the proletariat, to its second stage which must give power to the proletariat and the poorest peasant strata" (Ibid., p 114).

This was the main view expressed in the April Theses. It directed the party toward the implementation of a new general line aimed at the victory of the socialist revolution.

The Leninist scientific analysis of the political situation in Russia in 1917 has retained its significance to the present. Situations resembling the twin power in Russia developed in the course of the growth of the democratic revolutions in socialist revolutions in some countries such as, for example, Czechoslovakia, prior to February 1948.

Lenin's conclusion that the socialist revolution was the immediate task of the Bolsheviks triggered a sharp reaction on the part of the leaders of the Menshevik and other parties. Plekhanov described the April Theses as "delirious" and asserted that Russia allegedly lacked the objective conditions for a socialist revolution, and the task was to strengthen the positions of the provisional government rather than to overthrow it. Lenin described this position as the typical view of a "handful of former people" calling themselves social democrats" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 31, p 300).

Some members of the Bolshevik Party as well, Kamenev in particular, also failed to see the prerequisites for a socialist revolution in Russia. Kamenev believed that the course toward socialism was a "leap" across the unfinished bourgeois-democratic revolution and considered its theory similar to Trotsky's theory of the "permanent revolution" expressed in the formula of "no tsar but a worker government." As we know, Trotsky rejected the revolutionary role of the peasantry, claiming that it could not be the ally of the working class in the revolution, and relied only on the direct aid to the state provided by the international proletariat. Lenin had always struggled against the adventuristic Trotskyite theory of the "permanent revolution" estranged from life. This time again he proved the total groundlessness of the assertions of those who were trying to identify the formulation of the question of the socialist revolution in the April Theses with the Trotskyite formulation. Lenin wrote that he had formulated in his April Theses or other works nothing resembling the formula of "no tsar but a worker government." And that he had absolutely protected himself from such a "leap" and from all "games" of "power seizure" by a worker government by having clearly written in his theses that "...there can be no government in Russia (excluding the bourgeois) other than the soviets of worker, farmhand, soldier and peasant deputies," and that the power in Russia could go "only to such soviets in which, precisely, peasantry predominates, the soldiers predominate, the petit bourgeoisie predominates..." (Ibid., p 137).

In the April Theses Lenin proceeded from the existence of the necessary objective and subjective prerequisites for a socialist revolution in the country. Even though Russia remained, economically and technically, one of the most developed countries in Europe and compared with the United States, it was an imperialist country with an average level of capitalist development. Speaking of the world capitalist system at the beginning of the 20th century as a whole, Lenin noted that this was an epoch of "very high development of capitalism throughout the world and of a relatively high capitalist development in Russia," and that here again "capitalism had become monopolistic too" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 20, p 20; Vol 34, p 191).

The vestiges of feudalism, interwoven with capitalist relations, determined the greater sharpness of class contradictions in Russia compared with other imperialist countries. The antagonism between labor and capital was deeper, coarser, and more emphatic. It covered not only the proletariat but tens of millions of peasants. The basic contradictions, intensified by World War I, were manifested in Russia more strongly while the situation in the country itself was the most revolutionary. The proletariat -- the main

revolutionary force -- even though smaller than in other European countries in terms of numbers, was highly concentrated; headed by its vanguard -- the Bolshevik Party -- it was tempered in the flames of two revolutions. The Russian proletariat was the type of hegemony power of the liberation struggle under whose leadership the toiling masses could successfully make a socialist revolution.

The April Theses reflect the substantial change in the ratio of class forces in Russia as a result of the victory of the February revolution. The peasantry was divided even more profoundly into kulaks, middle peasants, and the poor. The class antagonism between the rural bourgeoisie -- the kulaks -- and the proletariat and semi-proletariat in the countryside increased. Changes occurred in the composition of the allies of the working class in the new stage of the revolution. In the bourgeois-democratic revolution the proletariat launched its struggle against the landowners as allied with the entire peasantry. In the struggle for socialism the poorest peasants were the main ally of the proletariat. It would be erroneous, however, to assume that at that stage Lenin considered it to be the only ally of the proletariat. Lenin had in mind all exploited people. "...Every oppressed person will come to us..." Lenin said at the 4 April 1917 Bolshevik meeting. The April Theses expressed the basic interest of the toiling and exploited masses. Somewhat later Lenin wrote that in the struggle for socialism the proletariat acts "together with the poorest peasantry, together with the semi-proletariat, together with all exploited people against capitalism, including against the rural rich, the kulaks, and the speculators" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 37, p 311).

In April 1917 Lenin favored the involvement of the progressive intelligentsia as well in revolutionary creativity. Returning to this question subsequently, he declared even more clearly that "the number of representatives of the sciences, technology, and the arts who are becoming convinced of the need to replace capitalism by another socio-economic system" is growing steadily and irrepressibly. ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 45, p 147.)

Lenin's elaboration of the question of allies of the working class in the struggle against capitalism and his study of their structure and extent of their solidarity with the leading force -- the proletariat -- are still helping the communist and worker parties in formulating their revolutionary strategy and tactics. Lenin's thoughts teach us, above all, that the question of the allies of the working class should always be considered in accordance with specific historical reality and specific stage of the revolutionary struggle. The basic concept remains unchanged: the working class, as was emphasized at the 1969 International Conference of Communist and Worker Parties, is "the main motive and mobilizing force of the revolutionary struggle and of the entire democratic and anti-imperialist movement."

The April Theses developed further the Marxist theory of the state and its significance in the socialist evolution. Lenin's great merit was that he described comprehensively the socio-political nature of the soviets of worker, soldier, and peasant deputies. He proved that they were the product of the revolutionary creativity of the masses, that they were organizations

of the working people themselves and that they were similar to the government of the Paris Commune. Lenin formulated the idea of the single power of the soviets by proclaiming the slogan of "All Power to the Soviets!" "Not a parliamentary republic, as going back to it from the soviets of worker deputies would be a step backward," the April Theses emphasized, "but a republic of soviets of worker, farmhand, and peasant deputies, all over the country, from top to bottom" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", Vol. 31, p. 115). Lenin's formulation of the question of the transition of the entire power to the soviets was aimed at the development of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry into the dictatorship of the proletariat.

V. I. Lenin considered the soviets the best form of state power, accessible to and understood by the broadest masses. He considered the existence of such soviets in Russia one of the decisive factors in the development of the socialist revolution. Let us note that Lenin considered the soviets only as one of the forms of governmental organization of the working class and noted that the transition from capitalism to socialism in other countries would bring about a variety of political forms but that "the essence will be inevitably one: dictatorship of the proletariat" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", Vol. 33, p. 35). The correctness of these ideas was confirmed by the experience of the revolutionary movement of a number of countries, including highly developed ones.

The conciliationist parties -- Mensheviks, Esers, and their leaders -- spoke against Lenin's ideas on the dictatorship of the proletariat and fabricated a variety of "threatening" fables about it. Rebutting the petit bourgeois and bourgeois cries against the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin proved that it meant not the destruction of democracy but, on the contrary, its factual and uniquely broad implementation. He emphasized the exceptional significance of the dictatorship of the proletariat to the overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie and the repelling of its counterrevolutionary intrigues.

Proceeding from the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the nature and significance of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the communists stated that despite the entire variety of the revolutionary progress in the individual countries, the main thing remained unchanged: socialism can be gained only as a result of surmounting the fierce opposition of the capitalist exploiters, and only as a result of the establishment of the power of the working class allied with the other detachments of working people.

The April Theses not only raised the question of the need for the transition of the entire governmental power to the soviets but also provided an answer to the question of how to achieve this transition in practical terms. At that time the petit bourgeois Menshevik and Eser parties, influenced by the bourgeoisie and following its policies, predominated in the soviets. The Bolsheviks in the soviets were in the minority. Lenin believed that this ratio of forces was temporary and called for working for the transition of the power to the soviets in the interests of the further development of the revolution, despite the fact that they had a Menshevik and Eser majority.

This was a tactic of revolutionary compromise: the petit bourgeois parties would abandon the bourgeois bloc. As parties dominating the soviets they would assume power while the Bolsheviks would not oppose them in this shift of power. "Gentlemen, become the present leaders of the soviet -- we favor this, even though you are our opponents....," Lenin said addressing himself to the leaders of these parties ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 32, p 340).

The purpose of this tactic was to insure the peaceful growth of the bourgeois-democratic into a socialist revolution. As members of the soviet the Bolsheviks would have criticized the inevitable fluctuations of the ruling petit bourgeois parties, would explain to the masses the inability of such parties to resolve the problems raised by the revolution, and would help the workers get rid of their petit bourgeois feelings. Undergoing a practical test, the political programs of the different parties and the changes in the structure of the soviets through reelections would change the ratio of the forces in favor of the Bolshevik Party which would assume the power as a party expressing in fact the basic interests of the working class and all working people. Lenin wrote that such activities "seem to be 'merely' propaganda work. In fact, this is practical revolutionary work itself" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 31, p 157). That is why the April Theses contained the instruction of the need for patient, systematic and persistent clarification of the tactical errors of the soviets and, at the same time, the exceptional significance of the transition of all state power to the soviets.

This was a new Marxist view of the ways for the development of the revolution and Lenin's famous formulation of the question of the peaceful development of the revolution.

The possibility for a peaceful development of the revolution is exceptionally rare but exceptionally valuable in world history. Lenin saw in the most complex interweaving of the class struggle in Russia the possibility for the growth of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution peacefully, without an armed uprising, and substantiated the ways for such a development in the April Theses. "In Russia," he said, "such a revolution is possible as a peaceful revolution, on an exceptional basis" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 32, p 270). One of the basic prerequisites for the peaceful development of the revolution in Russia was the existence of the soviets which enjoyed the support of workers, peasants, and the army. "Arms in the hands of the people and absence of coercion over the people from the outside was the essence. This is what opened and insured a peaceful way for the development of the entire revolution," Lenin wrote ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 34, p 11).

To the Bolshevik Party the peaceful development of the revolution was the most desirable and, therefore, as long as such a possibility remained, the party did everything possible to promote precisely this path. The bourgeoisie did everything possible to weaken the course of the revolutionary process. It deliberately falsified the Bolshevik concept of the peaceful development of the revolution, joined by their conciliationist parties. Thus, distorting

the content of the April Theses, Plekhanov's newspaper YEDINSTVO stated that Lenin had "raised the flag of civil war." History has confirmed that frightening with civil war is the favorite method used by the bourgeoisie and the opportunists. Lenin firmly exposed such lies. He wrote that neither his theses nor his report contained a single word about civil war and that at a time when the capitalists and their government lack either the power or the daring to use violence over the masses the thought of a civil war is "naive, senseless, wild," and that "as long as the government does not initiate a war (against the proletariat -- the author) we preach peacefully" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 31, pp 116-117, 309, 351).

History and contemporaneity prove that it is precisely the bourgeoisie that is the first to use violence in its most rigid forms, ignoring moral or constitutional norms. In 1917, in Russia, on several occasions it tried to organize a "blood bath" for the proletariat. As a result, at the beginning of July the possibility for a peaceful development disappeared and the revolution took a different, violent path. "The basic formulation of the question of the possibility for two ways of development of the revolution, however, remains a topical achievement of Leninist thinking," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev describing the significance of the April Theses and Lenin's contribution to the creative development of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the revolution.

On the basis of Lenin's formulation of the problem, the communists in a number of countries have provided a number of examples of successful struggle for the peaceful development of the revolution. For the first time in history the proletariat seized power peacefully, even though briefly, in Hungary, in 1919. In 1945-1949 a peaceful transition of power to the working class took place on a broader scale in a number of countries in Central and Southeast Europe.

V. I. Lenin proved that both the peaceful and the violent paths of the revolution must have material support. In order to achieve freedom the people must be armed. Therefore, in April 1917, Lenin raised the task of the general arming of the people, the abolishment of the police, and the disarmament of the bourgeoisie. Explaining the need for such measures, he ascribed particular importance to the democratization of the army and its involvement on the side of the people, and to blocking the attempts of the generals and the reactionary segment of the officer corps to use the army against the people and the revolution. The history of all revolutions, including those of the present, fully confirm the correctness of Lenin's ideas. Summing up the experience of the contemporary struggle against imperialism and for national independence, peace and socialism, the conference of communist parties of Latin American countries and of the Caribbean (Havana, 1975) noted that the ruling classes will not surrender their power voluntarily but, on the contrary, will defend it fiercely. "The Chilean experience clearly shows," states the conference document, "that the revolutionary movement cannot reject any given democratic approach to power. At the same time, however, it must be fully ready to defend the democratic gains by the force of arms."

In the April Theses Lenin enriched the science and art of the political leadership of the masses. In order for a revolution to succeed the masses have to become persuaded of the correctness of the communist program of struggle. Slogans had to be formulated properly and proclaimed openly. The masses had to be told who their class enemies were and the struggle against such enemies had to be headed firmly. Specific measures, close to and understood by the masses had to be formulated. Every working person was to be made to see specifically that such measures would improve his life. The theses formulated a program for the struggle for peace and for an end to the hated imperialist war, demands in the field of the agrarian-peasant problem, and measures for economic change.

V. I. Lenin directed the party's attention to the fact that under the traditional government as well, the war retained its predatory and imperialist nature, and that all talk of "revolutionary defense" was a lie and a deception of the masses. He pointed out that the war could not be ended with a truly democratic and non-coercive peace without the overthrow of capitalism. "Outside socialism there is no salvation of mankind from war, hunger, or the death of more and more millions of people" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 31, pp 104, 130).

Developing further the party's agrarian program, Lenin called for the confiscation of landed estates, the nationalization of the entire land in the country and, as a step toward socialism, the creation of model farms based on the big landed estates. He appealed to the peasants to seize the landed estates skillfully and decisively without waiting for the convention of the constituent assembly as the conciliation parties suggested. Lenin paid particular attention to singling out and uniting the poor country strata. He pointed out that in the agrarian program "the center of gravity must be shifted to the soviets of farmhand deputies" (Ibid., p 115).

The theses called for the immediate merger of all banks in the country within a single national bank and for the establishment over it and public production and distribution controlled by the soviets of worker deputies. Lenin considered all these measures as transitional socialism. Their implementation would have immediately eased the lives of millions of people. He taught that the immediate task was not the "introduction" of socialism but the implementation of such transitional measures. Lenin advised the greatest possible caution in their steadfast implementation. "Otherwise," he said, "the soviets of worker and soldier deputies will be scattered and will die an ignominious death..." The successful implementation of the transitional measures by them "would make further steps toward socialism in Russia entirely possible... The factual transition of Russia to socialism would become inevitable and the success of this transition guaranteed" ("Ibid., pp 358, 303).

Lenin's formulation of the question of the significance of transitional measures is heeded by the communist and worker parties. They are planning for such requirements in the fields of industrial output, agrarian relations, and culture, based on the strict consideration of the specific conditions prevailing in their countries.

In the April Theses the question of the party whose role as the vanguard, educator, and organizer of the masses assumes particular importance in the revolution is treated as inseparably linked with the transition to a socialist revolution. The theses formulate the immediate tasks: the immediate summoning of a party congress to discuss the most important problems of activities under the new conditions, and amendments to the essentially fulfilled 1903 party program.

Lenin paid exceptional attention to the ideological and organizational strengthening of the party ranks. Even as an emigre, in a number of works and in his "Letters From Afar" he exposed the Menshevik attempts to deprive the Bolshevik Party of its autonomy. He cautioned against an organizational unification with it. Lenin considered inadmissible the unification with obvious opportunists such as Mensheviks and hesitant people such as Martov, Chkhaidze, and the like. He called for continuing to do systematic work for a "party of a new type" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 49, p 403). Developing further the Marxist theory of the party, Lenin earmarked a number of measures aimed at improving the organization of party forces in each rayon, district, plant, or company so that the party organizations could act as one man, and so that from each such organization the threads would lead to the Central Committee, and so that such threads would be solid and that the enemy would be unable to break them in its first strike, "so that the enemy could not catch us unawares" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 31, p 338).

The purpose of the solution of interparty tasks was to enable the proletariat to mobilize its forces for victory in the socialist revolution. Also important in this set of measures was changing the name of the party. Lenin considered this an important political problem. The name of the party, he taught, must be based on science, theoretically correct, and help to "clarify the mind of the proletariat" (Ibid., p 179).

Like K. Marx and F. Engels, Lenin considered as inaccurate the name of the party as "social democratic." As early as 1914, when the parties within the Second International had stained this name by betraying the interests of the proletariat, he had raised the question of its change. In 1917 Lenin raised this question again, this time as directly linked with the tasks of the socialist revolution. For the purpose of separation from the opportunists, in the April Theses he suggested that the name of the Bolshevik Party be changed to Communist Party. Furthermore, the identical name (RSDWP) shared by the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks frequently confused the workers. This could harm the development of the socialist revolution.

The party's new name was consistent with the theory of scientific communism, accurately reflecting the final objective of its struggle. The party accepted Lenin's suggestion and became the first of the working class parties to describe itself as communist at the March 1918 7th Party Congress. "The name of our party," Lenin said in this connection, "expresses quite clearly the fact that we are marching toward full communism..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 66).

V. I. Lenin considered the party of the Russian proletariat a structural part of the world's workers movement, always acting on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism. In the April Theses he called for strengthening the entire world labor movement and its unity through struggle against opportunism and the creation of a new, revolutionary Third International, to replace the bankrupt Second International. Emphasizing the durable significance of the principles of proletarian internationalism, Lenin developed them in terms of the new epoch.

The April Theses are an outstanding work of creative and effective Marxism. In them Lenin developed the theory of the revolution and substantiated the new strategic course of the Bolshevik Party toward a socialist revolution, covering all its basic problems.

Lenin's return to Russia and his proclamation of the April Theses were a turning point in the activities of the Bolshevik Party and in its struggle for the preparation for and victory of the socialist revolution. Lenin immediately assumed the leadership of the Central Committee and of PRAVDA, the central party organ.

Under Lenin's wise leadership, the party collectively elaborated a course toward a socialist revolution. On 6 April 1917 the April Theses were discussed at a Central Committee session; they were published in PRAVDA on 7 April and then reprinted in many Bolshevik newspapers. Soon after their publication the April Theses were extensively discussed by the party and became the foundation of its new strategic course.

Even though acknowledging that the April Theses should be assigned a central place in the history of Bolshevism in 1917, and that 25 October could not come without 3 April, the contemporary bourgeois falsifiers of history, in particular Cambridge University Prof H. Braun, American Professors R. (Vesson) and S. Page, and others, tried to depict matters as though Lenin's ideas were "extremist" and supported merely by a "handful of revolutionaries." Lenin, they state, "had a great deal of trouble convincing his own party that Russia was ripe for a socialist revolution," and so on.

In reality, the history of the adoption of the April Theses by the party was different. Some party members, particularly those who used the old categories and concepts, initially displayed a lack of understanding of the theses, while others (Kamenev, Rykov), who considered a socialist revolution in Russia as essentially impossible, voiced their objections. "Both the theses and my report," wrote Lenin about this, "triggered differences among the Bolsheviks themselves and the PRAVDA editors" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 31, p 131). In this connection, the Central Committee unanimously reached the conclusion that it would be most expedient to discuss within the party openly the new formulation of the question of the revolution. This decision proved the great democracy of the party and the fact that it elaborated the new course, under Lenin's guidance, in a truly collective fashion,

In the course of their discussion by the party organizations, the formulations of the April Theses were accepted with tremendous satisfaction and approval. Directives to the delegates to the 7th (April) All-Russian Conference were formulated at party meetings and conferences of party organizations, calling upon them to defend Lenin's theses and vote for Lenin's platform. The resolution of the First North Baltic Oblast RSDWP (b) Conference stated the following: "After discussion of Comrade Lenin's theses, the conference... acknowledges them as being accurately based on scientific socialism and congratulates Comrade Lenin as a leading fighter of the Russian revolutionary proletariat, openly taking the path of a social revolution" ("Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biograficheskaya Khronika," Vol 4, p 96). The facts show that the biggest party organizations discussed and approved the April Theses within a very short period of time, taking no more than one or two weeks.

The theses were opposed by individuals only. Among them the most negative position was that of Kamenev. In his article "Our Differences" he proclaimed the theses "unacceptable" for they proceeded from the conclusion that the bourgeois-democratic revolution had been completed. He objected to the course toward "immediate conversion of this revolution into socialist revolution." Kamenev believed that conditions for solution of this problem were not ripe. On 12 April he published a second article entitled "On Lenin's Theses," in which he attempted to prove that their concepts are suitable only to European countries such as Britain, Germany and France, but not to Russia. At the Petrograd City Conference (14-22 April) and, subsequently, the 7th (April) All-Russian RSDWP (b) Conference (24-29 April) he voiced his essential disagreement with Lenin's theses and described the orientation toward a socialist revolution as "the greatest of errors."

At the April Conference Lenin exposed the erroneous and opportunistic nature of the statements made by Kamenev, Ryakov, and their few supporters. "Comrade Ryakov says," Lenin said, "that socialism must come from other countries with a more developed industry. This is not so. One cannot say who will begin and who will end it. This would not be Marxism but a parody of Marxism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 31, p 363).

The conference was attended by 151 delegates representing as many as 80,000 party members. The absolute majority of delegates favored Lenin's theses. All conference resolutions embodying the concepts of the April Theses were adopted by overwhelming majority of votes on the basis of extensive discussions.

Thus, the April conference, whose importance equaled that of a congress, proved that the party had unanimously approved the course to a socialist revolution formulated and substantiated by Lenin. The conference results convincingly proved that the party displayed a profound understanding of the political circumstances.

Emphasizing the significance of Lenin's brilliant ideas to the victory of the revolution and the building of socialism and communism, the CPSU Central

Committee noted in its decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution" that our party "proved to be on the level of the great tasks of the epoch."

The international fame and popularity of the Bolshevik Party and of Lenin, its leader, grew at a headlong pace. The fighters for freedom in Europe and Asia and in all parts of the world began to realize ever more profoundly the international significance of Leninism. The opportunists were spreading the lie of its "limited" significance. In the eastern countries they spoke of the suitability of Leninism only to European countries, while in Europe they tried to persuade the masses that Leninism was an oriental product and applicable only in backward countries. Thus, the question of the significance of Lenin's ideas to western Europe arose within the European labor movement. Answering this question, and emphasizing the international significance of Leninism, Palmiro Togliatti, the outstanding leader of the Italian and international communist movement, said that "Lenin was precisely a 'European,' whose political activities gained universal significance as being applicable to the entire contemporary world!" (Palmiro Togliatti, "Izbrannyye Stat'i i Rechi" [Selected Articles and Speeches], in two volumes, Vol II, Moscow, 1965, p 123).

The ideas of Leninism -- the Marxism of the contemporary epoch -- provide a key to the understanding of revolutionary processes, the composition of the motive forces of democratic and socialist revolutions, and the determination of peaceful and violent ways of their development and the allies of the working class; they illuminate the path of transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism and communism. Lenin's works serve the building of the new world. "The books written by Lenin," said Ivor Montague, the noted British public figure, "are not among those who become covered with dust... These books are our fellow fighters in the present clash... Lenin's writings are not archives but an arsenal."

These are splendid words. They graphically characterize the greatest international significance of Lenin's works among which the April Theses assume one of the leading positions.

5003
CSO: 1802

HISTORICAL ENCOUNTER

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 pp 79-90

[Article by V. Sedykh, Paris-Moscow]

[Text] On 21 October 1957 a solemn ceremony took place in the embassy of the USSR in France: the Soviet ambassador presented the Order of Lenin to Marcel Cachin, the outstanding leader of the French and international communist movement, and the political director of L'HUMANITE. On that memorable day Maurice Thorez, Jacques Duclos, Waldek Roche, and other leaders of the French Communist Party, Cachin's relatives and friends, representatives of Soviet organizations in France, and journalists gathered in the old house on Rue de Grenelle, in Paris.

The 40th anniversary of the Great October Revolution was approaching. This event emphasized particularly vividly the profound and even symbolic meaning of the ceremony, ascribing it a rarely happy mood and cheer.

Receiving from the hands of the Soviet envoy the order with the chiseled face of the leader of the greatest revolution, the 88-year-old director of L'HUMANITE was unable to conceal his emotion. He began his speech with a recollection particularly precious to him. "I had the particular honor," he said, "to meet, in the first months of 1917, one of the most active and outstanding builders of the new Soviet system and, subsequently, its brilliant founder, the great Lenin."

The day he was presented the order, Marcel Cachin said: "This is a reward for my entire life."

Personal encounters and talks with Vladimir Il'ich not only played a tremendous role in Cachin's life but left profound traces in the history of the French and international communist movements. This was frequently stated and written by the director of L'HUMANITE, Cachin's closest fellow workers, friends and children frequently spoke of the significance of these meetings.

The following event comes to mind. In September 1969 the communists and working people of France extensively celebrated the centennial of the birth of their outstanding son. It was decided to begin the ceremonies in Brittany where Marcel Cachin was born. The passenger coach which was taking a special delegation to Brittany carried Jacques Duclos and Cachin's daughter Marie-Louise. They invited me, at that time a private correspondent of PRAVDA in France, to participate in the trip. Marie-Louise carefully preserves in her files Cachin's priceless diaries and notes, continuing to add to them other documents and testimonies. She was familiar with my brief and, alas, only talk with her father, held in 1956 in L'HUMANITE's editorial offices. At that time I was merely able to ask Marcel Cachin for an interview on his meetings with Lenin.

"But L'HUMANITE quite recently published my memoirs." Cachin smiled looking at me under his heavy gray eyebrows and shortly added: "Actually, one could write and speak endlessly about Lenin, as about the October Revolution. The topic is as inexhaustible as life itself."

Traveling in Brittany, we visited the modest home engulfed in vegetation in the small village of Lancerf-En-Plouriveaux. It was here that Cachin came to rest for many years. Then, the delegation headed by Duclos, visited Paimpol and Marie-Louise took us to the old house at 45 Eight Patriots, a narrow street, where her father was born.

Marcel Cachin was born on 20 September 1869 in that small fishing town huddled on the coast of the English Channel, in the northwestern end of Europe. Seven months later, in the eastern part of the European continent, in a city along the bank of a powerful Russian river, a brilliant person was born who was destined to play an exceptional role in universal history. Both of them, the Frenchman and the Russian, were born on the eve of the Paris Commune which was drowned in blood by the triumphant reaction; half a century later, they met on the land of the victorious proletariat revolution which had avenged the defeat of the Communards who, in Marx's inspired expression, had "stormed the sky." It was as though this historic meeting between Cachin and Lenin symbolized a certain natural merger, predetermined by the development of events, of the best traditions of the homeland of the Paris Commune and the ideas and creativity of the Red October, of the revolutionary vanguard of the French socialist movement with Leninism.

That was precisely the topic chosen in 1969 by Etienne Fajon, French Communist Party Politburo member, who was the director of L'HUMANITE for many years after Cachin's death. He pointed out that no other French socialist could represent the French workers movement and its best tradition more brilliantly when he met Lenin in 1920 in the young Soviet republic. "This meeting with the victorious October Revolution, and with irreconcilable and, at the same time, creative Marxism," Fajon emphasized, "predetermined his life forever."

This speech was made in the Paris suburb of Choisy-le-Roi, at the ceremony of the inauguration of the history museum in the house where Marcel Cachin had lived for over 20 years. Here, on Auguste Blanqui Street, we heard

for the first time the detailed story which Marie-Louise Jacquier-Cachin told about the meeting between her father and Lenin,

"See, this was my father at 50," said she, showing a faded photograph. "The photograph was taken in Russia in the summer of 1920. It was precisely then that he had his talk with Vladimir Il'ich. Both I and my sister Marcelle will remember my father's stories of this meeting forever."

This interesting narration, accompanied by references to Lenin's works, Cachin's memoirs, and historical documents, some of which have not been published yet, lasted several hours.

By 1920 Marcel Cachin had already become one of the outstanding leaders of the French socialist movement. As early as 1891 he joined the French Workers Party, headed by Jules Guesde and Paul Lafargue, the first Marxist party in France to take the positions of the class struggle. Subsequently, he actively fought for the unification of the two French socialist parties headed by Guesde and Jores, and was a delegate to a number of congresses of the Second International, including the 1912 Basel Congress.

As we know, the Basel Congress appealed to the socialists to prevent the outbreak of war. Alas, when the worldwide conflict broke out 2 years later, the leaders of the socialist parties followed the bourgeoisie, voting for military credit for "their own" governments. It was only Lenin's party that remained systematically loyal to the cause of proletarian internationalism.

In World War I and, particularly, after the October Revolution, Marcel Cachin's views experienced a complex evolution. From a "defensive" position held by the rightwing socialist leaders, he gradually came closer to Lenin's understanding of the duty of a true Marxist-internationalist. In August 1916 Cachin reached the conviction that the war would inevitably bring about a revolution in Russia. When the bourgeois-democratic revolution in our country became known in France, in February 1917, the Chamber of Deputies decided to send to Petrograd Marcel Cachin and two other members of the parliament's foreign affairs commission. Returning to his homeland, Cachin reported to the Socialist Party what he had seen in Russia.

Following the Great October Revolution, Marcel Cachin was one of the first people in France to support courageously the young Soviet state. In L'HUMANITE and in parliament he scourged the policy of the then French rulers who had declared a merciless war on Soviet Russia.

Addressing the Chamber of Deputies on 13 June 1919, turning to the representatives of the reaction, Cachin said: "You wanted to put a noose around the neck of the Russian revolution. You wanted to exhaust it through hunger and suppress it. You have achieved certain successes... Actually, you have been unable to surround revolutionary Russia entirely... Gentlemen, let us give the Russian people the possibility to find its way; do not interfere in its affairs; do not provide financial assistance to the worst kind of reactionaries who are trying to enslave the people!

Give the people the possibility to choose its own way. Furthermore, recall the soldiers sent there despite their wish; do not punish those you describe as the rebels of Sebastopol and Odessa," (This was a reference to the French soldiers and sailors who mutinied on the Black Sea refusing to participate in the intervention against the Soviet republic.)

Marcel Cachin's bold and principled position enhanced his prestige among the socialists. At the next party congress, in October 1918, he was appointed political director of L'HUMANITE. (Since 1912, following the death of Paul Lafargue, Cachin had been one of the editors of the newspaper founded by Jean Jores in 1904.)

In February 1920, the majority of the delegates attending the Strasbourg Congress of the French Socialist Party (SFIO) decided to withdraw from the bankrupt Second International under the influence of the revolutionary advance in Russia and the upheavals of World War I. The congress called for establishing contacts with the Communist International in order to clarify the conditions for possible membership. The then secretary general of the SFIO, L. O. Frossard, and the director of L'HUMANITE (at that time a socialist newspaper,) Marcel Cachin, who, incidentally, was the Strasbourg Congress chairman, were appointed delegates to the Socialist Party for talks with the heads of the Comintern.

The French delegates left their country on 31 May, crossed to Germany, Sweden, and Finland, and, after a lengthy and dangerous trip, reached Russia on 13 June. Many years later, sharing his impressions on his visit to Russia, Cachin wrote that the wreckage of 3 years of civil war, imposed upon the revolutionary nation, was added to the destructions caused by the imperialist war: one could easily imagine the condition of the country's economy after 6 years of war. Despite this, however, the French socialist noted, "the greatness of the task only increased the enthusiasm of workers and peasants."

On 16 June Cachin attended the session of the VTsIK [All-Russian Central Executive Committee], held in the Bol'shoy Theater, under M. I. Kalinin's chairmanship. The speakers sharply criticized the imperialists, including the French, who were still trying to strangle the young Soviet republic. However, when Marcel Cachin took the floor, he was welcomed by warm applause. He was greeted as the envoy of democratic toiling France, supporting revolutionary Russia.

Three days later, on 19 June, Cachin was invited to attend a session of the Comintern Executive Committee. It was here that the director of L'HUMANITE met Vladimir Il'ich.

Turning to the French guests, Lenin said: "I was expecting you, as I was certain that Paris and the France of the Paris Commune will have a live and unconditional sympathy for our victorious revolution!"

Almost half a century later, in a PRAVDA interview, Jacques Duclos noted that Lenin ascribed great importance to the visit to Russia of the director of L'HUMANITE, and the close collaborator of Jules Guesde and Paul Lafargue. With his inherent political perspicacity and profound knowledge of the world and French worker movements, Lenin understood that the SFIO majority could follow Cachin and his friends the revolutionary socialists. He was not mistaken.

Our father, Cachin's daughters have said, repeatedly recalled this session of the Comintern Executive Committee, the first at which he was present on behalf of the French delegation. He spoke of the political situation in France, the movement in the defense of Soviet Russia, and the subversive activities of the reaction. In conclusion, Cachin stated: "Our visit to your country is for us of tremendous importance. We shall leave more resolved and stronger: to us you are the living proof that faith, inexhaustible energy, and tireless persistence in pursuit of the objective lead to victory."

Lenin spoke several times at that session of the Comintern Executive Committee, which lasted over 5 hours. Vladimir Il'ich spoke French fluently and Cachin was able to report in detail his statement and individual answers and remarks. Initially the head of the Soviet Government thanked the French Socialist Party and its representatives for turning to the Comintern. Lenin ascribed great importance to this event, for he valued quite highly the revolutionary energy of the French working class.

However, the leader of the socialist revolution mercilessly criticized the opportunism of the SFIO leadership. Well familiar with the situation in France, he pointed out, above all, that it is not a question in the least of making immediately a revolution in that country. That is not the way the question should be formulated to the French, the Italians, or the "independents" in Germany. The main and basic prerequisite for joint action is to create, losing no time, prerequisites for an effective struggle against imperialism. Yet this calls for the urgent abandonment of faulty methods.

"Look at that issue of L'HUMANITE which we read here very carefully (Lenin opened the paper). You will find no unity in it. On the contrary, every day and, frequently, on the same page, we come across conflicting claims.

"Some, people like you," Lenin went on turning to Cachin, "defend the Russian revolution. Others are openly fighting against it and are calling upon the imperialists of their own country to destroy it. Some are preaching most vulgar opportunism. Others are trying to fight such a fatal position. In your view, how could the working people find their way among such conflicting claims? A party newspaper must educate, explain, and popularize ideas which would lead the working people to their liberation. However, such tasks must be clearly formulated. In particular, the implementation of such a task could be entrusted only to those who will carry it out relying on the energetic and well-organized struggle of the proletariat."

Then Vladimir Il'ich praised the practice of L'HUMANITE for publishing the list of monetary contributions in support of strikers or of any given party measure. He noted that the Paris workers sent their contributions along with statements representing their thoughts and their anger and proper opinions. Your primary duty, Lenin said, is to give the workers a clear program which would provide a correct analysis of contemporary events in which the capitalist system is decaying rapidly.

Lenin laid L'HUMANITE on the table and continued:

"Printed and oral propaganda must be assigned to reliable, tried, and loyal comrades, to the vanguard of the proletariat, armed with the Marxist theory. In a word, if L'HUMANITE wishes to fulfill its mission, it must abandon, above all, the equal presentation of conflicting topics. It must be consistent and logical; such are the conditions required for party activities."

Lenin then spoke of democratic centralism and on the need for stricter discipline for all party members, and, above all, for representatives, journalists and activists, in a word, those who have the honor to hold responsible positions in it. The main thing is to develop a class oriented, very united and well trained party, based on the Marxist doctrine.

As a result of the war and the subsequent conditions headlong changes are taking place in the world in the economic situation, along with the aggravation of the class struggle, and the growth of the revolutionary movement, Lenin noted. Consequently, it was important to prepare the proletariat to be able to face these new times.

Cachin took note of yet another remark by Lenin: "It is useless to guess the time of the revolution, whether it would be soon or later. Our only task is to educate everywhere the progressive segment of the proletariat so that events will not catch it unawares, and so that at the proper time it could assume control over such events."

"You are telling us that you are short of people," Lenin went on. "We, too, are short of them. However, we are going ahead and people are showing up. Above all, it is necessary to have infinite faith in the inexhaustible possibilities of the proletariat. The masses should not be blamed for the inability, shortcomings, or cowardice of opportunistic leaders who retreat in the face of the struggle."

Vladimir Il'ich believed that the French must well understand the Bolshevik tactic which is inspired by the revolutions made by the French people in the past. As he pointed out, the Russian revolution, its course, and its internal and external conditions remind of the French revolution. The Bolsheviks are the Jacobins linked with the working class. They were inspired by the French example. Let the French proletariat take the example of its predecessors and let this example give faith in the future!

Concluding his address, Lenin emphasized the need for active propaganda among colonial peoples, striving toward the ideas of freedom and democracy.

Such was, briefly, M. Cachin's testimony of the tremendous political and scientific significance of V. I. Lenin's addresses at the session of the Comintern Executive Committee.

Following the session the French delegates cabled the SFIO National Council for permission to participate in the proceedings of the Second Comintern Congress in an advisory capacity. Permission was granted.

The congress was 2 weeks away and Cachin decided to make use of this time to travel around the country. In his previous visit to Russia, in the spring of 1917, he had visited the western front in addition to Moscow and Petrograd. Now the French delegate decided to go east of Moscow.

From 2 to 13 July he covered the difficult distance of 3,000 kilometers in a Russia destroyed by the war, visiting Nizhnyy Novgorod, Kazan', Simbirsk, Lenin's native town, Samara, Saratov, Tambov, Tula, and Ivanovo-Voznesensk. Comparing later this trip with the trip taken in Russia after the February revolution, Cachin noted that in the spring of 1917 he had "been present at the irreparable decline of old tsarist Russia." Now, after the Great October Revolution, he was "amazed by the inordinate moral uplift of the leaders and the entire people." Cachin expressed his impressions on this trip in a telegram sent to Paris on 13 July 1920. He wrote of the profound faith of the Russian working class in the triumph of its cause and of the severe privations experienced by the Russian working people by the fault of the Entente. "The working people are asking us," the cable said, "how could the proletariat of the western countries, the French proletariat in particular, tolerate such a disgusting policy for three consecutive years."

Several days later, on 21 July, L'HUMANITE published another telegram from Cachin, delivered to Paris through Berlin. It refuted the rumors deliberately originated in France that the SFIO delegation was forced to hasten its return to the homeland. This abrogation concealed the desire of the rightwing socialist leadership to prevent at all cost the SFIO from joining the Comintern. "On the contrary," the telegram noted, "with the full agreement of our Russian comrades, we have expanded our visit in order to increase our information on the general circumstances and on the Third International.

"We are in a country without a bourgeoisie and capitalist exploitation. The working people are the only rulers in all fields of the economy, politics, administration, self-management, and justice. New forms of social life are appearing under our own eyes. The Russian people have razed the old regime to the ground. Despite the tremendous suffering and difficulties created by the blockade and the war, the building of a socialist society in which work alone will have the right to exist has not stopped for a single day. Things have progressed so far that the proletariat the world over could learn from this experience."

In conclusion, the telegram emphasized the need for the SFIO to join the Communist International.

The Second Comintern Congress began its work in Petrograd -- the cradle of the October Revolution -- and continued it in Moscow. A special train took the congress delegates to Petrograd. On 19 July 1920, together with the other congress delegates and guests, Marcel Cachin heard in the Tauric Palace Lenin's report on the international situation and the basic tasks of the Communist International. That same day an entry was made in the notebook of the director of L'HUMANITE, published for the first time by PRAVDA, in 1969, by permission of Cachin's daughter.

"Lenin rose on the rostrum," Cachin said. "Endless applause. Small lively eyes, a smiling and mocking mouth, simple and natural gestures; self-control. A jacket with a vest, soft collar, a black and white striped tie, a pointed beard, medium size, broad shoulders, the appearance of a calm and strong fighter confident in himself. He spoke for over an hour and the entire hall listened to him. He spoke rapidly and once again attacked the bourgeoisie and the Second and a Half International."

After describing briefly Lenin's speech, the French delegate noted in brackets: "We shall receive the complete text of the speech tomorrow." Subsequently, Marcel Cachin would frequently go back to this speech, particularly noting Lenin's principled and systematic struggle against the opportunism of the leaders of the Second International.

Here is another remark: "In America, Britain and France we are faced with the immeasurably stronger opposition of opportunistic leaders, the upper crust of the working class, the worker aristocracy; they are opposing more strongly the communist movement. Therefore, we must be ready for the fact that deliberation of the European and American worker parties from this disease will be more difficult than in our country."

"Opportunism is our main enemy," Lenin said at the session of the Second Comintern Congress. "Opportunism at the upper levels of the workers movement is bourgeois rather than proletarian socialism. It has been proved in practice that leaders within the workers movement following an opportunistic direction are better defenders of the bourgeoisie than the bourgeois themselves. Without their leadership of the workers the bourgeoisie would be unable to survive" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," [Complete Collected Works], Vol 41, pp 231-232).

Marcel Cachin noted other statements by Lenin at the Second Comintern Congress: "The unification of the revolutionary proletariat in the capitalist leading countries, with the revolutionary masses of countries where there is no or almost no proletariat and with the oppressed masses of colonial oriental countries is factually taking place at the present congress. It depends on us -- and I am confident that we shall do this -- to consolidate this unification. Universal imperialism must fall when the revolutionary pressure of the exploited and oppressed workers within each country, defeating the opposition of petit bourgeois elements and the

influence of an insignificant handful of worker aristocracy, will join the revolutionary pressure of hundreds of millions of people who have so far remained outside of history and considered only as its object" (Ibid., p 233).

On that same page in the notebook in which Cachin wrote down Lenin's speech we find the following note:

"Program: visit to the grave of the fighters for revolution.

"Monument to the Communards.

"Monument to Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg (laying the cornerstone).

"International meeting.

"Presentation on the two worlds in the Labor Palace.

"Fireworks on the Neva."

As we know, Lenin participated in most of these events. He addressed the meeting on the occasion of laying the cornerstone of the monument. Marcel Cachin saw Lenin once again and heard his speech.

In it the leader of the Great October Revolution recalled the exploit of the heroes of the Paris Commune who, on 18 March 1871, raised the flag of the uprising and assumed power. "They were defeated," Lenin said. "The German troops of the imperialists, allied with the French bourgeoisie, suppressed the Paris workers. Despite this defeat, however, we can see that their cause did not die. We are successfully continuing to build a Soviet republic in Russia."

Marcel Cachin listened to this speech with particular emotion. Throughout his life he had been attracted by the Communards who had accomplished the first proletarian revolution in history. Associated with a number of surviving members of the Commune, Marcel Cachin had written a number of outstanding articles on that revolution.

"To honor the memory of 18 March is the unquestionable duty of the entire French working class," he wrote. "Yet what does 'to honor the memory' mean? This would be an empty gesture unless accompanied by the powerful will to bring to victory and revenge the battle which was courageously fought on 18 March by the confederates and, after them, by the creators of the Soviet Republic."

At one of the congress sessions the delegates decided to express their thoughts about Lenin in writing. The album stored at the Central Party Archives of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism, has the following entry by Cachin: "As both a theoretician and man of action, Lenin is today the biggest personality of the world's workers' movement."

On Wednesday, 28 July, Marcel Cachin was received by Lenin. The director of L'HUMANITE took particularly detailed notes on this unforgettable encounter. They begin thus: "We met with Lenin from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. in his Kremlin office. Three Russian soldiers were stationed along the way leading to this rather modest office; in the waiting room three typists, one of them a hunchback, were working at their typewriters. We talked. Lenin asked us about the situation in France and Italy. He shared his views on Poland."

"Our father recalled this meeting so often and described Lenin's office in the Kremlin in such detail," said Marcelle Hertzog-Cachin, "that, many years later, when I visited this office myself, it seemed to me that everything was quite familiar and that I had seen it a number of times."

At the beginning of the talk Lenin said that he admires the history of France and the Paris and French proletariat. He warmly greeted the French soldiers and sailors who refused to participate in the aggressive war against Soviet Russia. The conversation then turned to Poland. It was precisely then that the Red Army was engaged in a victorious offensive against the White Polish Troops which had captured a considerable part of the Ukraine. French and British imperialists were helping the occupation forces. However, the Dunkirk dockers had refused to load arms for the French division commanded by General Weigan. Lenin asked Cachin to thank warmly the French working people for this courageous action.

The director of L'HUMANITE then noted Lenin's words as follows: "If in Poland the workers would answer the call of the Russian revolution and set up their own soviets; if the farmhands working the big landed estates would join the Polish workers to create a communist government; and if the Russians see the possibility for Polish support they would give Poland all possible assistance."

In the opposite case, Lenin thought, it would be necessary to make peace with Poland and offer it conditions which would improve on the British conditions.

In the words of the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, "at the present time Russia's foreign policy is extremely complex. Caution and flexibility are needed. The situation is difficult."

However, as Lenin emphasized, "imperialist Europe has missed the opportunity to defeat us... For the present time it has lost the game."

He added: "Now, after the defeat of the imperialists in Poland, we will have relative peace on our fronts; we shall use it to reorganize our country and make it invincible."

Lenin then asked his guests their impressions on their trip around Soviet Russia. "We answered," Cachin wrote, "that the memories we shall keep of our

stay will be ineradicable. We told him that despite the tremendous calamities caused by the war we noted throughout the country enthusiasm, faith in the future and courage, which are the true guarantees for victory."

Lenin was quite satisfied with this answer. Parting, he expressed the hope that the great Communist Party, whose successes he will follow with most lively interest, will soon be created in France.

This confidence was emphasized also in the letter of the Presidium of the Second Comintern Congress, addressed to "all members of the French Socialist Party, and all conscientious French proletarians." The document expressed the thoughts voiced by Lenin in his meetings with Marcel Cachin, and listed the basic principles governing the party's Comintern membership. The letter stated that the Communist International is fully aware of the entire variety of conditions in which the workers in different countries have to struggle.

The letter was imbued with Leninist respect for the French proletariat and with faith in its future: "There cannot be for the revolutionary French working class, with its amazing revolutionary traditions, culture, readiness for self-sacrifice, and splendid fighting temperament, not to create a powerful Communist Party at a time when the bourgeois system has obviously begun to die."

As Thorez said, familiarity with the revolution in Russia and with Lenin made Cachin a supporter of communism forever.

Returning to his homeland, together with the other progressive socialists Marcel Cachin launched an active campaign in favor of the Socialist Party joining the Comintern. These actions were consistent with the imperative of the time and the logical demand of the entire history of the worker and socialist movements in the land of the Paris Commune. On 13 August 1920 some 40,000 people gathered in the biggest hall in Paris to hear the story of the French delegates on their trip to Moscow. They welcomed them singing the International and with toasts in honor of Lenin and Soviet Russia. The Parisians heard with great attention the speech by the director of L'HUMANITE who described emotionally the joy of an "old socialist who had dreamed for 30 years of seeing a society in which labor would not be exploited... to find himself in that kind of Russia in which the power, the entire power, belongs to labor alone."

However, in his homeland Cachin was also forced to engage in an adamant and courageous struggle against the dirty and slanderous campaign launched by the reaction against the Soviet republic from the very first days of its existence. Unfortunately, leaders who considered themselves "socialists" and "revolutionaries" frequently fell for the reactionary propaganda. Answering such "critics" of the Soviet system, Cachin wrote in L'HUMANITE: "Instead of wasting time launching attacks together with the bourgeoisie on the Russian revolution, it would be better to study its experience and then to follow its example."

Several days later, returning to this topic, once again he firmly proclaimed in the newspaper: "At the risk of repeating ourselves, we shall say nevertheless that we shall defend the Russian revolution and tirelessly oppose all sallies, whatever their origin. We shall leave to the bourgeoisie the disgusting role of being the executioner of a heroic long-suffering people."

The principled and consistent position held by Cachin and the other revolutionary socialists, organically blending the national with the international interests of the French working people, contributed to the historical decision passed at the end of December 1920 at the SFIO Congress in Tours. Following the appeal of Cachin, Villant-Couturier, and their comrades, the Congress majority voted in favor of the party's joining the Communist International. Thus was born the French Communist Party which restored and continued the best revolutionary and democratic traditions of its people.

M. Thorez noted that Cachin played a decisive role in the creation of the French Communist Party, a worker party of a new type, "radically different from the old Socialist Party which had declined to fulfill its duty in 1914."

In turn, Waldeck Roche emphasized that the October Revolution had a "decisive influence on the vanguard of the French labor movement... Without abandoning in the least its own national roots in this connection, socialism in France became stronger and more effective. In contact with the victorious socialist revolution it restored and enriched its best revolutionary traditions."

To his final days, Marcel Cachin, the elder comrade, friend and fellow worker of Maurice Thorez, Jacques Duclos, and Waldeck Roche, and one of the most respected and prestigious leaders of the world's communist movement, recalled tirelessly the universal-historical significance of the October Revolution and of the great Marxist-Leninist doctrine. According to Duclos, Cachin represented an outstanding example of the blend of the best traditions of French socialism and the new gains of Marxism-Leninism after the October Revolution inaugurated a new era in the history of mankind. In his article "The Struggle for Leninism," Cachin called upon the French communists to study "the foundations of Leninism and the theory and the tactic of the proletariat revolution, mercilessly to criticize reformism and use the clear Leninist analysis in the assessment of current events." In that same article the famous veteran of the revolutionary movement wrote of the preparations for and ripening of a "universal October." He emphasized the need for the proletariat of all countries to be able to use, in the interests of its class, "the lessons and example given by Lenin and the Leninists who are continuing his immortal cause."

In one of his final articles entitled "History Proved the Rightness of the Friends and Defenders of the Russian Revolution," published in L'HUMANITE in the spring of 1956, Cachin noted that, inspired by the example of October 1917, the peoples the world over oppressed by capitalism, imperialism and colonialism, are rising to the struggle. "Nothing can prevent this movement any longer," the author emphasized, "neither violence

nor war nor persecution, nor the lies of governments and their newspaper lackeys!"

Today the speech which Marcel Cachin delivered during the commemorative ceremonies which took place in the Soviet Embassy in France, on the eve of the 40th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, sounds like a political legacy. The old revolutionary spoke of the fact that after his fraternal contacts with Lenin and his fellow workers, he decided, sparing no efforts and whatever the circumstances, to support the friendliest and closest possible relations between his homeland -- France, and the new society which appeared in Russia on 7 November 1917. For 40 years this remained his primary and basic rule of behavior. The veteran of the revolutionary movement shared his indescribable happiness of seeing in the course of all these years the constant progress made and the decisive successes achieved "by our common ideas not only in the huge Soviet Union but throughout the world," and to have witnessed the steady growth of the prestige of the Communist parties.

"More than ever before," he said, "I wish to express my ever growing admiration of the immortal cause of the 1917 revolution. More than ever before, I am confident of its definitive and imminent triumph on earth. More than ever before I am happy to have seen Lenin and realized his genius which changed the face of the world."

In that speech Marcel Cachin said that the people of that France which has remained the supporter of the revolution, is and will be the loyal and natural ally of the great Soviet republic. The French people will never forget that in World War II the world was freed from Hitlerism thanks to the tremendous sacrifices and the heroism of the Soviet Union. Cachin who was at that time the oldest deputy in the French National Assembly, expressed his firm belief that the fraternal friendship between the two peoples will continue to strengthen and intensify in the future. This strong Franco-Soviet friendship is one of the guarantees for universal peace and human progress.

"The total and permanent moral solidarity with Lenin's famous homeland," said this passionate patriot and convinced internationalist, concluding his speech, "is the guiding rule of all the members of the French Communist Party to which I dedicated the best part of my life."

This was one of Marcel Cachin's last addresses. He died 3-1/2 months later, on 12 February 1958. The memory of this outstanding son of the French people, the excellent example of his life, and his many works continues to live and serve the great cause of the working class, the cause of socialism. In its 1958 declaration the French Communist Party Central Committee emphasized that it was Marcel Cachin in whom the "flame of the Great October flared from the very first day" who had brought Lenin's appeal and rallied in 1920 the best forces of the French working class.

"Dear Comrade Marcel Cachin!" the French Communist Party Central Committee solemnly stated. "We shall maintain this flame which illuminated your entire life. You gave it to thousands and thousands of communists. In turn, disseminating it even more broadly with the entire human warmth inherent in you, we shall turn what was the bright hope of your life -- socialism -- into the French reality of tomorrow."

5003

CSO: 1802

FROM THE POSITIONS OF CLASS SOLIDARITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, April 1977 pp 91-93

[Exchange of messages between the student organizations of the USSR and China (February-April 1923)]

[Text] The revolutionary movement in China, which intensified under the influence of the Great October Revolution, invariably met with the sincere support of V. I. Lenin, the Bolshevik Party, and all Soviet people. The history of international solidarity between the working people of the USSR and China has been covered in detail both by Soviet and progressive Chinese scientists and has been reflected in numerous publications of documents.

The documents submitted to the attention of the readers shed light on the history of international relations between the revolutionary youth of Soviet Russia and China.

At the beginning of 1923 mass student actions were launched in Peking and other Chinese cities. Demanding satisfaction of their immediate requirements, the revolutionary students then actively participated in the struggle waged by the Chinese working people to overthrow the rule of the militarists in the country and eliminate the imperialist oppression of the capitalist countries and to normalize diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

Expressing their solidarity with these actions launched by the Chinese youth, the Soviet students sent the Chinese students a telegram whose text is presented below.

Also included here is the answer of the Peking Student Union¹ to the Soviet students. The translation of this document was found at the Central Party Archive of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

This publication was prepared by V. N. Shchepochilina, scientific associate at the Central Party Archive of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of

Marxism-Leninism, and V. I. Glunin and K. V. Shevelev, scientific associates at the USSR Academy of Sciences Far East Institute.

Document Number 1

Greetings Telegram Sent By the Russian Students to the Revolutionary Chinese Students²

28 February 1923

The Russian students send their warm greeting to the revolutionary Chinese students and, particularly, the students of Peking who have raised again the banner of the struggle against the rule of militarists--the Tu-chun³ and against their henchmen--the reactionary ministers of the Peking government.

Once again the reactionary forces in China have raised their heads. Instructed by the worst enemies of the Chinese people--the foreign imperialists--their vassals, the Chinese Tu-chuns are engaged in a merciless struggle against the growing revolutionary movement aimed at the unification of the country and the establishment of a truly labor republic. They are mercilessly suppressing the rising wave of the labor movement, shooting at the worker masses in Central China and are beginning to apply the same methods against the Chinese revolutionary studentry.

The new Russian studentry, coming from the mass of the workers and peasants, and having undergone the training of an adamant struggle, is tirelessly following the struggle of the toiling masses the world over. We note with hope the revolutionary action of the Chinese studentry fighting for the abolishment of the double oppression of foreign imperialism and feudal militarism. The arising revolutionary masses of China will gain their full economic, political, and national emancipation only through close alliance with Soviet Russia which has cast off the chains of capitalist slavery.

On behalf of the 100,000-strong Russian studentry accept our sincere greetings and warm wishes for victory. Be strong in your great struggle! The Russian worker and peasant students are following with enthusiasm this struggle and are always ready to come to the aid of their Chinese fellow students.

Long live the struggle of the Chinese working people for total liberation!

Long live the struggle of the worker and peasant masses the world over!

Central Russian Student Bureau⁴

Reprinted from the journal PROLETARSKOYE STUDENCHESTVO, No 2, 1923, pp 197-198.

Document Number 2

Answer by the Peking Student Union to the students of Soviet Russia

Peking, 6 April 1923

Dear brothers and sisters!

We received your telegram which filled us with profound enthusiasm and cabled it throughout the country.

We, the students of China, under the yoke of the aristocracy of the Tu-chun system and capitalist imperialism of the great powers consider your message, full of comfort and sympathy, as the only revelation sent to us from heaven. For this, dear brothers and sisters, above all, accept our profound gratitude.

As a result of the double oppression of this slavery we are experiencing the type of suffering which cannot be equaled even by the suffering you experienced before your great revolution. A civil war is spreading throughout the country and the militarists are playing the role of feudal monarchs. Our country is becoming ever more a colony of the great powers which are siphoning off all its juices and are hindering our progress by all possible means.

By virtue of their backwardness the masses do not know how to achieve their liberation. We fully understand and are firmly aware of the fact that we have the responsibility and the duty to educate them and lead them to a great revolution such as yours.

Dear brothers and sisters!

Ever since the butchery of 7 February,⁵ when the reactionary militarists struck a heavy blow at our striking railway men, we have known that the abandonment of a revolutionary offensive means the loss of any hope for the salvation of our people and their liberation from the slavery in which we are kept by imperialism and its agents. The line of our program and tactic has already been established.

First and above all we shall struggle with all our forces against the Tu-chun system and against capitalism which are the main obstacles to our liberation. As you know, the conference of the National Federation of Student Unions, held last month in Shanghai, proclaimed itself the pioneer of the single front in the struggle against the double oppression. Thus we are not limiting ourselves merely to propaganda but deem it our obligation to participate in the revolutionary actions of the masses.

We have class consciousness. We acknowledge the class struggle and our only friends and comrades are the exploited masses.

Dear brothers and sisters!

You alone could give us advice and instructions and tremendous aid. Your strong words make us confident that our victory is imminent and cannot be distant.

We greet you on behalf of all Chinese student youth.

Long live the strong tie between Soviet Russia and China!

Long live the close alliance between the students of Soviet Russia and China!

Peking Student Union

NOTES:

1. The Peking Student Union was founded in January 1923. Members of the Communist Party of China and the Socialist Union of Chinese Youth played an active role in the activities of this organization.
2. Commenting on this telegram, the Peking Student Union Gazette, in its 8 March 1923 edition in particular, wrote: "Now we must organize a united front with Soviet Russia for the joint struggle against world imperialism and for acquiring the possibility to overthrow our domestic militarists and destroy the Tu-chun system in China. Only then will the Chinese people be able to actually achieve its political, economic, and national liberation.
3. The greetings we received from the students of Soviet Russia, expressing their readiness to help our country are the best guarantee for the fraternal solidarity between Soviet Russia and the oppressed masses of China. Long life the close tie between China and Soviet Russia!" (PROLETARSKOYE STUDENCHESTVO, No 2, 1923, p 200).
4. Tu-chun (in the text--dudzyun)--military governor.
5. Central Bureau of the All-Russian Association of Communist Students. Existed between 1922 and 1924.
6. On 7 February 1923 the reactionary militarists Wu P'ei-fu and his assistants organized a bloody reprisal against the railway men of the Peking-Hankow main railway.

5003

CSO: 1802

ANTONIO GRAMSCI -- PROLETARIAN REVOLUTIONARY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 pp 94-106

[Text] Antonio Gramsci, one of the founders of the Italian Communist Party, died prematurely 40 years ago, on 27 April, after imprisonment in fascist Italian jails. Honoring the memory of this outstanding proletarian revolutionary and thinker, the editors of KOMMUNIST offer to the attention of the readers some of his works and thoughts on Lenin and Leninism, the October Revolution and its significance to the social liberation of the working people the world over, the building of socialism in Soviet Russia, the dictatorship of the proletariat, democracy, and the international solidarity of the working people.

This is the first publication of Gramsci's works in Russian.

The translation is the work of I. Grigor'yeva, candidate of historical sciences.

Leader¹

... The main thing on the question of proletarian dictatorship is not the fact that it is physically personified by someone. The main problem is that of the nature of relations between leader or leaders and the party of the working class, or relations between the party and the working class: are such relations purely hierarchical, of a military nature, or are they historical and organic in nature? Are the leader or the party elements of the working class, part of the working class, representing its most profound and vital interests and aspirations, or are they merely a growth, something which has imposed itself over them? How was a given party established, how did it develop, how were the people guiding it chosen? Was this accidental or not? Why did it become a party of the working class? Was this accidental or not? This question develops into the problem of the entire historical development of the working class which is slowly organizing itself in the struggle against the bourgeoisie, winning some victories and suffering numerous defeats -- not only the working class of a single country but the

working class the world over with all the differences existing within its ranks, superficial yet no less important at any given time and, at the same time, united and homogeneous in its essence.

This problem develops into the problem of the viability of Marxism, into the problem of could it be, or not be, the most accurate and profound interpretation of nature and history; could it add to the brilliant political intuition of the political leader a faultless method, a highly precise instrument enabling him to look into the future, predict events on a mass scale, control them and, consequently, achieve the desired outcome?

The international proletariat has had, and has the living example of a revolutionary party implementing the dictatorship of a class; it has had but, unfortunately, no longer has the most characteristic and expressive living example of what a revolutionary leader should be -- Comrade Lenin.

Comrade Lenin initiated the new process in the development of history, for he was also the manifestation and the final and most individualized link of the entire process of past historical developments not only in Russia but throughout the world. Did he become the leader of the Bolshevik Party by accident? Was it an accident that the Bolshevik Party became the leading party of the Russian proletariat and, subsequently, of the entire Russian nation? The selective process which brought about this result took 30 years. It was rather difficult and frequently assumed seemingly very strange and absurd forms. On the international level this selection took place in contact with the most developed capitalist civilizations of Central and Western Europe, and in the struggle among parties and factions within the pre-war Second International. It continued within that minority of the international socialist movement which, even though partially, resisted the infection of social patriotism. It was resumed in Russia in the struggle for winning over the majority of the proletariat, in the struggle for understanding and interpreting the needs and aspirations of the innumerable peasant class scattered across an endless territory. It is still going on, every day, for every day one must understand, foresee, and take measures. This selection was a struggle among factions, small groups and individuals; to withstand it meant divisions and alliances, detentions, exile, jail and attempts on one's life; to withstand it meant not to surrender to discouragement or conceited arrogance; it meant to suffer from hunger while having at one's disposal millions in gold; it meant to retain the soul of a simple worker while occupying the throne of kings; it meant not to despair when everything seemed lost and begin everything all over again, patiently and adamantly, keeping total self-control and smiling while others were losing their heads. The Russian Communist Party and its leader, Lenin, had involved themselves so closely with the entire development of the Russian proletariat and, consequently, the entire development of the entire Russian nation that it is impossible even to imagine one without the other, or to imagine the proletariat as a ruling class without the Communist Party being the ruling party, without the party's Central Committee to inspire governmental policy, and without Lenin as the head of the state. Even the position of a considerable number of Russian bourgeois who said that "A republic headed by

Lenin but without the Communist Party could be our ideal too," and even that position had an important historical meaning. It proved that the proletariat dominated no longer physically alone but spiritually as well. Deep within himself the Russian bourgeois vaguely understood that Lenin could not have become and remain the head of the state without the rule of the proletariat and without the Communist Party being the ruling party; his class awareness was still preventing him from understanding that he, the bourgeois, had been defeated not only physically, directly, but also ideologically, historically; yet, he was beginning to doubt it and that is how he had voiced this doubt.

Another question arises. Today, in the period of the world's revolution, is it possible for "leaders" to exist outside the working class, for non-Marxist leaders not closely linked with the class which embodies the progressive development of all mankind? We have a fascist regime in Italy, headed by Benito Mussolini, and an official ideology according to which the leader is deified, proclaimed infallible, and presented as the organizer and inspirer of the revived Holy Roman Empire. Every day we read in the papers tens and hundreds of greeting telegrams to the "leader" sent by local clans. We see a photograph: the frozen mask of that same face we used to see at socialist meetings. We know this face. We are familiar with its way of moving the eyes with the mechanical fierceness which once was aimed at horrifying the bourgeoisie and now the proletariat. We are familiar with this always menacing fist. We are familiar with all these mechanics and this entire set of methods and realize that it could impress and stop the heart beat of bourgeois school students. All this, even looked at closely, is impressive and astounding. Yet, is this a "leader?"

Then, as now, he has remained the concentrated embodiment of the Italian petty bourgeois full of rage and cruelty, a mixture of all the detritus remaining on the national soil after several centuries of foreign domination and church rule. He could not become the leader of the proletariat and became the dictator of the bourgeoisie which loves ferocious faces at a time when it is renewing its liking for the Bourbons, and which is hoping that the working class is experiencing the same horror it felt once at the sight of these rolling eyes and threatening folded fist.

The dictatorship of the proletariat operates by broadening its influence rather than through reprisals. There is a steady motion from the bottom to the top, a permanent exchange through the finest social channels, and a constant circulation of people. The leader we mourn today found a society in a state of decay, converted into a scattered human mass lacking all order and discipline, for in five years of war, production -- the source of all social life -- had dried out. Yet everything, from factories to the government, was made orderly again and reorganized with the means inherent in the proletariat and under the leadership and control of the proletariat -- the new class in power and on the historical stage....

From the Article "The Primary Party Organization " ²

....One of the main distinguishing features of Leninism is its tremendous inner integrity and consistency. Leninism is a single system of thoughts and practical actions in which everything -- from an overall concept of the world to the pettiest organizational problems -- is interlinked and interdependent. The essence of Leninism in the field of practical actions is the dictatorship of the proletariat and all the tactical and organizational problems of Leninism are related to the preparations for and establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat....

From A. Gramsci's Lecture on the Leninist Doctrine ³

....Leninism encompasses within itself its own concept of the world without which today Marx can no longer be understood....On the correlation between Marxism and Leninism one could say that Lenin continued and brought Marxism up to date....

From the Article "The Ghost" ⁴

"A ghost is wandering around Europe -- the ghost of communism. The entire forces of old Europe have joined in the sacred persecution of this ghost...." The forces of the old Europe have changed since February 1848 when Karl Marx began his Communist Party Manifesto with these words. The Pope remains but has largely lost his spiritual authority and influence on the course of historical events. The tsar was overthrown and it is precisely communism that is creating the new order on the ruins of Holy Russia.

The descendants of Metternich remain, now having moved from Austria to the West; also remaining are the French radicals and the German police fighting on the streets of Berlin the worker and soldier columns led by Karl Liebknecht.

The ghost has acquired flesh and blood and that is why it is so frightening. The ghost has become a state in a specific territory, with its army and treasury and its own steadily developing organization, and today communism is offering the proletariat no longer simply a "Manifesto,"....but access to positive experience, method of action, and "practice" which brings life to theory and rallies the individuals in a new social form radiating energy and advancing toward high perfection and clarity....

A Revolutionary Year ⁵

The Red Army of the Russian workers' state is at the gates of Irkutsk and Odessa; Admiral Kolchak has been cut off from his military bases and, possibly, will be captured and tried by the Siberian workers and peasants. General Denikin has been expelled and has sought the protection of British and French battleships. The victorious advance of the Red Army workers is the most significant fact of the past 1919, and the greatest historical event of the first 20 years of our century: A workers' state has appeared in Europe and

the world, influencing Europe and Asia, 120 million people strong, influencing the hearts and the minds of over one billion people, and bringing into motion two-thirds of the earth's population.

The victorious advance of the Red Army is the best proof of the durability of the Russian workers' state: it has already powerfully joined the system of economic and political forces operating in the world and is transforming and forcing them to take into consideration its existence, attracting active thoughts and wills through its overflowing energy. In two years four million urban workers, supported by the poor peasant masses, were able to create the type of governmental machinery which can surmount the oldest and strongest capitalist organizations: from the wreckage of gigantic ruins the Russian working class was able to recreate a living historical reality which is developing and strengthening while the world around it is like a building about to collapse.

From a state of economic destruction, thanks to the heroic efforts of the proletariat -- the conscious vanguard of the working people -- Russia was able to create the type of economic organization which enabled it to subsist on its own resources while the rest of Europe is contracting debts and borrowing against its future at a tremendous rate of interest. After suffering a military defeat and becoming a country splintered into a number of small states, thanks to the selflessness and creative abilities of the toiling people and the sacrifices of the conscientious proletariat, Russia created a strong army and a powerful military machine which is forging ahead and pushing back the mercenary forces of capitalist reaction who are running helter-skelter, like a herd. While the world is in the throes of decay, whose most obvious symptoms are the inability of the economic apparatus, under the yoke of private ownership, to satisfy basic human needs and the inability of the political apparatus serving the moneybags to promote discipline and social consciousness in the population, in Russia the proletariat has been able to create the type of economic machinery "sufficient" for Russian society and, as it develops, even though with pains and sacrifices, to insure future prosperity and civic progress, and the type of political machinery which enables the authorities to rule, relying on the trust and cooperation of the masses, and gives the authorities the necessary prestige for turning the mass maintaining a conscientious and voluntary discipline into a powerful and disciplined army willing to undertake even the most difficult work and experience the most cruel suffering for the sake of supporting the government, strengthening it, and force the capitalist coalition to recognize and respect it.

To create a state and a state system capable of living and developing is a historical imperative for any nation wishing to create a new system. This was accomplished by the working people of Russia. It was accomplished thanks to the heroism of the proletariat, the heroism of the communist workers headed by the Marxist revolutionary party. The workers of the big Russian cities proved the correctness of Marx's historical prediction: The capitalist class is decaying as a result of the fact that it is removing itself ever further from the production process and shutting itself

up in the narrow realm of pleasure, violence and corruption; the Russian proletariat gained its tremendous strength through its ability to reject the forms of bourgeois democracy, enter the realm of labor and production, and in that world determine and rally its forces as a result of the fact that it based the choice of its representatives on the principle of representation from the world of labor, the enterprises, and the urban industrial complex, as a result of its ability to present itself as a great new force in the eyes of the peasant masses and prove to the peasants that the city, previously the bulwark of the banks and all other forces which robbed the peasantry had now become the bulwark of the proletariat, the working class which shares the interests and aspirations of the peasant class.

Thus, through its economic experience, the Russian working class has given the working class the world over support in the guise of a positive lesson and example. Through its irreconcilable policy, backed by the successful operations of the Red Army, it weakened the resisting capacity of the oppressors of the world's proletariat. Moving eastward, the Red Army is awakening the desire for freedom of 400 million Chinese suppressed by Anglo-American plutocracy and threatened by the aggressive aspirations of Japanese militarism. It is awakening the will to fight in 300 million Indians enslaved by English capitalism (gap in the original -- the translator). By creating the Third International the proletariat restored the principle of order and international revolutionary discipline destroyed by reformist opportunism which, during the war, became the servant of the bourgeois governments.

Thus the Russian workers state is proving that it is embodying the vital principle of broader action compared with previous revolutions, a principle which received its living combat embodiment in the Russian Revolution -- the principle of the renaissance of the world, of the unification of the renascent world. The year 1919 witnessed the most important phase in the development of the Russian Revolution, the development of the first worker state in history. It witnessed the desperate efforts of that state to concentrate internally and gain the type of external influence which, by the end of the year, went into irrepressible motion on two continents, sweeping off the barbaric past. The year 1919 witnessed the beginning of the blossoming of the history of mankind without classes or internecine wars.

Proletarians, Forward!⁶

Soviet Russia is the center of proletarian freedom in the world. That is why, helped by the traitors to the cause of socialism, the international reaction is trying to strangle Soviet Russia and humiliate in front of the working masses of Western Europe the superhuman efforts which the Russian working class, headed by the Communist Party, is indefatigably continuing to apply to save the Russian nation from a most savage barbarism and reorganize civilian life in the country in all fields: economics, administration, justice, culture, and international relations.

For three years Soviet Russia experienced a most cruel blockade in which the Italian bourgeois state is also participating....Had Soviet Russia been crushed, and had world reaction been able to restore a bourgeois government in Moscow or Petrograd, the working class the world over would lose any hope of liberation for at least 50 years....

Fighting in defense of Soviet Russia, the international working class is fighting for its own freedom, its revolution, and its future. Gaining an understanding of the events taking place in Russia, the working class is gaining an understanding of its own revolution, preparing to surmount the obstacles it will face, and develop in itself the character and mentality of a ruling class. The blockade is the murderer of the Russian people; the privations suffered by Russia are caused by the blockade and not by the Soviet system....Is it not a miracle that the government is surviving under such circumstances? Is there any explanation for this miracle other than the population recognizes that government as the only government defending its interests, trying to divide equitably everything it has, rescuing with its energy and intelligence everything which could be rescued, organizing what can be organized, defending the country's territory, and insuring the future freedoms and progress of the people? The blockade is the murderer of the Russian people; the Soviet government is the only force capable of restraining the killers, and preventing the turning of the Russian people into a herd of slaves driven by the whip of bankers and industrialists and capitalists. The international working class realizes that not the Soviet system but capitalist imperialism is to be blamed for Russia's present condition; that is why it is fighting imperialism and supporting the Soviet government.

The same force which supports the reaction and the blockade of Russia supports the reaction against the Italian working class as well. The bourgeois press is indignant at the messages which the Communist International is addressing to the Italian Socialist Party and Italian proletariat. The bourgeois press is claiming that the revolution is being imposed from the outside and that the Russian communists want to rescue their Soviet system which is on the brink of doom. However, the working class parties develop as international parties....The working class parties have never concealed the fact that the International's messages are indeed published by the communist press. Why is it that the bourgeois press fails to inform us that Clemenceau ordered Nitti to initiate the trial of the Italian Socialist Party? Why does it fail to inform us of the accords concluded between Giolitti and Millerand during the movement of the metallurgical workers?

Why is it that the bourgeois press mentions nothing today against the Masons' International which favors reaction and military dictatorship, the way it said nothing when that same Masons' International wanted Italy to enter the war to save "France" and "Latin civilization?"....The bourgeois press which wishes the death of the Russian workers' state and defames the communist revolution day after day also wishes a reaction in its own country and defames the Italian working class day after day.

The struggle in defense of Soviet Russia and against the reaction is one and the same: the struggle of the proletariat aware of its historical mission and preparing, the world over, for the founding of its own state in order to establish a new order of economic forces undermined by capitalism and eliminate the division of society into classes.

Russia and the International⁹

Soviet Russia has gained and, with every passing day, is gaining the ever greater sympathy of the working class throughout the world. This is natural. The Russian proletarian revolution divides the entire world into two camps: those who are for it, for its development, and for its victory the world over; and those hostile to it, who wish it drowned in the blood of the revolutionary Russian people, hoping that this will crush the world revolution. The first side includes the working class and semi-proletarian classes (i.e., the small peasants) of all countries; the other includes the capitalists, bankers, big land owners, and speculators the world over.

The sympathy of the international proletariat for Soviet Russia is so great that the capitalist governments themselves, who are organizing the economic blockade against it, no longer dare to fight its government openly, and are forced to recognize it and to establish commercial relations with it.

Particularly important, however, is the following noteworthy fact: no single workers' party, no single workers' organization, even though favoring opportunism and reformism, dares any longer to proclaim openly its hostility toward Soviet Russia, even though in their own countries such parties in fact support the bourgeois system.

Why are reformist and opportunistic parties and organizations thus forced to conceal their factual and basically hostile attitude toward Soviet Russia disguised as hypocritical friendship? Because failure to do so would soon deprive them of the support of the working masses. Consequently, their statements in favor of Russia are governed by self-serving considerations. Such is the behavior of centrists and semi-reformers who, even though opposing the Communist International, its principles, tactics, and centralized organization, nevertheless depict themselves to the working class as defenders of the Russian proletarian revolution. Failure to do so would doom them and the masses would abandon them. They are pursuing a hypocritical policy of false friendship and sympathy for Russia so that they may continue to promote confusion and hinder the revolution of the proletariat.

This applies to all countries, Italy in particular. We are not mentioning the reformists, for the conscientious workers are already aware of what their policy is worth and know that they are the enemies of the Russian proletarian revolution even though they do not dare to condemn it openly.

We are speaking of the centrists and semi-reformists, those who are hiding their treason behind the mask of protecting party unity and call themselves unitarian communists. They loudly proclaim that they are zealous defenders

of Soviet Russia and decisive supporters of the Communist International, even though, in fact, they have declared open war on Russia and the International! Why are Comrade Serrati and his supporters displaying their solidarity with Russia so loudly? Because Russia, its revolution, its principles, and its methods of struggle are enjoying tremendous popularity among the Italian proletarian masses. Because the Italian proletariat admires Soviet Russia and hails it, because it expresses its full solidarity with Soviet Russia, and because it is fully resolved to support Soviet Russia to the end and with all possible means. That is why Comrade Serrati and the unitarian communists are adapting themselves to the circumstances in order not to lose their influence on the proletariat.

However, they are displaying friendship and sympathy not only for Russia and the Russian Revolution but for the Communist International as well. For in the mind of the Italian proletariat the Russian Revolution is inseparably and comprehensibly linked with the Communist International. Guided by its conscience and proletarian perceptiveness, the Italian proletariat does not separate the Russian Revolution from the Communist International but relates them the way they are related in real life. That is why, here again, Comrade Serrati and his supporters are forced to adapt themselves to the feelings of the proletariat in order not to lose their influence....

The Russian proletarian revolution is the first great proletarian revolution which ended victoriously with the seizure of power by the proletariat in the biggest capitalist country in the world and the establishment of the first proletarian dictatorship in history. The historical experience of the Russian revolutionary working class is of tremendous importance to the entire international proletariat and its liberation struggle. On the other hand, the Russian Revolution is not merely a product of the exceptional and special conditions of that country....Now, after the war, common phenomena are noted in all capitalist countries, such as economic crisis, unemployment, higher cost of living, and monetary depreciation which make the situation in each country similar to that of Russia before 1917. Yet, not only the beginning but the further development of the Russian Revolution is related to and dependent on the world's economic and political crisis, a crisis which is becoming ever broader and deeper....

The crushing of the Russian Revolution means, consequently, the crushing of the world's revolution. This is known to the capitalist governments, for which reason they are waging a merciless struggle against Soviet Russia. However, the international proletariat as well is beginning to understand this better and better....

From the 9 February 1924 Gramsci Letter to P. Togliatti, U. Terracini, and Others¹⁰

....Amadeo (Bordighi --the translator) has his own view on this, and in his system everything is logically linked, one stemming from the other. He believes that the tactic of the International bears the imprint of the Russian situation, i.e. that it appeared on the grounds of a backward and

primitive capitalist civilization. From his viewpoint this tactic is distinguished by extreme voluntarism and theatricalness, for only with a tremendous effort of the will could one make the Russian masses engage in a revolutionary action not determined by the historical situation. He believes that this tactic would be either unsuitable or entirely useless in the case of the more developed countries of Central and Western Europe. In his view, in those countries the historical mechanism is operating according to all the sacred Marxist canons: here the grounds which were absent in Russia exist, for which reason all the efforts must be focused on the establishment of a party as such, for its own sake. I believe matters to be entirely different. First, because the political concept of the Russian communists was formed on international rather than national grounds; second, because the development of capitalism in Central and Western Europe not only determined the formation of broad proletarian strata but their upper crust as well -- a worker aristocracy with its supplements: trade union bureaucracy and social democratic groups. The conditionality which was direct in Russia (and urged the masses to take to the streets for the revolutionary assault) is complicated in Central and Western Europe by the existence of all the political superstructures created by the higher development of capitalism here, slows down and makes more cautious the action of the masses and, consequently, requires the entire strategy and tactics of a revolutionary party to be more complex and longer-range compared with the bolshevik strategy and tactics of the March-November 1917 period....

The USSR is Marching Toward Communism¹¹

Last week the bourgeois press carried a number of articles on the situation in Russia. The result of what LA STAMPA, TRIBUNA, and IL MONDO wrote on this account was summed up in IL MONDO by Deputy Baldesi who claimed that it had already been proved that communism in Russia had failed and that Russia was marching quickly toward the restoration of capitalism. As befits a social democrat, Baldesi is very displeased, above all, by the fact that the bolsheviks made a socialist revolution in October 1917, for, in his view, it would have been better to follow the overthrow of tsarism by a bourgeois-democratic regime, one of the regimes enjoyed by the proletariat of all other countries. He is so displeased by this that he forgets, despite his allegedly favorable attitude toward the agrarian reform, that only the proletarian revolution gave the land to the peasants. In other words, he forgets that the various governments which alternated in Russia from February to October 1917 were imperialist bourgeois governments which would have never implemented the agrarian reform which democrats and reformists claim to favor so enthusiastically.

The alliance of workers and peasants alone, the bolshevik revolution alone made this gigantic change in the foundations of the Russian economy. No single democratic regime, even after the war, has done anything similar. In the western part of Europe this could not even be conceived. The timid attempts at agrarian reforms in Romania and Poland are failing dismally. In their analysis of the present economic situation of Russia Baldesi and

his friends ignore, to begin with, the prewar level....In the level of per capita national income Russia trailed behind even Greece, Turkey, Bulgaria, and Serbia. Then there was the war, and after the war there was the civil war.

It was not the revolution which took a few days in Moscow, Petrograd, and the rest of the country that wrecked Russia and turned it into a huge heap of smoking ruins but the intervention for the support of the White armies on the part of the great European powers, i.e., on the part of the liberal and democratic regimes which IL MONDO and Baldesi like so much. By the fault of the White armies, i.e., of the French and British democratic bourgeoisie, the peasants stopped farming, railroads were destroyed, factories abandoned, and cities plundered. The very fact that despite all this the Soviet system won proves that it had the support of the tremendous majority of the Russian people. No other system in any other European country would have been able to withstand the trials of the Soviet system. Consequently, it would suffice to consider the conditions under which the revolution broke out in order to understand that if the Russian working people did not acquire rivers of milk and honey it would be ridiculous and stupid to blame communism for this. On the contrary, the results which have been achieved so far -- reaching the prewar level in industrial and agricultural production and the improved situation of the working people -- should be considered a near miracle....

....The main argument of our opponents is the NEP and its development. Yet, they ignore the fact that even though private capital played a role in the reanimation of the Russian economy, public capital was even more important. All socialized big industry, and all plants and factories -- metallurgical, metal processing, textile, etc. -- are owned and managed by the state. They employ 95 percent of the workers. To the enemy, however, this is unimportant....It pretends not to know that foreign trade was monopolized by the state through the banks which are also entirely socialized. It deliberately ignores the fact that the entire efforts of the state are aimed at the development of the socialist production elements and that the capitalist elements deemed to be useful and which cannot be eliminated in one fell swoop are kept under strict control.

This leaves agriculture. We already pointed out that the bolshevik revolution alone had the required strength to give the land to the peasants. In no bourgeois regime, even had Baldesi been minister, would the peasant masses have ever had the opportunity to acquire land. However, from the bourgeois viewpoint -- an opinion supported by Baldesi the social reformist -- the establishment of middle and big ownership and the process of concentration of wealth would be fatally inevitable, as a result of which landed estates would inevitably appear. Then, a couple of centuries later, a new peasant revolution would break out, and so on and so forth.

We do not deny that this process may become inevitable if opposed by the force of the state and of the socialized industry and banks. A different process is happening in Russia: the development of the small farms and

their unification. By cooperating in production, marketing, credits, purchases of necessary commodities, production improvements, and so on the Russian peasants will avoid the restoration of capitalism in agriculture and will create the type of economy in which collective methods will play an ever more important role....

No communist has ever promised the working people the creation of heaven on earth in 24 hours; no communist has ever believed that a communist system could be achieved in six months. The transition from slave ownership to feudalism, and from a feudal to a capitalist system cost mankind tremendous efforts over very long periods of time. Today, vestiges of a feudal economy may be found in even the most prosperous capitalist countries. Therefore, there are no reasons whatever to demand the instant advent of communism by waving a magic wand.

The profound difference between Russia and other countries whose system the various Baldesi's in the democratic and reformist camp like so much, is the following: in Russia all the power and efforts of the state are directed toward reaching communism, whereas in the other countries they are directed toward the preservation of capitalism and preventing the achievement of communism. This also applies to countries in which reformists are in power, such as, for example, beautiful Belgium in which Vandervelde is the slave of bureaucracy and...the servant of democracy letting the petty bourgeoisie and the working people pay for the economic crisis just like some Poincare or worse.

We know that these are all elementary truths not to the liking of the bourgeoisie. Yet, if we were to trust the sincerity of the social democrats--ours and foreign -- we would be puzzled by the joy with which they describe the imaginary failure of communism in Russia, i.e., the failure of the only revolution in which Marxist theory and the abilities of the proletariat were subjected to a practical test. Have these people kept anything of a socialist nature? They well know that should new crises bring to life a new proletarian society, it is not they who will assume the honorable and difficult duty of implementing the ideal of the working people. They are able to survive only by guarantying to the bourgeoisie their ability to defend its rule should ever their services be required...

From the Article "In Which Direction is the Soviet Union Developing?"¹²

....The bolsheviks won precisely because they were able to raise slogans consistent with the profound and insurmountable aspirations of the Russian people's masses: peace and land. The Russian bourgeoisie could not allow an agrarian revolution, for the expropriation of the landed estates without compensation would have not only destroyed the vestiges of feudal relations but dealt a mortal blow at capitalism in industry and finance. Actually, if the land should belong to the peasants, why should the plants not belong to the workers? That is why only the workers' revolution, the bolshevik revolution, could give land to the peasants.

In vain does IL MONDO try to make a distinction between East and West and even defend pitiful tricks such as the Polish and Romanian agrarian reforms. The truly liberal and democratic bourgeoisie proved what it is capable of. It distributed among the peasants a few scraps of land, generously rewarding the land owners. Now it is calmly taking over this land, for the peasants are unable to pay oppressive taxes and meet the price of the land. In those countries there is a factual return to big land ownership, even in areas where, after the war, the big estates were divided.

In Russia, however, the situation is different: here the state proclaimed collective land ownership and then gave the land to the producers, meeting the insurmountable wish of the peasants. It is said that all these are merely formulas. However, the assertion of great principles is never futile....

....The state is acting and will continue to act this way in order to prevent the appearance of big private farms, i.e., the new enslavement of the toiling masses. Day after day the latter are proving that the road to salvation goes through unification rather than internecine war. All the legislation and efforts of the bourgeois state are aimed at insuring the development of private capital, i.e., the exploitation and oppression of the poor classes. The Soviet state follows the precisely opposite policy.

We could also mention all the other elements which, under the conditions of the Russian system, are working in favor of communism and will contribute to its building, such as the new messianic spirit which has seized the masses, the tremendous development of culture, the struggle against illiteracy, which achieved greater successes in a few years after the revolution compared with hundreds of years of existence of tsarism, the participation of the masses in public life, and the adamant propaganda of the ideas of socialism, reaching the most backward strata, proud of their release from shameful slavery and of their progress toward a better future....

....Agricultural industrialization is inevitable. However, the peasantry itself is interested in implementing it in collective forms and not by following the path leading to capitalism.

Finally, the enthusiasm with which Moscow is looked upon in all corners of the world is of tremendous importance. What could the bourgeois-democratic systems offer the exploited classes and oppressed peoples today? Have the colonial peoples not seen through their own experience the hypocrisy of the bourgeois-democratic formulas of freedom and self-determination of the nations? Have the exploited classes not realized that in a bourgeois system there can be no freedom and prosperity for them? They are looking toward Moscow, to the revolution which gave freedom to the toiling classes, which gave the capital assets to the producers and which laid the foundations of the type of society in which capitalist exploitation will be eliminated. The liberal and democratic bourgeoisie from different countries began by using force against the Russian Revolution. In the name of immortal principles, freedom, etc., the democratic governments of France and Britain,

enthusiastically admired by IL MONDO, armed and subsidized all counterrevolutionaries. All the adventurers who contributed to the wrecking and calamities of their homeland were defeated. Then they resorted to the policy of barbed wire encirclement. ~~It was breached.~~ A relatively easier phase of the struggle has developed. A campaign has been launched in the press aimed at convincing the nations not of the errors of the bolsheviks (such arguments are no longer valid) but of the failure of communism. This is a slogan supported by all of them -- fascists and social democrats, conservatives and liberals. However, they too will be useless....

It is possible that this campaign in the press may be merely a preparation for the launching of new armed attacks, for a mortal duel is being fought between Russia and the capitalist society. We know who will win; and this victory, gentlemen from IL MONDO, will mean for the peoples the achievement of the type of democracy and freedom they have been waiting for in vain under the canopy of your beloved French and British systems....

FOOTNOTES

1. "Leader" was the March 1924 editorial of the journal ORDINE NUOVO. In a letter to P. Togliatti, dated 27 January 1924, in connection with the resumed publication of the journal, Gramsci shared his plans on the contents of the first issue: "...The first issue will be essentially dedicated to Comrade Lenin. I shall write the editorial in which I shall try to depict the main distinguishing features of his personality as a revolutionary leader. I shall translate his biography and make a small selection of his statements on the Italian situation in 1920. I consider that it would be more pertinent for you to publish in this section of the first issue a review of Lenin's books and pamphlets published in Italian, linking it with an assessment of the role which Lenin's activities and prestige played in Italy all those years...." Gramsci structured his article on the basis of the contrast between the image of the true proletarian leader, such as Lenin, and the sinister caricature of a "leader" such as Mussolini who, from a renegade of the socialist movement turned into a fascist dictator. The article is also polemically aimed at the sectarian views of A. Bordiga, who headed the Italian Communist Party during its first years, and at the relations between the party and the working class, and between the leadership and the party masses. The article is published with some abridgements (this and subsequent notes are the translator's).
2. Published in UNITA on 15 August 1925.
3. Cycle of lectures on this and other topics delivered by Gramsci to the Komsomol aktiv of Northern Italy in the summer of 1925.
4. "The Ghost" was written by Gramsci in December 1918 and published initially in the Piedmont edition of AVANTI!, central organ of the Italian Socialist Party in its 13 December edition.

5. Article published on 1 January 1920 in the Piedmont issue of AVANTI!
6. Article published on 14 October 1920 in the Piedmont edition of AVANTI! Slightly abridged.
7. Georges Clemenceau was French prime minister from November 1917 to January 1920. During the World War he supported an extreme imperialist course and dictatorial measures against the antiwar movement. Francesco Saverio Nitti was Italian prime minister from June 1919 to June 1920.
8. Giovanni Giolitti was Italian prime minister from June 1920 to July 1921 and had held that position on previous occasions as well. Alexandre Millerand, a renegade of the French socialist movement, became prime minister in January 1920 and was president of France from September 1920 to June 1924.

The movement of metallurgical workers (August-September 1920) consisted of the seizure by the workers of metal processing industry enterprises in response to the lock-out proclaimed by the entrepreneurs. It was one of the biggest mass actions in the period of the post-war revolutionary upsurge in Italy.

9. The article "Russia and the International," abridged here, was written by Gramsci in January 1921, on the eve of the split within the Italian Socialist Party at the Leghorn congress. It marked the beginning of the Italian Communist Party. Published in ORDINE NUOVO on 9 January 1921.
10. Discussing differences with Bordighi on problems of the tactics of the international communist movement.
11. Article written shortly before Gramsci's arrest in September 1926 and published in UNITA. Somewhat abridged.
12. Published in UNITA in September 1926.

5003
CSO: 1802

ALLIES OF SOCIALISM IN THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST STRUGGLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 pp 107-118

[Text] The contemporary stage in the intensification of the general crisis in capitalism is noteworthy because of the fact that this process is taking place under qualitatively new historical conditions. Today it is no longer a single socialist state, but an entire comity of countries, members of the new social system, which exert an active influence on the course of world development, including the deployment of political forces in the capitalist world itself. Under such circumstances, in addition to being confronted with the concluding breakdown of colonial empires, capitalism is becoming ever more limited in its choice of economic, political, and military means of combatting world socialism and the liberation movement, and of resolving its contradictions.

This applies both to the imperialists' foreign and, to a certain extent, internal policy. Their traditional means of protecting their interests at the expense of the popular masses and through expansion are encountering powerful opposition from the forces of peace and social progress, which have increased in unprecedented fashion. This opposition is based on the fact that, as was stressed at the 25th CPSU Congress, the nature of imperialism remains unchanged, even though the potential for its aggressive actions has now been considerably curtailed.

Capitalism has never hesitated at any, even the most extreme, adventures, whenever its profits have been threatened. We know that World War I broke out against the background of an overproduction crisis, which began in 1913 and which dealt a profound blow to all the largest imperialist countries. Similar upheavals, including the 1937-1938 capitalist economic decline, preceded World War II. The crisis phenomena of the present period are also energizing the militaristic forces in the capitalist countries, which are calling for the abandonment of detente, the acceleration of the arms race, and, "while there is still time," the reorientation of world politics back toward the Cold War. Under present day conditions, however, such forces can no longer determine the course of world events as they did in the past or impose their will upon the nations.

Encountering domestic difficulties, capitalism has usually made use of economic and political instability in order to even further intensify its social pressure on the working class, on the toiling masses. We know that fascism came to power in Germany precisely against the background of the 1929-1933 economic crisis. The crisis phenomena of the present period are also energizing the reactionaries and galvanizing neofascist forces and other varieties of extreme right-wing currents in the capitalist countries, which are promoting a "tightening of the screws," "belt-tightening," and "the bringing of order." However, under present day conditions, these trends are being countered by the powerful front provided by the democratic forces.

A new historical situation has developed in which capitalism still lives, and yet can no longer live according to its own laws. "Capitalism, in its imperialist stage," V. I. Lenin wrote, "leads us close to the greatest all-round socialization of output. It pushes the capitalists, so to speak, despite their will and awareness, into a type of new social order which is a transition from total freedom of competition to total socialization." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 27, pp 320-321). This situation is characterized by substantial changes in the very functioning of state-monopoly capitalism, changes which are in turn, above all, the result of major shifts in the deployment of social and political forces making up the antimonomopolistic front on the eve of a socialist revolution. As was noted at the Berlin Conference of Communist and Worker Parties of Europe, "This historical necessity of replacing the capitalist society with a socialist society, created in accordance with the wish of the entire people, is becoming obvious to ever-broader social strata."

The working class is the leading force in this universal-historical process. "Under contemporary conditions, when the general crisis in capitalism has substantially intensified, and when its irreconcilable contradictions have become aggravated," stipulates the CPSU Central Committee Decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution," the struggle against exploitation and monopoly dominance and for democracy and socialism is taking on ever broader scope. The proletariat is in the vanguard of this struggle." At the 16th USSR Trade Unions Congress, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out that the workers' movement is becoming an ever more important factor in social progress, and that at the same time, its responsibility to history is becoming ever greater, for which reason it is necessary to continue to strengthen the unity of the universal labor army--unity in the struggle for social progress and for the peace and security of the nations.

I

The need for radical change has become the real sign of the times. No single party or social movement in the capitalist countries can any longer ignore the feelings of the broadest toiling masses or demand one socio-political change or another. The 1974-1975 crisis and its consequences

make this problem even more acute. The whole question is what the content of the changes expected should be, and which forces will carry them out to the benefit of the others.

Marx's method, as Lenin pointed out, is to take the "objective content of the historical process, at any given moment and under any given circumstance, into account, in order to determine above all what specific class is the mainspring of any possible progress under this specific circumstance" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 26, pp 139-140). The workers' movement is such a mainspring.

Ever since K. Marx discovered this truth, reality has often provided confirmation. Invariably the proletariat is in the very thick of class battles. At the same time, it is assuming the role of the militant vanguard with ever greater confidence in the struggle for social liberation and progressive democracy.

The working class gained a position of hegemony in the resolution of the problems in the liberation and democratic struggle of the working people in the course of adamant battles with the reactionaries, during which the correlation among such tasks and the position of hegemony among the other classes in contemporary society gradually changed. There was a time when the proletariat, already participating in the democratic movement, was nonetheless unable to act as an autonomous force on its own behalf and with its own program. At that time it fought not specifically against its class enemy--the bourgeoisie, but rather against its enemy's enemies--against the feudal lords and absolutism. Such was the case as early as the end of the 18th century, in the period of the French bourgeois revolution, and during the American colonies' war of independence. In other words, even then the proletariat had to be singled out in the general democratic mass as its vanguard detachment and liberated from bourgeois influence. Briefly, the task was to make it an autonomous and main force of social progress.

This task was successfully implemented in only a few decades. In the class battles of the 1830's and 1840's, this was seen in the Chartist movement in Britain, the Lyons uprisings of 1831 and 1834 in France, and the 1844 weavers' uprising in Silesia. The proletariat had been singled out to a great extent as an autonomous force of the democratic movement. In subsequent decades, particularly following the emergence of Marxism, this process increased and spread to ever more countries. The working class formulated its program which was vastly broader and more progressive, as compared to all other contemporary democratic movements.

However, the nature of the dialectics of development is such that while winning this position, the proletariat begins to implement its historical mission not only in its own interests, but in the interests of all the working people. It rallies the solution of the basic social and political problems of the broad nonproletarian strata ever more actively in its program.

This unification is dictated by the very logic of social development. Just as the bourgeoisie created its own gravedigger--the proletariat--in its own cradle, capitalism, which is withering away, is developing the objective conditions for rallying the broadest possible front of all the democratic forces in bourgeois society around the working class.

"The proletariat," Lenin taught, "must carry out a socialist coup, joining to itself the mass of semiproletarian elements in the population in order to crush the opposition of the bourgeoisie and to paralyze the instability of the peasantry and the petit bourgeoisie" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol II, p 90). This conclusion was drawn at the beginning of this century, and already then determined the general features of the very nature of the future epoch of man's transition from capitalism to socialism, its basic tasks, and the type of forces to implement them. Ever since this concept was formulated, it has been the focus of constant ideological and political struggle. This is natural, for it is a question of assessing the main content of the contemporary historical process, and the main sociopolitical guidelines of social development. A particularly intensive struggle is being waged on the role of the working class today, when a further radical change is taking place in the worldwide balance of class forces in favor of the proletariat.

In an effort to dispute the fact of the growing role of the working class, the bourgeois ideologues speak of its "erosion," "dilution," or even "disappearance." "Under the conditions of a programmed society," claims French scientist Alain Touraine, "the working class is no longer the main historical character" (A. Touraine, "La Societe Post-industrielle" [The Post-industrial Society], Paris, 1969, p 25). Sigried Hunke, author of works on philosophy and political problems which are quite popular in the West, is even more categorical. "Marx's model," she writes in a book pretentiously entitled "The Postcommunist Manifesto," no longer suits the changed society. No trace remains of the proletariat. With every passing day, there are fewer reasons to speak of a working class. It has long since become integrated with the middle classes and is uninterested in the class struggle. The impoverished masses, the alienated proletariat, feeling the burden on themselves, their exploitation and oppression, as well as the pressure of economic relations, are no longer present in the classical Marxist sense" (S. Hunke, "Das Nach-Kommunistisch Manifest. Der dialektisch Unitarismus als Alternative" [The Postcommunist Manifesto, The Alternative to Dialectical Unity], Stuttgart, 1974, p 15).

Assigning herself the task of nothing more and nothing less than "arming the young generation with the means of fighting Marxism," S. Hunke does not, however, even take into account the commonplace and rather confused considerations as to a "possible social partnership." Her "manifesto" merely takes the reader back to vulgar anticommunism. No other way is possible if we ignore the actual trends of the epoch, as is done by A. Touraine, S. Hunke, and other imperialist ideologues, who, willy-nilly distorting the dynamics

of the social structure of the bourgeois world, suppress its main trends--the continuous increase in the volume of hired labor and the steady increase in the role of the working class in it. Both trends reflect the objective requirements of the contemporary production process.

The permanent capitalist trend toward the concentration of capital goods, triggering, at the other extreme, a concentration of population masses with no means of livelihood other than the individual capacity to work, is fully operational in all and, in particular, in the most developed, capitalist countries. Official statistics confirm that the percentage of hired labor in the active population of such countries has increased steadily. By the mid-1970's it had reached 70-85 percent. These figures represent millions and millions of human destinies, the ruination of hundreds of thousands of families, the collapse of baseless illusions, the painful break with customary views, and, at the same time, the accumulation of class antagonism in social forces made bitter about monopoly rule by the very nature of capitalist production.

The most important aspect of the social polarization in contemporary bourgeois society is unquestionably the increased size and role of the industrial proletariat. Whereas at the turn of the century this group accounted for about 40 million people in the countries within the developed capitalist zone, it now accounts for more than half of the 230 million-strong hired labor army.

However, the historical mission of the working class as the hegemonic force of the revolutionary movement is dictated not only by its numerical strength, but to an even greater extent by its position within the social production system, its organization, conscientiousness, and prestige in society. All the more important is the fact that in recent years, under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution, profound qualitative changes have taken place in the situation of the working class: its role in economics, its educational level and political activity have been increasing.

Wherever new detachments join the ranks of the proletariat, more favorable conditions are established, objectively, for the dissemination and acceptance of Marxist-Leninist ideas, and for the rallying under their banner of a broad, antimonopolistic front of democratic forces. Favorable prerequisites ripen for profound sociopolitical changes implemented by the conscious vanguard of the working class in the course of a daily struggle against the forces of reaction.

Naturally, each step along this path triggers furious resistance. As long as capitalism exists, it will continue to act on the working class, with a view to dividing it, isolating it from its natural allies, and diverting it from the main targets of the struggle. It is using and will continue to use the heterogeneous structure of the working class, the division among its political organizations, and the few enduring traditions and misconceptions

brought into the labor movement from the outside. Many of today's workers left the nonproletarian strata only yesterday. They have not as yet undergone sufficient training in the political struggle and often offer fertile ground for bourgeois ideology and petit bourgeois reformism. The economic status of the various national detachments of the working class in the contemporary capitalist world is quite disparate, as it is among the various categories of working people in each capitalist country. The increased unevenness in the development of the individual units within the capitalist system even further intensifies such phenomena, triggering certain illusions among some workers' strata, brought about by group interests of a circumstantial nature. Of late the bourgeoisie has learned a great deal and has invented thousands of traps to channel the struggle of the working people into false hopes.

In this connection, ideological diversions play an important role. The main target of the crossfire of bourgeois, right-wing opportunistic and "left-wing" radical propaganda is the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the leading role of the proletariat in the democratic movements and in the struggle for socialism.

Naturally, not all bourgeois scientists, and to an even lesser extent the reformist leaders, are as direct in their statements as the author of "The Postcommunist Manifesto," referred to above. Most of them deny neither the increased volume of hired labor, its increased role in contemporary production, nor the fact that the working class and its allies are successfully building a new society in a large group of countries. Furthermore, they try to build their arguments consistent, to a certain extent, with these realities. In the past, they simply said that the working class, consisting of "people standing by their machine tools," could not claim to play a hegemonic role, since they were uneducated, lacked the proper experience, and would not be supported by other strata of the population. The question is formulated differently now: the conditions governing the existence of the proletariat and the proletariat itself have changed to such an extent that the need for a socialist revolution and, consequently, for the leading role of the working class, have disappeared of their own accord, since all, or nearly all such "damn problems" have supposedly already found, or will find, their best solution within the framework of bourgeois democracy. Or, conversely, it is claimed that as a result of the new changes, the other classes and strata of bourgeois society have become as or even more "revolutionary," and have the same or an even greater right to claim the role of hegemonic power in the antimonopolistic struggle.

A variety of approaches to these conclusions may be found in the very extensive sociopolitical writings recently published in the West. Some authors, in the spirit of traditional bourgeois political economics, without separating themselves too far from its vulgar-apologetic concepts, continue to elaborate on the claim that the proletariat has gained access to corporate income, ceased to be a nonproperty-owning class, and almost

become a co-owner of capital. Others, identifying the working class with the category of individuals performing physical labor, preach the concept of the disappearance of the proletariat, with the development of the scientific and technical revolution. Others are demonstrating that it is no longer a single class, for it breaks down into a number of heterogeneous conglomerates or "strata." All such concepts agree on the fact that the contemporary workers, suddenly discovering for himself that a "revolution in income" has taken place, as a result of which he is the "social partner" of the entrepreneur, has supposedly lost his revolutionary potential, and has become "bourgeoisified," thus becoming totally reconciled with the domination of monopoly capital. Unlike previous capitalism, claims the American scientist J. Galbraith, "the class struggle in the new industrial state dies down," for "interests which were previously radically opposed are coming ever closer to a state of harmony at present" (J. K. Galbraith, "The New Industrial State," Boston, 1967, p 263). He is echoed by one of the French interpreters of this problem, Henri Lefebvre, who claims that the working class today is unable to engage in the "radical reorganization of society," since along with it, strata demanding only certain reforms appear (see HOMME ET LA SOCIETE, Paris, No 21, 1971, p 154).

Whatever circumvening maneuvers may be used by bourgeois and reformist ideologues to conceal the revolutionary role of the working class, they cannot ignore the fact that the contemporary proletariat in the capitalist world, as was the case in the past, has been excluded from the means of production and management functions, and lives exclusively from the sale of manpower. In other words, by the very logic of matters, the proletariat remains the main antagonist of the bourgeoisie.

As long as economic and political power levers remain in the hands of the monopolies and the bourgeois state, the worker in the capitalist countries can rely only on "more favorable conditions which would enable him once again to work to multiply the wealth of the bourgeoisie and to increase the power of capital--to work, satisfied with forging the gold chains with which the bourgeoisie binds him to itself" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 6, p 451).

The structural changes which have occurred in recent years in the capitalist production forces, the development of the scientific and technical revolution, and the growth of state-monopoly capitalism, without changing anything essential in this respect, place on the shoulders of the working people an even greater burden of exploitation, some of it in skillfully concealed forms, unparalleled intensification of the work, unbearably excessive mental stress, and an increased accident rate.

II

More than ever before the contemporary proletariat is pitted by life itself against monopoly capitalism on the battlefields of economic and political struggle. Ever more decisively it is making a choice in favor of scientific socialism. This is convincingly confirmed by the growth of the Marxist-

Leninist vanguard of the working class--the communist parties, and their strength and prestige among the masses, as well as the upsurge of the world communist movement as a whole, which in recent years has risen to an even higher level.

Summing up some of the results in these past years, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the October 1976 CPSU Central Committee Plenum: "...In the course of adamant class battles, the communist parties in a number of capitalist countries have achieved major successes of late. They have broadened their mass base and strengthened their prestige. Their weight in political life has increased. Today mass communist parties are functioning in three of the six largest capitalist countries--France, Italy, and Japan, with a total electoral strength of more than 20 million voters. As a result of the last elections, the Italian Communist Party won a position such that now, essentially, not a single major problem in the life of the state can be resolved without its participation. In France the alliance between the communists and socialists and other leftist forces has become a universally acknowledged and weighty factor in the country's political life.... The communist parties of India, Finland, Denmark and some Latin American countries enjoy considerable political influence."

Relying on the experience of factual socialism, the world communist movement has now taken on some new features. Its tasks on the ideological and political levels have broadened considerably. It is above all a question of achieving a leading position in the general democratic struggle. Naturally, this presumes a combination of the ideas of scientific communism not only with the labor movement, but also with the sociopolitical activities of the other groups of working people; strengthening relations with the national liberation struggle of the peoples; and the further extension of the influence of the ideas of scientific communism to the progressive revolutionary forces in the developing countries.

Both of these aspects are dictated not by some sort of temporary reasons which might change tomorrow, but by the whole course of the development of contemporary capitalism, the breakdown of its colonial empires, the crisis in the state-monopoly system, and the scope of the scientific and technical revolution, which under the conditions of monopoly rule, leads to the reproduction of social antagonisms on a greater scale and with greater gravity than ever before. "This is not merely an increase in the contradictions between labor and capital," the 1969 International Conference of Communist and Worker Parties noted, "but an intensification of the antagonism between the interests of the overwhelming majority in the nation and the financial oligarchy.... The claims as to a 'revolution in income' or a 'social partnership' notwithstanding, capitalist exploitation is increasing. Wage increases fall far below the growth rates in labor productivity and intensification and social needs; they cannot be compared with the increase in monopoly profits. The position of the petty peasantry continues to deteriorate. The living conditions for a considerable segment of the middle classes are becoming increasingly difficult."

The very conditions of daily life pit the tremendous majority of bourgeois society, including that part of the population usually described as the middle class, in a situation of ever more irreconcilable relations with monopoly capital, broadening the social base of the anti-imperialist struggle and creating the objective prerequisites for the unification of ever broader nonproletarian masses--peasants, petty urban bourgeoisie, white collar workers, and intellectuals--with the working class and its communist vanguard. They are becoming the allies of the proletariat in the struggle against monopoly domination, for a progressive reorganization of society, and for prevention of a new world war.

The middle classes themselves represent a highly heterogeneous mass. Artisans and petty merchants, white collar workers and the intelligentsia and the people in the liberal professions occupy different positions in the social structure, the production hierarchy and the political life of bourgeois society. Some of them are small capital owners. Others have no means of subsistence but their work; some are involved with small or large scale output, while others are not engaged in production activities; some have material guarantees of a greater or lesser sort, while others have no permanent source of income. The social and political interests of these groups and, consequently, their ideological guidelines are, as a rule, unstable.

The petty private owners--peasants, artisans, and some merchants--are linked with the bourgeoisie by their past, whereas the future draws them to the proletariat. They are engaged in an exhausting and uneven struggle against big business. However, representing a splinter of commodity output, they frequently act on the basis of yesterday's positions. Yearning for the "good" old days of free enterprise, and having an adamant aspiration to retain their ephemeral "independence," which in reality has long since disappeared, they are sometimes hesitant to accept the ideas of socialism. On the other hand, however, the reality of the capitalist system itself leads them into the ranks of the antimonopolistic front and the fighters for a lasting peace and social progress.

Until World War II, a considerable contingent of these population groups followed the reactionary parties, fascist demagogues in particular, or served as the base for other right-wing bourgeois trends. However, the historical shift in favor of socialism, the aggravation of the general crisis in capitalism, and the discrediting of the extreme right-wing groups of the imperialist reactionaries substantially changed their ideological orientation. In the 1950's and 1960's, as a rule, they were the main social consumers of all kinds of bourgeois propaganda consisting of liberal-apologetic concepts. Recently, particularly since the 1974-1975 crisis, their swing to the left and increased interest in scientific socialism have been noted.

Naturally, this swing is not by any means a simple thing. Bound by the burden of bourgeois relations and traditions, the members of the petit bourgeoisie frequently take into the arena of ideological combat reformist,

extreme left-wing, anarchic, and other antiscientific views. Their criticism of capitalism is most frequently inconsistent and one-sided, while their acknowledgment of socialist ideas is usually accompanied by all sorts of liberal-bourgeois reservations.

The individual representatives of the middle classes do not have immediate common interests or stable national and international relations. They are not united within a single class organization. However, as was stated at the 1969 conference, "The broad population of the middle classes, despite the lack of unity in their ranks and their particular receptivity to bourgeois ideology, is acting in defense of its interests and joining in the struggle for general democratic demands. An understanding of the vital importance of joint actions with the working class is growing among them."

The labor intelligentsia, existing by the sale of its manpower, is becoming ever more influential in production and social life with the development of the scientific and technical revolution. With every passing day, particularly under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution, state-monopoly capitalism is classifying the intelligentsia in various groups ever more obviously. Most of them, defending themselves against the monopolies, are gravitating toward the working class and its ideals.

Hired labor accounts for a considerable segment of the intelligentsia. State employees, employees of private companies, engineering and technical workers, and members of the various intellectual professions are not as a rule owners of capital goods. The social functions of these groups and their property status also vary widely. Work within the apparatus of the capitalist state or as technical administrators of private enterprises brings them ideologically closer to the bourgeoisie and leaves a specific imprint on their consciousness. Yet these population categories are closer to the working class when it comes to other substantial aspects of life.

White collar workers, engineering and technical personnel and members of the liberal professions are basically the offspring of workers' families and earn a living by their own labor. As hired labor, they are exploited by big capital. The living standard of many of them hardly differs from that of a skilled worker, and is often even below that. On the whole, their situation depends on the economic fluctuations in the capitalist countries.

In the first decades after World War II, when monopoly capital was able to skim off the cream of the scientific and technical revolution and maintain a rather considerable increase in output, the material position of such population groups remained more or less stable. At that time, the bourgeois propagandists hastened to proclaim loudly a "revolution in the redistribution of income" in favor of the white collar workers. However, the moment the capitalist countries experienced a slowdown in the pace of economic development at the beginning of the 1970's, with monetary difficulties and inflation, these same white collar workers, along with the working class, became

the victims of these phenomena. If anyone needed further proof that such a threat is always hanging over the intelligentsia in the capitalist countries, the 1974-1975 crisis provided abundant confirmation.

Intensified political reaction, the intellectual and moral deterioration of social life, and the profound crisis in bourgeois culture forced these strata to look for a social alternative to capitalism, leading them to a socialist outlook. The stormy student actions which spread to literally all the capitalist countries toward the end of the 1960's, and the outbursts of discontent among precisely that part of the youth which was training to reinforce the white collar detachment, were the first threatening warnings of the growing opposition of this detachment of the working people to the capitalist system.

When monopoly capitalism was just developing, Lenin predicted that as its positions broadened, two opposite processes would develop: on the one hand, the proletarianization of the intelligentsia; and on the other, the intellectualization of the working class (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 4, p 209; Vol 6, p 389). In the decades which have passed since then, particularly with the beginning of the scientific and technical revolution, capitalism has almost entirely deprived the intellectual of an independent position, transforming him into a simple hired worker subject to all the vicissitudes of the labor market. In other words, the proletarianization of the intellectual masses has taken place. The scientific and technical specialists and most of the intelligentsia in general are merely a variation on the hired worker, and as such, are able to oppose the monopolies and fight for their rights only within a broad democratic front.

The contradiction between the democratic majority and monopoly capital extends to an inordinately broad range of problems, covering not only the social and political life of the capitalist countries, but the areas of culture, science, education, and others. In all cases, the struggle for the solution of general democratic problems or for reorganization of a socialist type inevitably broadens the battlefield between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, leading the toiling masses politically toward Marxist-Leninist ideology.

III

The democratic and socialist tasks of the liberation struggle are becoming ever more closely interwoven not only in the developed capitalist zone, but in the national liberation zone, for the imperialist system of oppression and coercion itself has made the achievement of social and national equality an indivisible problem. After winning political independence, the former colonies felt, above all, the acute need to eliminate the feudal (and in many cases prefeudal) relations and to implement other changes which had been made by the peoples of Europe in the course of the bourgeois-democratic revolution as early as the 17th to the 19th centuries. However, developing

under entirely different circumstances, when capitalism has already discredited itself in the eyes of the nations, while socialism has become the decisive force in the development of the world, the struggle in this field is today taking on a new content.

The bourgeois-democratic revolutions of the past brought about the strengthening of capitalism. In our century, even national movements which do not go beyond the boundaries of bourgeois-democratic changes are striking at imperialism. The bourgeois-democratic revolutions were directed above all against domestic reactionary forces--the feudal lords and feudal-monarchic absolutism. The cutting edge of the contemporary national-liberation movements is directed above all at imperialism and the domestic forces allied with it. In our time, the peoples who have undertaken national-liberation revolutions either take the path of the building of socialism directly or proclaim their socialist orientation, or they may formulate socialist program objectives.

Naturally, until the final choice of the path of further sociopolitical development has been made, and so long as antagonistic classes remain in the young national states, and powerful neocolonial and reactionary forces, such as foreign imperialism, the mercantile bourgeoisie, and feudal lords, survive and function, such countries will remain battlefields of intensive internal struggle. The anti-imperialist front which developed in the period of the national liberation movements rallies within its ranks heterogeneous class forces, and in countries where the basic social problems have remained unresolved, the aggravation of the ideological battle is inevitable.

The working class represents a leading force which could provide the movement as a whole with a socialist direction. However, in many countries in formerly colonial parts of the world, this class is still small and insufficiently experienced in the political struggle. The peasant masses, which account for the greater part of the population, are organizationally uncoordinated and frequently follow the national bourgeoisie. The national bourgeoisie itself, as a rule, occupies an ambiguous place in the liberation struggle: on the one hand, it has an objective interest in undertaking an anti-imperialist and antifeudal revolution; on the other, it leans toward making agreements and compromises with imperialism and the feudal lords.

Today the national liberation movement has entered a new phase. The developing countries are faced with the most difficult task of winning economic independence. Experience has shown that, forced by circumstances to acknowledge the right of the young states to national sovereignty, the imperialist states immediately attempt to replace the old colonial order with a neocolonial system which, disguised as outwardly respectable cooperation, would enable them to continue the exploitation and plundering of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The peoples of the former colonies and semicolonies are trying to extricate themselves from the capitalist economic system. A new round is developing in the struggle against imperialism--the most intensive and complex, for it is a matter of eliminating foreign economic domination and doing away with the very roots of the imperialist system of domination.

Therefore the question of the transition of the vast population masses in the countries developing toward socialism arises. It can only be resolved successfully through a close alliance with the world socialist system and the international working class, which plays the role of the proletarian vanguard, on an international scale, for the peoples engaged in national liberation struggle.

This makes it clear why the ideologues of imperialism and their petit bourgeois minions try above all to attack this alliance precisely. Once, the bourgeois propagandists claimed that the national liberation movement in the colonies had no basis of its own, in general, allegedly having been brought in from the outside as a result of "communist intrigue." Later, a basically opposite thesis was adopted: that same movement is given a sort of halo of a kind of national-racial exclusivity, and an effort is being made to show that neither socialism nor the working class in the capitalist countries is indifferent to it.

In fact, in the overall deployment of class forces today, this movement plays the role of a powerful ally of state-organized socialism, the international working class in the anti-imperialist struggle, and the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, in turn, as was noted in the CPSU Central Committee Decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution," are giving all-round support to the developing countries in their struggle to implement their legitimate aspirations and to achieve full freedom from imperialist exploitation and the right to decide their own destinies.

Becoming global in scale today, the international liberation movement is developing at an unparalleled rate and is leading ubiquitously to shifts of truly universal-historical significance. It is involving huge masses of people on all continents, people at widely varying stages of class development and belonging to different social strata, in the revolutionary current. Their awakening to active political life accelerates the process of the transition of mankind to socialism and communism tremendously.

However, we must not ignore here the fact that population masses which have not yet overcome the bourgeois influence, and which bring to the liberation movement their old views, misconceptions, and petit bourgeois confusions, are being swept into the whirlpool of the struggle. The various and socially heterogeneous forces which act against imperialism and describe socialism as the final objective of their struggle frequently invest the concept of socialism with their own content, representing their present economic, political, and national interests. This provides fertile ground for the growth of a variety of non-Marxist socialist theories.

There is nothing surprising to communists in this. Only doctrinaires and sectarians would demand a sterile "ideological purity" of the masses which have just come into the arena of political struggle. A scientific outlook is developed in the course of political struggle itself, after surmounting one prejudice or another and after the gradual liberation of of the minds of the people from the influence of a hostile ideology.

The socialist revolution, Lenin taught, "can be nothing but an explosion of the mass struggle of all the oppressed and discontented. A segment of the petit bourgeoisie and the backward workers will inevitably participate in it, for without their contribution no mass struggle or revolution is possible. Just as inevitably, they will bring into the movement their prejudices, reactionary fantasies, weaknesses and errors. Objectively, however, they will be attacking capitalism, and the conscious vanguard of the revolution, the progressive proletariat, expressing this objective truth of the disparate, uncoordinated, variegated, and outwardly splintered mass struggle, could unite and direct it...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 30, pp 54-55).

This truth today finds its specific expression in the complex interaction among economic and scientific and technical factors, social and political phenomena, and domestic and international processes. Furthermore, the growing interdependence among all realms of social life, both within the context of individual countries and on a worldwide scale, is one of the characteristic features of the contemporary epoch--the epoch of the social and scientific and technical revolution, when the liberation and democratic tasks of the working class and all working people are inextricably interwoven with the general current of the anti-imperialist movement.

The capitalist system is experiencing the most profound crisis in its history. Unable to find a solution to the crisis, confused and fearful for the future of capitalism, its defenders are ready to promote even the most heedless adventures. Thus the French scientist E. Muraise claims in his book "Testament for A Future World" that mankind, or rather capitalism, has no recourse other than war, the exchange of "moderate" atomic strikes, which would allegedly trigger a "turn toward the conditions of the pre-industrial period, or to something between such conditions and the benefits of controlled scientific and technical progress" (E. Muraise, "Testament pour un Monde Futur" [Testament for A Future World], Paris, 1971, p 22). This is a description proffered by bourgeois thinkers in order to heal the ills of capitalism, although there can be no question of any such thing, much less in the event of a nuclear war.

The communists formulate another alternative. The representatives of the 29 communist and worker parties of Europe who met at the Berlin Conference in the summer of 1976 noted in their final document that "the economic and social structure of the capitalist society is becoming ever more in conflict with the needs of the working people and the popular masses, as well as the requirements of social progress and democratic and political development."

"The working class and the working people of capitalist Europe are struggling to find a democratic solution to the crisis, a solution which would be consistent with the interests of the people's masses, and which would open the path to socialist change."

In this connection, the question of the forms of transition to socialism acquire exceptional importance. It was formulated by Marx himself, who allowed for a "transitional condition of society," in which "the present economic foundation of society has not as yet been reorganized, on the one hand, while on the other, the working masses have accumulated sufficient strength to force the adoption of transitional measures designed to achieve, in the final analysis, the radical reconstruction of society" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 16, pp 384-385).

Such a development of events was contemplated by Marx as a possible but rather remote eventuality. Today, under the conditions of the new ratio of class forces in the international arena and in the capitalist world itself, this possibility has become entirely real. At the Berlin Conference the communists noted that "the positions of imperialism, the nature of which remains unchanged, have weakened as a result of shifts in the balance of forces. This is expressed in the fact that it can no longer eliminate the historical gains of socialism or stop the advance of the progressive forces and the movement for the liberation and independence of the nations."

Consequently, the strength of the working class and the antimonopolistic movement as a whole has already now reached a level at which they can achieve the implementation of major sociopolitical steps along the path toward socialism peacefully, and at which, in Lenin's words, state-monopoly capitalism in a truly revolutionary-democratic state would inevitably and invariably represent one or several steps toward socialism (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 34, p 191). Essentially, many of the program stipulations of the communist and worker parties of Western Europe--demands for antimonopolistic democracy, the formation of left-wing bloc governments and the pursuit of a disarmament policy--are of a transient nature, earmarking intermediary levels to be reached in their struggle for socialism.

Naturally, the path of peaceful democratic changes does not in any way mean any abatement of the class struggle. On the contrary, only the steady, energetic and powerful offensive of the working people against capitalism can ensure progress, for the revolution is not a sum total of reforms, and as long as the main problem in the class struggle, the problem of power, remains unresolved, no progressive gains can be considered permanent. The peaceful path of the revolution presumes not the weakening, but on the contrary, the intensification of the political struggle being waged by the democratic forces against imperialism within the context of the individual capitalist countries.

As to the international aspect of this problem, the very interests of the class struggle call for the expansion and consolidation of the worldwide front of democratic forces opposing the camp of war and reaction, for as Lenin taught, the greatest manifestation of democracy is found in the basic problem of war and peace. Whereas within the national framework of a given country, the democratic forces are oriented toward the working class and its communist vanguard, on an international scale, the socialist comity, headed by the homeland of the Great October Revolution, provides such a guideline and reliable bulwark.

The struggle for social progress is indivisibly linked with the struggle for lasting peace. The main revolutionary forces of our time--the socialist states, the workers' movement in the capitalist countries, and the national liberation movement--can, together with all the democratic and peaceloving forces, surmount the opposition of the reactionaries and prevent the outbreak of a world war.

5003

CSO: 1802

LENIN -- ORGANIZER OF THE COUNTRY'S DEFENSE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 pp 119-125

[Review by V. Fomichev of the book "Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biograficheskaya Khronika. 1870-1924" [Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biographical Chronicle, 1870-1924], Vol 7, March-November 1919, Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 700 pages with illustrations]

[Text] The most severe trials experienced by the young Soviet state occurred in 1919. The White Guard Army, relying on the support and direct military assistance of world imperialism, surrounded the republic in a ring of fire. In the spring of that year Kolchak's divisions were 85-100 kilometers distant from the Volga. In October Denikin's forces captured Orel and, entering Tula Guberniya, directly threatened Moscow. General Yudenich twice reached the approaches to Petrograd. According to V. I. Lenin this was "one of the most critical and, probably the most critical moment of the socialist revolution" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 39, p 44). In those days, by the will of the party the Soviet republic was converted into a single military camp, directly subordinating all its forces to defense.

During that responsible moment the outstanding role which Lenin played as the inspirer of the country's defense, wise strategist and tactician, and unsurpassed organizer of the masses was manifested with particular emphasis. Using the number of documents, frequently new ones, the seventh consecutive volume of his biographic chronicle reveals with exhaustive fullness the activities of the great leader during those most difficult days for the country.

Chronologically, the volume covers the period from 18 March to 6 November 1919 and includes over 3000 facts. Their sources, along with familiar publications, as was the case with the previous volumes of the Soviet period, are the minutes of the sessions of the RKP(b) Central Committee, the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, the Council of People's Commissars, and the Defense Council, memoirs, materials from the periodical press of the time, and numerous archive sources. Their extensive use has enabled the compilers to publish for the first time, fully or partially, 790 new Leninist documents (letters, notes, telegrams, resolutions, inscriptions, and so on), and to refine a number of facts.

As we know, the Eighth Congress of the RKP(b), held on 18-23 March 1919, played an outstanding role in the history of the CPSU. The first pages of the volume describe Lenin's role in the work of this historical congress which met in the Round (now Sverdlov) Hall in the Kremlin. Vladimir Il'ich spoke at the opening and closing of the congress. He submitted the Central Committee report, a report on the party program, and a final speech on this matter. He presented a report on working in the countryside and a speech on the military problem and took the floor over 20 times as chairman. He was member of the program commission and the agrarian section of the congress and repeatedly met and talked with its delegates.

The second party program, adopted at the Eighth Congress, and its proclaimed policy of strong alliance with the middle peasants, as well as the congress decisions on the military question, aimed at the creation of the powerful, regular and strictly disciplined Red Army, headed by the party, were of tremendous significance to mobilizing the country's forces in repelling the enemy and strengthening the alliance between the working class and the toiling peasantry; they opened a scientific possibility for the building of a socialist society. Adopting these historical decisions, the Bolshevik Party once again presented itself to the Russian working people and the entire world as a powerful political force creatively resolving the vital strategic and tactical tasks of the proletarian revolution.

Materials on Lenin's work within the party's central organs are presented far more extensively in the seventh volume, compared with the previous publications. His participation in the sessions of the RKP(b) Central Committee Politburo and Orgburo, and in the work of the Central Committee Plenums is depicted quite thoroughly. Emphasizing the exceptional role of the Central Committee in the life of the party and the state, and, above all, in directing the defense of the country, at the fifth (closed) session of the Eighth Congress Vladimir Il'ich said: "At each session of the Central Committee on any major problem of strategy -- and there has not been a single occasion in which there was no session of the Central Committee or the Central Committee bureau -- not once did we avoid discussing basic problems of strategy" (p 10).

The Central Committee Politburo and the other central party organs never lost sight of problems of the country's defense, mobilization of economic and food resources, national policy, economic construction, organization of political work in the army and among the toiling masses, and so on, and so forth (see pp 100, 117, 138, 256, 352-353, 489, 509, and others). The facts included in this volume showing Vladimir Il'ich's participation in the activities of these organs deserve our closest attention also because many of them have not been covered previously in such detail. We find here descriptions of over 10 Politburo meetings or joint sessions between the Politburo and the Orgburo (with references to archives only). For example, this is the first time that the reader can study the Politburo and Orgburo sessions of 10 July, 6 August, and 23 August, and the 7 October and 30 October 1919 Politburo sessions, and learn that the 13 April Plenum of the RKP(b) Central Committee directed all party organizations to mobilize

for the front no less than 20 percent, while the areas adjacent to the front, no less than 50 percent of their membership (p 79), and that at the joint Politburo and Orgburo 29 April session, discussing the question of the procedure for proclaiming a general and voluntary mobilization, and the draft circular of the Central Committee to the party organizations Lenin was instructed to participate in the writing and editing of leaflets to be circulated among workers and peasants in connection with the forthcoming mobilization (p 138).

The volume describes the work of the July and September Central Committee Plenums which played an important role in defeating Denikin. Addressing the September Central Committee session, in the course of a discussion of the military situation developing on the southern front, following the breach by Shkuro's cavalry and the loss of Kursk, Vladimir Il'ich called for the mobilization of a maximal number of senior workers, and pointed out the need to transfer from the western to the southern front the Latvian Infantry Division and the cavalry brigade of Chervon Cossacks (pp 512-513).

Also noteworthy in understanding the outstanding role of the party is the fact that the most important documents on organizing the defense of the country, written by Lenin, were published as Central Committee documents. On 11 April he wrote the "Theses of the RKP(b) Central Committee in Connection with the Situation on the Eastern Front" (p 71), which called for assessing all forces and developing revolutionary energy for the defense of the Volga, the Urals, and Siberia, and for the defeat of Kolchak. At the beginning of July Vladimir Il'ich wrote the appeal "Everyone To the Struggle Against Denikin!" And requested the Politburo and Orgburo to discuss whether or not such an appeal should be published "as the author's commentary to the plenum decisions (the plenum was held on 3 July -- the author), or as a Central Committee letter or else as a leaflet by the author, and so on" (p 354). Considering the organs of the document, it was decided to publish it as a letter of the RKP(b) Central Committee to the party organizations. It emphasized the need to convert the Soviet republic into a single military camp not in words but in fact. An expanded program for action in this direction was earmarked. It was pointed out that "all communists and all conscientious workers and peasants, anyone who does not wish to allow Kolchak's and Denikin's victory should display an inordinate upsurge of energy immediately and in the next few months. "Revolutionary work" was demanded ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 39, p 63).

The materials well describe Lenin's irreconcilable attitude toward those who tried to violate or avoid the implementation of the Central Committee decisions and directives. Thus, on 17 July he sent a letter to the RKP (b) Central Committee sharply criticizing Trotskiy who had opposed the Central Committee 15 June decisions on strengthening general headquarters, and pointed out the inadmissibility of ignoring the will of the Central Committee majority (p 300). On 6 September Vladimir Il'ich condemned the suggestion cultivated by Trotskiy, Serebryakov, and Lashevich to amend the strategic plan for the struggle against Denikin, adopted by the Central Committee (p 495). Nor did Lenin ignore other cases of violation of party directives

and decrees by officials. In a letter to S. I. Gusev, member of the republic's revolutionary council, noting the major omissions in the conduct of military operations by the Revolutionary Military Council, Lenin emphasized the inadmissibility of the weakening control over the implementation of decisions and pointed out that "whereas this may be our common sin, in military affairs it means no less than death" (p 506).

Ascribing such great importance to the work of the central party organs, and always controlling the strict observance of their decisions, at the same time Vladimir Il'ich maintained links with the local party organizations, guided their activities, corresponded with them, and met with their representatives. On 22 March he looked at the "Instructions and Regulations on the Organization of Party Work in Nizhegorodskaya Guberniya" and used the materials contained in this document in his report on work in the countryside presented at the Eighth Party Congress; on 1 May he had a talk with V. M. Zagorskiy, secretary of the Moscow Party Committee, and a group of party workers from the Blagushche-Lefortovskiy Rayon in Moscow; he studied the report submitted by P. F. Barnyakov, secretary of the Sibirskaya Oblast RKP(b) committee on the Second All-Siberian Party Conference, held in March; by the end of August he read and corrected a draft Central Committee telegram to the Permskaya, Yekaterinburgskaya, and Ufimskaya Guberniya party committees on reinforcing with cadres the organizations and establishments in areas liberated from Kolchak; by the end of October he talked with the chairman of the Orenburgskaya Guberniya committee of the RKP(b) I. A. Akulov on the food situation in the guberniya and on the possibility for oil extraction in Turgayskaya Oblast. He was interested in the political feelings of the Orenburg Cossacks. A number of such facts describing the daily attention which the leader of the party paid to the local party organizations may be found in this volume (see pp 22, 91, 522, 590, and others).

During that period Lenin chaired 56 sessions of the Council of People's Commissars and 54 sessions of the Defense Council at which over 1800 problems were considered pertaining to a number of important aspects of the country's life: defense, economy, food situation, finances, administration and improvements in the state apparatus, selection and placement of cadres, labor organizations and so on. Naturally, a brief survey cannot provide an expanded description of the work of the superior authorities of the Soviet state at that time. Suffice it to refer the reader to pages describing in great detail, using archive materials, Sovnarkom sessions held on 27 March (pp 23-25) or 8 July (pp 361-363), or Defense Council sessions held on 7 April (pp 56-57) or 1 October (pp 538-540), to see the principle and attentive approach taken by Vladimir Il'ich to the organization of the work of the Sovnarkom and Defense Council he headed, his thorough formulation of the agenda for the sessions, and his notes and remarks on decisions passed, some of which he immediately signed, or his correspondence with officials on urgent matters during sessions. The study of all such materials not only intensifies our knowledge on the history of our homeland and adds to it previously unknown details but enables us, again and again, to see the Leninist style of work, always distinguished by work on several levels, efficiency, operativeness, exactingness and party principle-mindedness.

Guiding the central authorities of the party and the state, Lenin also personally and permanently controlled the defense of the country. He maintained thousands of connections with the fronts and the active party. He systematically received war information and was in constant touch with the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic, and the general and front headquarters, guiding and coordinating their efforts. Vladimir Il'ich could deal with the most complex problems of military science and strategy. At any given moment he was able to direct the attention of the party and the people to the decisive sectors of the front, and mobilize all available forces to gain victory. The materials included in the volume give a clear idea of Lenin's role in organizing the defeat of Kolchak, Denikin, and Yudenich, and of the intervention forces, in suppressing counterrevolutionary mutinies, and organizing the guerrilla movement behind enemy lines.

Let us consider a few of them. On 11 April 1919 Lenin called upon the party, the working class, and all working people in the country to focus all their forces on Kolchak's defeat. "We must stress all our forces," he wrote, "and develop our revolutionary energy, and Kolchak will be defeated quickly. The Volga, the Urals and Siberia can and must be defended and reconquered" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 38, p 274). Toward the end of April the Red Army launched a decisive counteroffensive on the eastern front and dealt crushing blows at the enemy who retreated to the east. At that time, as chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council, Trotskiy suggested to the front command to halt its offensive. This would have enabled Kolchak to stabilize the front and rebuild his army. It was only Lenin's firm intervention that prevented the implementation of such a fatal design. Vladimir Il'ich called upon the workers, peasants and Red Army forces to continue their offensive on the eastern front and to rally all their forces for victory over the enemy. Toward the end of the summer the danger represented by Kolchak was no longer the biggest. A threatening situation developed in the summer of 1919 on the Petrograd front as a result of Yudenich's offensive. On Lenin's suggestion the RKP(b) Central Committee considered at that time the Petrograd front as "most important" and the defense of Petrograd was placed under the direct control of the Defense Council. On 20 May Lenin issued an instruction to the Republic Revolutionary Military Council on the measures to be adopted to strengthen the Petrograd Front; the same day he sent a telegram to the special representative of the RKP(b) Central Committee and the Defense Council in Petrograd, J. V. Stalin, to send reinforcements to help the city threatened by the menace, and expressed the hope that the complete mobilization of the Petrograd people will result in the front offensive (p 210). On 9 July he suggested E. M. Sklyanskiy, deputy chairman of the Republic Revolutionary Military Council, to transfer immediately troops from Arkhangel'sk and the eastern front to the aid of Petrograd; he ordered S. D. Markov, deputy people's commissar of railroads, to direct to the Petrograd front 11 combat echelons from Kazan' and 11 echelons from Yekaterinburg (p 275). These and other facts cited in the volume prove that the measures of the urgent aid rendered by the center and the mobilization of all the forces of the Petrograd workers for the defense of the city were effective. The enemy was stopped and dealt crushing blows. By August Yudenich's forces had been thrown back to Estonia.

Equally numerous and historically very valuable are the documents proving Lenin's guidance of the defeat of Denikin's hordes which had accomplished the deepest penetration within the country. During the most strenuous days of the extremely aggravated situation on the southern front (September-October 1919) he regularly studied the operative reports received from the front and the plans for the disposition of the individual troop units on the southern front and was in touch by telephone with the Republic Revolutionary Military Council and the front command. Recalling this period, Commander-in-Chief S. S. Kamenev wrote: "Every day Vladimir Il'ich received reports and, frequently, on his demand written reports were submitted by the staff of the Republic Revolutionary Military Council" (p 532). All these documents were marked "secret," "for Comrade Lenin personally," and "urgent."

Referring to archive data the volume describes in detail the 15 October 1919 Politburo session at which most important measures of a military-political and strategic nature were earmarked and at which the following decision was made: Tula and Moscow and the approaches to them will not be surrendered; Petrograd will not be surrendered;¹ a maximal number of people to be taken from the White Sea Front for the defense of the Petrograd area; Petrograd to be assisted by sending some cavalry; review, once again, of the question of possible help from the other fronts to reinforce the southern front. At that session Vladimir Il'ich was elected to a commission instructed to provide a detailed elaboration of and implement a number of specific measures aimed at assisting the forces holding back Denikin's pressure, including the following: removing from public work in the center and locally the maximum number of party members and sympathizers, formulating a plan for the mobilization of volunteers for the defense of Tula, and adopting energetic measures to improve political work in the five divisions raised in the Moscow sector by assigning to them the best Moscow workers and speakers (pp 568-569).

At that time V. I. Lenin called upon the workers and Red Army men to fight to their last drop of blood, hold on to every inch of land, and be firm to the end. He expressed his firm confidence in victory. Victory came! On 20 October he received a telegram from G. K. Ordzhonikidze, member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the 14th Army on the Southern Front reporting the seizure of Orel (p 585); no later than 24 October he was informed that the Red Army had captured Detskoye Selo on the Petrograd Front (p 586). On 25 October (after 7:38 p.m.) he received a telegram from the Southern Front command reporting that in the battles for Voronezh Budenny's cavalry had defeated the White Guard cavalry corps commanded by Shkuro and Mamontov (pp 599-600). The Red Army was achieving decisive successes on all front!

¹At that time General Yudenich had launched a new offensive on Petrograd and had come closer to the city,

In the spring, summer and autumn of 1919 Lenin's activities were clearly characterized also by his addresses to various congresses, conferences, and meetings of workers and Red Army men; over 40 such addresses are included. In them Vladimir Il'ich explained the policy of the party and the state, discussed frankly the difficult situation developing at the fronts and in the rear, and appealed to the masses for self-sacrifice, firmness and discipline. After hearing Lenin talk at the building of the Bryansk (now Kiev) railway station in Moscow, addressing the workers departing for the southern parts of the country to set up sovkhozes, N. G. Poletayev subsequently wrote that the speaker "did not try to ingratiate himself with the hungry people but spoke without any affected pity, sternly and simply" about the developing difficulties; in the course of the speech he, Poletayev, "saw tears on the pale and suffering faces of the workers and realized that these people will go anywhere this short man wearing a cap, strong as a rock, would send" (p 251).

Guiding the defense of the country and elaborating the strategic and tactical plans for the defeat of the enemy armies and carrying them out, Lenin paid tremendous attention also to the solution of the food problem and the organization of the supply of the army and the workers with bread above all. He explained that "the Red Army cannot be strong without substantial state grain reserves, for without this the army can neither be freely moved nor trained properly. Without this we cannot maintain the workers working for the army" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 39, p 153). The reader will find hundreds of examples showing Vladimir Il'ich's concern for grain procurements and grain traffic schedules, proper distribution of food and its norming, and so on. He submitted such problems for discussion at Sovnarkom and Defense Council sessions. He sent senior personnel to the decisive grain procurement sectors, sent telegrams, demanded of guberniya and uyezd party and soviet authorities the prompt harvesting of the crop, and was merciless toward speculators, carpetbaggers, and kulaks (pp 5, 115, 135, 206, 254, 377, 404, 496, and others).

Under Lenin's guidance the Bolshevik Party also resolved complex problems of industrial work. Despite the wreckage, the seizure of important economic areas by the enemy, and the shortage of raw materials, manpower and specialists, it found the ways and means to organize a war industry so that the Red Army was able to receive the armaments, ammunition and fittings it needed. Along with daily and current problems of organization of the work of war plants such as that of Tula (pp 48, 85, 147, 231, and 469), Lenin systematically watched the condition and development of entire economic sectors and regions. This is adequately shown in the materials of Vol 7.

Thus on 12 April he received a telegram on the difficult situation in the Donetsk Basin and wrote his decision that this problem be discussed at the Sovnarkom session. The item was indeed included in the agenda of the cabinet meeting held the same day (pp 75, 77). Several days later Vladimir Il'ich asked for a brief report on the construction of the Volkhovskaya, Kashirskaya, Svirskaya, and Shaturskaya Electric Powerplants; on 22 April he received this report written by A. V. Vinter (p 112). He included in the agenda of the 24 July Sovnarkom session the question of measures

related to the metallurgical industry in the Urals (p 405). At the beginning of October he talked with I. M. Gubkin, chairman of the Main Administration of the Shale Industry on the prospecting of petroleum deposits, particularly of oil deposits 70 versts west of Orenburg and spoke of the need for oil prospecting in Kazanskaya, Sanarskaya and Ufinskaya Guberniyas (p 552). These, like many other documents, including those related to the organization of transportation, communications, finances, and supplies to agriculture of the necessary tools and machinery proved the tremendous concern which the party, the state and Lenin devoted to the development of the country's economy and to subordinating its entire operations to defense requirements.

Naturally, Vladimir Il'ich was concerned with more than the current requirements of the national economy. He carefully looked at life, at the occurring social processes, and at the changing attitude of workers and peasants toward labor, public ownership, and the state. He sensitively detected everything new, progressive and promising. His brilliant perception as a Marxist theoretician enabled him to see that the first subbotnik, held on 12 April by the workers of the Moscow Marshaling Yard Depot of the Moscow-Kazan' railroad, and the other subbotniks which followed them were events of tremendous historical importance. In the pamphlet "The Great Initiative," completed on 28 June, Lenin described the subbotniks as "the factual beginning of communism," for this was a "victory over one's own sluggishness, slackness, and petit bourgeois egotism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 39, pp 5, 22). He proved that the tremendous importance of the subbotniks was that it developed in the workers a communist attitude toward labor, marking their transition to a new conscious discipline and higher labor productivity. It was precisely this that he considered as the most important and main factor in the victory of the new social system.

As always, during that period Lenin's theoretical activities were quite fruitful. On 11 July and 29 August he delivered two lectures on the state at the Communist University imeni Ya. M. Sverdlov (unfortunately, the record of the second has not been found), published the pamphlet "Successes and Difficulties of the Soviet System," wrote a plan and summary for a pamphlet on the dictatorship of the proletariat and an article (incomplete) on "Economics and Politics in the Epoch of Proletarian Dictatorship."

In all these works Vladimir Il'ich summed up the nearly two-year-old experience of the post-October period. He elaborated a number of most important problems of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, developed the Marxist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and proved its constructive role in the building and consolidation of the new society and in the establishment and the development of socialist democracy as a higher and more advanced democracy compared with bourgeois democracy. Describing the petit bourgeois concept of the transition to socialism through democracy "in general," typical of the representatives of the Second International, as an infinite theoretical absurdity, in his article "Economics and Politics in the Epoch of Proletarian Dictatorship" Vladimir Il'ich wrote: "General statements on freedom, equality, and democracy are in fact

the equivalent of a blind repetition of concepts and a duplication of market production relations... From the proletarian viewpoint the question may be formulated only as follows: freedom from oppression for which class? Equality among which classes? Democracy based on private ownership or on the struggle for the abolition of private ownership?, and so on" ("Poln. Sochr. Soch.," Vol 39, p 281).

In all of his theoretical works written in 1919, Lenin invariably emphasized the international nature of the experience of the Soviet system. He tried to share the experience more extensively with the working people of the capitalist countries. At the same time, he carefully watched the development of revolutionary events in the west, events which had developed under the direct impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, and the process of the establishment and strengthening of communist parties, greatly intensified following the establishment of the Third Communist International. He displayed great interest in the course of revolutionary events in Bavaria and Hungary and welcomed the news of the establishment of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. On 22 March, on behalf of the Eighth Congress of the RKP(b) Lenin cabled greetings to the government of Soviet Hungary; on 8 April he sent a radiogram to Bela Kun with a request for detailed information on the Bavarian revolution and the program of the government of the Bavarian Soviet Republic. On 27 April he addressed a greeting to that republic and on 27 May he wrote the article "Greetings to the Hungarian Workers," appealing to them to display firmness in the only legitimate, just, and truly revolutionary war waged against the exploiters and for the victory of socialism.

The volume describes extensively the meetings between Vladimir Il'ich and representatives of the communist parties and other foreign progressive organizations (pp 37, 174, 397, 514, and others), and his extensive knowledge of the situation of foreign fraternal parties. On 5 July, for example, he received a telegram that the 22nd Congress of the Bulgarian Workers Social Democratic Party (leftwing socialist) had proclaimed itself the first congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party (leftwing socialist); soon afterwards he received the "Program Declaration of the Bulgarian Communist Party." After 11 July he received a letter from the representative of the Polish Communist Workers Party on the internal situation in the country, the workers' movement, and the status of the party's work. He showed concern for the unity among fraternal parties, unity based on principle, on surmounting opportunistic currents and correcting errors arising as a result of the lack of understanding displayed by some leaders of the communist movement of their tasks and of the forms of struggle against the bourgeoisie. On 28 October he sent a letter to "Comrade (Lorio) and all French friends who have joined the Third International," discussing the need for a firm struggle against all opportunism. The same date he addressed a "letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany on the subject of the division," in which he expressed his concern about the split within the Communist Party of Germany and expressed his belief in the possibility to restore its unity (p 606). In all his talks and meetings with representatives of communist parties, and in his letters to them he issued advice

and recommendations on the organization of party work and expressed his satisfaction that "throughout the world the communist movement is growing very well -- slower than we would like it but broad, powerful, deep and invincible" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 39, p 254).

In the most complex conditions of 1919, in circumstances of a mortal clash with the domestic and foreign class enemies, the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Government continued to pursue an energetic peaceful foreign policy -- a policy of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems. The materials in the volume enable us to see properly this aspect of Vladimir Il'ich's activities as well. The reader will see the way Lenin participated in talks on strengthening friendship with Afghanistan, which were concluded with the establishment of implementing relations with that country (see pp 174, 181, 217, and 233), and the steps taken to make peace with the bourgeois governments of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Finland (see pp 353, 489, 495, 590, and others). Despite the openly hostile attitude displayed toward the Soviet Republic by the imperialist countries, Lenin tirelessly struggled for the policy of peace, but of a sincere peace, based on the recognition of the independence and sovereignty of the state. Characteristic in this respect was his letter to G. V. Chicherin and M. M. Litvinov, dated 6 May, related to the planned answer to Fridtjof Nansen, regarding his suggestion of supplying Russia with food with the stipulation that military activities on the civil war fronts would be terminated, yet providing no clear indications that this prerequisite would be binding to the countries pursuing a policy of intervention against Soviet Russia. On this occasion Vladimir Il'ich wrote: "If an armistice is for the sake of peace... we are in favor...; if the armistice is not for peace but for the purposes of the political game, we do not want it. One does not joke with peace. No one will be able to swindle us" (p 168). The thought of the readiness to live in peace with other countries, including the United States, was expressed in his answer to the correspondent of the American newspaper THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS, I. Levin, on 5 October: "Our policy of peace remains unchanged...on occasions we have officially proposed peace to the Entente... We firmly favor economic agreements with America -- with all countries but particularly with America" (p 547). The active diplomatic efforts of the Soviet state and its policy of equality among big and small countries and nations increased the sympathy which the working people and the progressive forces the world over felt for the Soviet republic, increased their opposition to the participation of the capitalist states in the anti-Soviet intervention, and contributed to the victory of the Red Army.

Numerous interesting facts may be found in this volume reflecting Lenin's constant attention to the development of the socialist culture and, above all, of public education, science, literature, the arts, and book publishing and library work, and his thoughtful attitude toward noted representatives of the creative intelligentsia, including M. Gor'kiy (see pp 98, 121, 168, 390, 418, 506, 595, and others). A number of materials describe Vladimir Il'ich's constant concern with the working people and, particularly,

their children (pp 32, 185, 285, 475, and others), as well as his friends and relatives. Information is also found on his short days and hours of recreation, frequently used for further work for the state, scientific work, and meetings and talks with workers and peasants.

All the materials, documents and facts included in this seventh volume of the biographic chronicle are a new and important contribution to the study of Lenin's life and activities, of the foreign and domestic policies of the Communist Party and Soviet State, and their struggle for the defense and consolidation of the gains of the Great October Revolution, whose solemn celebration the Soviet people, and all the fighters for peace, democracy and social justice on our planet are preparing to observe.

5003

CSO: 1802

WHERE ISKRA WAS CREATED

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 pp 125-126

[Review by G. Obichkin, doctor of historical sciences, of the book "Lenin v Myunkhene" [Lenin in Munich]. Memorable Sites. By L. L. Murav'yeva and I. I. Sivolap-Kaftanova. Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 207 pages.]

[Text] A new book has been published on V. I. Lenin's life as an emigre -- "Lenin v Myunkhene." It resembles the works "Lenin v Zheneve" [Lenin in Geneva] and "Lenin v Berne i Tsyurike" [Lenin in Bern and Zurich]. This study is unquestionably of interest to the broad readership and, in particular, to those who are studying the history of the party and Vladimir Il'ich's life and activities.

The value of the book lies not only in the fact that it describes the areas related to Lenin's stay in Munich, although this alone required extensive and painstaking work, but more important, in the fact that the authors have introduced valuable new data covering the tremendous organizational and theoretical activities of the leader of the revolution during a very important period in the history of the Russian workers' movement. This was the period of the creation of ISKRA and the dissemination of the newspaper in Russia, from issues number 1 to 21, until the publication was moved to London. Lenin described this period as the most important in the building of the party (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 48, p 212).

V. I. Lenin arrived in Munich on 7 September 1900, and immediately began to make energetic preparations for the publication of ISKRA and the journal ZARYA. As the book adequately demonstrates, the main burden of this fell on Vladimir Il'ich's shoulders: discussions with publishers, finding a press, acquiring the type, and so on.

The first issue of ISKRA was printed at the G. Rau Press in Leipzig, to which Lenin traveled from Munich to organize all of the work.

The newspaper's epigraph "The Spark Will Kindle A Flame!" formulated as clearly and prophetically as possible its role in the development of the workers' movement in Russia and in the making of a proletarian party of a new type.

Issue No 1 carried Lenin's program article "The Vital Tasks of Our Movement." Concisely, it formulated the basic and truly vital tasks confronting the workers' movement in Russia. The article called for the "introduction of socialist ideas and political self-awareness in the mass of the proletariat and the organization of a revolutionary party inseparably linked with the spontaneous workers' movement" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 4, p 374).

The article ended with an ardent appeal expressing belief in victory: "We are confronted with an enemy fortress in all its strength, from which streams of shot and bullets are being poured upon us, taking away the best fighters. We must seize this fortress, and we shall seize it if we merge all the forces of the awakening proletariat with all the forces of the Russian revolutionaries in a single party, toward which everything living and honest in Russia will gravitate" (Ibid, pp 376-377).

Thanks to the heroic efforts of Vladimir Il'ich and his loyal fellow workers -- the ISKRA agents, such a party was created.

The editors convincingly prove that Lenin was the actual editor and manager of ISKRA. They describe the complex interrelationships among the editors, who included representatives of the "Liberation of Labor" group, and the difficulties which Vladimir Il'ich had to surmount in the course of his daily work. The authors cite the words of N. K. Krupskaya: "Each issue had to be literally nurtured... Vladimir Il'ich himself proofed the entire newspaper" (p 81).

At that time Lenin was engaged in tremendous political and theoretical work. While living in Munich, he wrote such works as "Persecutors of the Zemstvo and Hannibals of Liberalism," "What Is To Be Done?," and "The Agrarian Program of the Russian Social Democracy," as well as a large number of articles for ISKRA. It was in that period precisely that Vladimir Il'ich used the pseudonym N. Lenin for the first time, for the four chapters of the work "The Agrarian Problem and Marx's Critics," published in the journal ZARYA.

It was as of then that Lenin's name became the banner of the struggle waged by all mankind for peace, democracy, social progress, and socialism.

On Vladimir Il'ich's initiative, and with his direct participation, the ISKRA editors elaborated and published a draft party program. The newspaper played a basic role in the preparations for the Second RSDWP Congress.

Overcoming numerous obstacles and difficulties, ISKRA penetrated the broad worker masses of Russia. It was read with tremendous interest, often collectively. It was carefully preserved and secretly passed from hand to hand. Letters, articles, and communications were sent to the editors. Having read the article "What To Begin With?," together with his comrades,

a Petersburg worker wrote the ISKRA editors the following: "Last Sunday I gathered 11 people together and read "What To Begin With?" and we did not break up until nightfall. How true it all is and how logical..." (p 80).

ISKRA was a truly collective propagandist, collective agitator, and collective organizer, as Vladimir Il'ich described it. The newspaper did not limit its coverage to the situation in Russia. It included a great deal of information on international events and the world workers' movement.

The authors describe in detail the fraternal help received by the Russian revolutionaries in the publication of ISKRA from such noted leaders of the German and international workers' movement as K. Tsetkin, A. Braun, I. Dietz, and Yu. Markhlevskiy. The printing workers in Leipzig, Munich, and Stuttgart did everything possible to ensure that ISKRA and the other publications of the RSDWP would be printed without delay. In many German cities secret meeting places and centers for the shipping of ISKRA, letters, and publications were arranged with the help of the German Social Democratic Party. All of this was a manifestation of the fraternal solidarity of the German workers with the revolutionary movement in Russia.

The title of the book is "Lenin in Munich." However, the authors have not limited themselves to a description of memorable Leninist sites in that city alone. They describe other German cities, such as Nuremberg, Leipzig, Stuttgart, Cologne, and Berlin which were visited by Vladimir Il'ich.

The section describing Lenin's participation in the International Congress of the Second International, held in Stuttgart in 1907, is of unquestionable interest. Together with R. Luxemburg, Lenin introduced amendments to the resolution at the congress, which were accepted. These amendments were essential and were for the purpose of the defense of proletarian solidarity. During the congress, Vladimir Il'ich met with A. Bebel, K. Tsetkin, R. Luxemburg, and other noted leaders, and held conferences with them. Subsequently, K. Tsetkin wrote the following about Lenin's activities at the congress: "It seemed that nothing worthy of attention could escape his sharp eyes and clear mind" (p 186).

The German working people revere the memorable Leninist sites. A museum has been created in the house in Leipzig where the first issue of ISKRA was printed; in that same city, a second museum has been established, on R. Luxemburg Street, in the building which housed the editorial and printing premises where the LEIPZIG PEOPLE'S NEWSPAPER -- the organ of the German Social Democrats -- was printed. Vladimir Il'ich visited the premises many times. Furthermore, memorial plaques have been placed in Leipzig and Berlin.

The authors have done a great deal of painstaking work. The book is based on a thorough study of Lenin's work and letters of that period and recollections of party leaders, Krupskaya above all, who did extensive

work as ISKRA secretary; the memoirs of foreign Social Democratic leaders of that time have been used. The authors have made extensive use of materials from the Central Party Archive of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism and its publications "Correspondence Between V. I. Lenin and ISKRA Editors and the Russian Social Democratic Organizations, 1900-1903," and "Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biographic Chronicle." The authors studied archives, address books, and library materials on the spot. All in all, they have been able to put together some 80 addresses related to Lenin's stay in Germany, many of them made more precise or determined for the first time. They visited all the addresses personally, which involved some difficulty, since after more than 70 years, and particularly since World War II, the appearance of German cities has changed considerably. The book includes a large number of photographs, many of them taken by the authors themselves.

We can say with full justification that a valuable new contribution to Leniniana has been made.

5003

CSO: 1802

FROM THE BOOK SHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 p 127

[List of books]

[Text] "Lenin ob Oktyabre. V. I. Lenin o Kharaktere, Dvizhushchikh Silakh i Bsemirno-Istoricheskom Znachenii Velikoy Oktyabrskoy Sotsialisticheskoy Revolyutsii" [Lenin on October. V. I. Lenin on the Nature, Motive Forces, and Universal Historical Significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution]. Collection compiled by T. V. Panchenko. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 143 pp.

"Lenin -- Tovarishch, Chelovek" [Lenin -- Comrade and Person]. Fourth expanded edition. Compiled by N. V. Bychkova and R. A. Lavrov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 318 pp.

"Sotsializm i Mir Nerazdelimyy" [Socialism and Peace are Indivisible]. Documents of the epoch. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 119 pp.

"Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biograficheskaya Khronika (1870-1924)" [Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biographical Chronicle (1870-1924)]. Vol 7. March-November 1919. By a collective of authors headed by G. N. Golikov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 700 pp.

"Leniniana." Bibliography of V. I. Lenin's works and publications on him, 1956-1967. Vol 3. "Literatura o Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti V. I. Lenina" [Publications on V. I. Lenin's Life and Activities]. Part 3, "Muzei V. I. Lenina" [V. I. Lenin Museums]. Historical sites related to V. I. Lenin's life and activities in the USSR and abroad. Auxiliary indexes. R. M. Savitskaya, scientific editor. Kniga, Moscow, 1977, 239 pp.

"Dekrety Sovetskoy Vlasti" [Decrees of the Soviet System]. Vol 8. April - May 1920. Edited by Yu. A. Akhapkin et al. Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 444 pp.

"Ob Ideologicheskoy Rabote KPSS" [On CPSU Ideological Work] Collection of documents. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 639 pp.

"KPSS o Formirovanii Novogo Cheloveka" [The CPSU on the Shaping of the New Man]. Collection of documents and materials (1965-1976). Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 456 pp.

"Ob Uchastii Trudyashchikhsya v Upravlenii Proizvodstvom" [On the Participation of the Working People in Production Management]. Compiled by N. I. Alekseyev and I. A. Ryazhskikh. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 318 pp.

"Materialy XXV S"yezda KPSS" [Materials of the 25th CPSU Congress]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 256 pp.

"Mir o XXV S"yezde KPSS" [The World on the 25th CPSU Congress]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 270 pp.

L. I. Brezhnev. "Bydayushchiysya Podvig Zashchitnikov Tuly" [The Outstanding Exploit of the Defenders of Tula]. Speech delivered at the ceremony of awarding the Gold Star Medal to the city-hero of Tula on 18 January 1977. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 16 pp.

L. I. Brezhnev. "Voprosy Upravleniya Ekonomikoy Razvitogo Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva" [Problems of Administering the Economy of the Developed Socialist Society]. Speeches, reports and addresses. Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 600 pp.

"Istoriya Kommunisticheskoy Partii Sovetskogo Soyuza" [History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union]. Fifth expanded edition. By a collective of authors headed by B. N. Ponomarev. Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 782 pp.

"Partiya i Velikiy Oktyabr" [The Party and the Great October]. Historiographic Essay. By a collective of authors headed by I. F. Petrov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 294 pp.

"Revolutsiya Izmenivshaya Mir. Slovo Progressivnykh Lyudey Mira o Velikoy Oktyabrskoy Sotsialisticheskoy Revolutsii" [A Revolution Which Changed the World. Statements by Progressive People Throughout the World on the Great October Socialist Revolution]. Compiled by T. F. Kuz'mina, A. P. Nenarokov, and Ye. D. Orekhova. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 334 pp.

Anikeyev, V. V. "Dokumenty Velikogo Oktyabrya" [Documents of the Great October]. Historiographic Essay. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 239 pp.

"Istoriya Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny. 1939-1945" [History of World War Two. 1939-1945]. In 12 volumes. Chief Editorial Commission, A. A. Grechko, chairman. Vol 7. "Zaversheniye Korennogo Pereloma v Voynе" [Completion of the Radical Turn in the War]. Voenizdat, Moscow, 1976, 551 pp.

"Slavnyy Syn Kommunisticheskoy Partii i Sovetskogo Naroda" [Great Son of the Communist Party and Soviet People]. On the occasion of the 70th birthday of Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 336 pp.

"Pozdravleniya i Privetstviya v Svyazi s Semidesyatiletiyem General'nogo Skretarya TsK KPSS Tov. Brezhneva L. I." [Congratulations and Greetings on the Occasion of the Seventieth Birthday of L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU CC General Secretary]. Pravda, 1977, 719 pp.

"XXV S'yezd KPSS i Zadachi Kafedr Obshchestvennykh Nauk" [The 25th CPSU Congress and the Tasks of the Social Sciences]. Materials of the all-union conference of heads of social science chairs of higher educational institutions, held in Moscow on 21-23 September 1976. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 142 pp.

"Kommunist" [Communist]. Callendar-Reference for 1977. Compiled by N. M. Kozhanov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 304 pp.

SPRAVOCHNIK PARTIYNOGO RABOTNIKA, No 12. Editors; K. M. Bogolyubov et al. Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 486 pp.

"Spravochnik Propagandista" [Propagandist's Reference Book]. Compiled by A. M. Rusakovich. M. A. Morozov, editor-in-chief. Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 224 pp.

"Problemy Kommunisticheskogo Dvizheniya" [Problems of the Communist Movement]. Yearbook. "1976. Proletarskiy Internatsionalizm i Bor'ba za Ukrepleniye Yedinstva Mirovogo Kommunisticheskogo Dvizheniya" [1976. Proletarian Internationalism and the Struggle for Strengthening the World Communist Movement]. N. V. Matkovskiy, editor-in-chief. Mysl', Moscow, 1977, 347 pp.

"XI S'yezd Bolgarskoy Kommunisticheskoy Partii" [Eleventh Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party]. Sofia, 29 March - 2 April 1976. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 215 pp.

"XVII S'yezd Mongol'skoy Narodno-Revolutsionnoy Partii" [Seventeenth Congress of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party]. Ulan Bator, 14-18 June 1976. Basic Materials and Documents. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 115 pp.

V. A. Bogorad and R. F. Matveyev. "Rabota Kommunistov Kapitalisticheskikh Stran v Massakh" [Work of the Communists in the Capitalist Countries Among the Masses]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 479 pp.

V. M. Khvostov. "Problemy Istorii Vneshney Politiki SSSR i Mezhdunarodnykh Otnosheniy" [Problems of the History of USSR Foreign Policy and International Relations]. Selected Works. Nauka, Moscow, 1976, 543 pp.

5003

CSO: 1802

STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN HIGHER PARTY SCHOOLS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 77 p 128

[Text] The enrollment of students in the CPSU Central Committee Higher Party School, the republic and inter-oblast higher party schools, and the CPSU Central Committee Correspondence Higher Party School is hereby announced.

Students will be accepted by the higher party schools on the recommendation of central committees of union republics and party kraykoms and obkoms.

The CPSU Central Committee Higher Party School shall accept leading personnel of party and soviet organs and ideological institutions with higher education and not over 40 years old.

The following may enroll in republic and inter-oblast higher party schools:

Two-year departments: party, soviet, and Komsomol workers and journalists with higher education, not over 40 years old;

Four-year departments: party, soviet, and Komsomol workers and journalists, and party committee members with secondary education, not over 35 years old.

The following may enroll in the CPSU Central Committee Correspondence Higher Party School: Three-year department: CPSU members with higher education, senior workers in party, soviet, and Komsomol organs and journalists; Five-year department: CPSU members with secondary education, not over 40 years old who are party, soviet, or Komsomol workers or journalists.

By no later than 10 May 1977 the central committees of union republics and the party kraykoms and obkoms must issue to those recommended for higher party school enrollment an excerpt from the bureau's decree, a character reference, and the necessary documents.

Those recommended for enrollment in the CPSU Central Committee Higher Party School and the two-year departments of republic and inter-oblast higher party schools shall be invited by the schools for a talk; those enrolling in the four-year departments of higher party schools shall be summoned for entrance examinations on the foundations of Marxism-Leninism (based on the middle party education level), Russian language (composition), and USSR history, secondary school level. Such examinations for the CPSU Central Committee Correspondence Higher Party school (five-year department) shall be offered during the same period at the respective departments and consultation centers of the Correspondence Higher Party School. The talks and examinations shall take place from 20 May to 20 June 1977. A two-week paid leave shall be granted for preparations for and taking of entrance examinations.

Classes at the higher party schools shall begin on 1 September.

The editors express their warm gratitude to Comrade Anatoliy Andreyevich Bichukov, CPSU member and RSFSR deserving artist, for the gift of his work -- a sculpture of V. I. Lenin -- to KOMMUNIST.

COYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo PRAVDA. KOMMUNIST, 1977

5003

CSO: 1802

- END -