

JPRS 69610

16 August 1977

U S S R

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 8, JUNE 1977

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20000329 136

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

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 69610	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST No. 8, June 1977		5. Report Date 16 August 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	21. No. of Pages 164
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price CA 08

16 August 1977

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 8, June 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
Anthem of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (S. Mikhalkov, G. El'Registan)	1
Election of L. I. Brezhnev as Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium	2
L. I. Brezhnev Speech at the 17 June 1977 USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Session	5
Answers by L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary, to Questions Posed by S. Hata, Editor in Chief of the Newspaper 'ASAHI'	10
L. I. Brezhnev's Answers to Questions Posed by the French Newspaper 'LE MONDE'	18
October Revolution and National-Liberation Movement (G. Aliyev)	25
Reduction of Manual Labor--Important Factor in the Rational Utilization of Labor Resources (L. Danilov)	43
Course Toward the Qualitative Reorganization of Agricultural Output (S. Sdobnov)	57
Watchful Watch (V. Gaponenko)	70
Post Number One (Rasul Gamzatov)	82

CONTENTS (Continued)	Page
Labor--Creativity (S. Trofimchuk)	88
We Shall Gain More Strength (N. Artemenko)	94
Bourgeois Dictatorship and Struggle for Democracy (V. Shekhonin)	97
Along Worn-Out Tracks (O. Borisov)	109
Higher Political Education Within the Party Educational System (A. Aver'yanov)	120
Bourgeois and Socialist Constitutions (A. Mishin)	122
Leninist Style--A Priceless Party Property (N. Lyaporov)	130
Scientific and Technical Progress and Social Production Effectiveness (V. Kamayev)	136
Art and Party Ideological Work (A. Mikhaylova)	141
Traditions of Combat Revolutionary Friendship (I. Lippay, N. Rakovskaya)	146
Facts Opposing Fabrications (S. Golyakov)	149
Brief Review of Books	153

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No 9,
Jun 1977

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo PRAVDA

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : Jun 1977

Signed to press : 23 Jun 77

Copies : 984,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo PRAVDA, KOMMUNIST, 1977

ANTHEM OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 p 3

[Anthem of the USSR ratified by USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Ukase dated 27 May 1977. Lyrics by S. Mikhalkov and G. El'Registan. Music by A. V. Aleksandrov.]

[Text] Unbreakable union of free republics
Uniting forever the Great Russia.
Long live the united and powerful Soviet Union
created by the will of the peoples!

Glorified be our free fatherland,
Reliable bulwark of the friendship among peoples!
Lenin's party--the strength of the people
Leads us to the triumph of communism!

The sun of freedom shone on us through storms
And the great Lenin illuminated our path:
He led the peoples to the right cause,
He inspired us to labor and exploits!

Glorified be, etc.

In the victory of the immortal ideas of communism
We see the future of our country,
And to the red banner of the great fatherland
We shall always remain utterly loyal!

Glorified be, etc.

5003

CSO: 1802

ELECTION OF L. I. BREZHNEV AS CHAIRMAN OF THE USSR SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDIUM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 4-6

[Sixth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Ninth Convocation; USSR Supreme Soviet Decree on the Election of L. I. Brezhnev as Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics decrees:

The election of Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev as Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Deputy Chariman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet: S. Niyazbekov.

Secretary of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet: M. Georgadze.

Moscow, the Kremlin, 16 June 1977.

Address by Comrade M. A. Suslov

Comrade Deputies!

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the Councils of Elders of the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet submit for your consideration the motion on the election of Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, as chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. (Stormy and lengthy applause. All rise.)

With total unanimity, the Central Committee plenum held on 24 May deemed it expedient for the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, to hold the position of chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet as well. The comrades who spoke at the Central Committee plenum comprehensively substantiated the correctness of this decision.

The whole of our party and Soviet people know Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev as an outstanding leader of our party, Soviet state, and international communist and workers movements.

Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev has dedicated his entire life, his outstanding talent as an organizer, farsighted politician, and Leninist-type leader to selfless service to the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia, and to constant concern with improvement of the life of the people and the great cause of the building of communism. Leonid Il'ich enjoys the boundless trust and love of our party and the Soviet people. (Lengthy applause.)

Leonid Il'ich has earned tremendous prestige and respect from all the honest people on earth by his tireless struggle for detente and for a lasting peace and social progress. He worthily represents our party, the entire Soviet people, and the great socialist state in the world arena. It is noteworthy that L. I. Brezhnev's signatures are found on international documents of vital importance not only to our country, but to detente and to strengthening the cause of peace. (Lengthy applause.)

The increased leading and guiding role of the communist party in the entire life of the country, the domestic and foreign political activities of the Soviet state and the outstanding personal qualities and selfless work done by Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev for the good of the homeland led naturally to the fact that for a number of years Comrade Brezhnev has in fact acted, in the eyes of our people and the entire world, as the most authoritative representative of the Communist Party and the Soviet socialist state. (Lengthy applause.)

The election of Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, to the position of chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet is consistent with the supreme interests of the Soviet society and state and will contribute to the achievement of new successes in the implementation of the historical decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and in the building of communism. (Lengthy applause.)

Allow me, comrade deputies, to submit for your consideration the following draft decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

"The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics decrees:

"The election of Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev as chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet." (Stormy and lengthy applause.)

Address by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev

Comrade Deputies!

I would like above all to express my profound gratitude to you, as representatives of the Soviet people in the supreme organ of our state, for

the great trust voted to me: my second appointment as chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. (Lengthy applause.)

The implementation of the related high and responsible state duties, along with the duties of general secretary of our party's Central Committee, is, naturally, no easy task. However, the will of the party, the will of the Soviet people, and the interests of our socialist fatherland have always been to me the supreme law to which I have subordinated and am subordinating my entire life. (Lengthy applause.)

Now as well, in accepting this new assignment of the homeland, I wish to assure you, dear Comrades, that I shall try to be worthy of the people's trust. (Lengthy applause.) I assure you that I shall dedicate all my strength to achieving the great objectives which the party and the people have set for themselves along the historical path leading to communism. (Lengthy applause.) I shall do everything in my power so that our beloved country may strengthen and prosper, so that the life of the Soviet people may become ever better, so that peace on earth may be strengthened, and so that good cooperation among the peoples may be developed. (Lengthy applause.)

Once again, Comrades, thank you very much. (Stormy and lengthy applause. All rise.)

5003

CS0: 1802

L. I. BREZHNEV SPEECH AT THE 17 JUNE 1977 USSR SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDIUM SESSION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 7-10

[Text] Before undertaking a consideration of the problems on the agenda, I would like to say a few words on the work of the Supreme Soviet and its Presidium, mainly in connection with the latest decisions of the May CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the priority problems we must resolve in the immediate future.

Above all, I would like to thank the party's Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, all deputies, and you, the members of the Supreme Soviet Presidium once again for the great trust given to me.

The position of chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium is an exceptionally responsible one. It is here, in the Presidium, that all the threads in the Soviet system come together, starting with the more than 50,000 soviets. This is the place to which thousands and thousands of people address themselves on a wide variety of problems.

Comrades, you are naturally well aware that the decision of the May plenum of our party's Central Committee on combining the positions of CPSU Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium was not by any means a formal act. The plenum decision has a deep political meaning.

It is above all a manifestation of the constantly growing leading role of the Communist Party, which is the nucleus of our entire political system, and of all the organizations of the working people, both governmental and public. Acting within the framework of the Soviet Constitution, the CPSU, as a ruling party, has formulated and will formulate the political line for the solution of all main problems in state life.

The May plenum decision also reflected the practice of our daily work, in the course of which many members of the Central Committee Politburo must directly conduct governmental affairs, both at home and abroad. As Central Committee general secretary, I too, in particular and as you know, have had to represent our country in intergovernmental relations, and in talks on

cardinal problems of strengthening the peace and insuring the security of the peoples, often including the occasions on which I acted in accordance with your instructions. Now this practice has been made official on a logical basis. Realizing all this, I have a clear idea of the great additional responsibility entrusted to me by the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Frankly stated, this is no easy matter. Here again I rely on your help and your understanding and support.

I have already had the opportunity to occupy the post of chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. I have been a member of the Presidium for many years and have reached the firm conclusion that the strength of this organ lies in our united and harmonious work. The principle of collective management promoted by our party and state must be manifested here with maximal fullness.

Yet any party or state organ works well only when each of its members, every worker, using his full strength, dedicates himself totally to our public cause. I believe that all of you agree with this, Comrades.

Speaking of problems within the range of vision of the Supreme Soviet, it is dealing evermore frequently, while paying tireless attention to the development of legislation and consideration of the plan and the budget, with problems related to the state of affairs in various economic and cultural sectors, hearing reports submitted by the government on such matters. The Supreme Soviet session ending now proves this convincingly. The control exercised by the USSR Supreme Soviet over the administrative organs is becoming evermore purposeful and profound. As has already been noted at our party's congresses, the 30 permanent commissions, which include more than two-thirds of the deputies to the Supreme Soviet, are of exceptional importance in this respect.

Naturally, Comrades, in order to implement the decisions of our party on the further development of all aspects of the activities of the Supreme Soviet, the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium must become evermore energetic. We believe that such an active position and initiative-minded work on the part of the Supreme Soviet Presidium is particularly important now, with the adoption of the new USSR Constitution. It offers the Supreme Soviet even greater opportunities to improve its activities. You and I together must master such opportunities as fully and effectively as possible.

What do I have in mind?

I have in mind above all the fact that the new constitution will codify the all-embracing powers of the Supreme Soviet even more accurately. The Supreme Soviet has the right to consider and resolve any problem within the jurisdiction of the USSR.

A considerable share of this right is exercised by the Supreme Soviet Presidium. In this connection, the Presidium is the organizer of all of

the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet. This includes the activities and sessions of the permanent commissions, and the execution of obligations by the deputies in their electoral districts. Each of these forms of work by the supreme power organ of the country must be utilized, as the saying goes, to the fullest extent. This organ must serve the strengthening of the activities of the Supreme Soviet along all main directions even more effectively.

The new constitution will become the base for the further development of our legislative work. Suffice it to recall that the draft of the constitution itself lists some 10 laws which must be passed in the immediate future. They include major legislative acts such as the regulation on the Supreme Soviet, the law on the USSR Council of Ministers, laws on elections and people's control, and others.

However, I would like to direct your attention here to another aspect of the same problem. The more we develop Soviet legislation the greater our concern for its strict and inviolable implementation must be. There is an old saying to the effect that there is no point in writing laws if no one obeys them. Obviously, therefore, the Supreme Soviet, its Presidium and the permanent commissions must become even more active in exercising control over the way our laws are executed and the way the national economic plans and state budget approved by the Supreme Soviet are implemented.

The most important direction which, in accordance with the new constitution, will unquestionably be pursued in the activities of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium involves the guidance of the soviets of people's deputies.

The draft of the constitution emphasizes yet once again that all soviets -- supreme and local -- constitute a single system of state power organs and the political foundation of the state of the whole people.

The Communist Party has always operated on the premise that each one of our soviets is a part of the supreme authority, and it not only has the right to resolve all problems within its range of competence, but is the promoter of all-governmental decisions as well. This, Comrades, is an exceptionally important principle. Such a unity between the supreme and local organs, and the reliance of the supreme power on local initiative reflect the main essence of the soviets -- their unbreakable ties with the people's masses.

Now that the constitution will stipulate that the USSR shall establish common principles governing the organization and activities of republic and local power and administrative organs, the USSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium must greatly intensify their work in this direction.

V. I. Lenin frequently emphasized that "there is nothing more foolish than the conversion of the soviets into something frozen and self-sufficing." Indeed, Comrades, the soviets are a living and mobile organization of the

people which is constantly renovating itself. As in the past they were able to combine in a common channel the revolutionary movement of the masses and their efforts in the building of socialism, the work of the soviets today, under the conditions of mature socialism, must encompass even more fully the struggle to upgrade production effectiveness, to implement the broad social program set forth by the party, and to develop all aspects of our socialist democracy, i.e., to resolve the problems of the building of communism.

As is known, foreign policy problems play a very important role in the activities of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium.

The constant efforts of the Communist Party and the Soviet state are directed toward the consolidation of the peace, reduction of the threat of a new world war, restraining the arms race, and strengthening the positions of socialism and all the forces favoring freedom for the peoples and social progress and mutually profitable cooperation among all countries. These efforts are based on the resolve of our entire people and they are winning the support and understanding of millions of people of good will throughout the world.

The initial principles governing Soviet foreign policy have been clearly and accurately formulated in the draft of the new constitution. The USSR Supreme Soviet, its Presidium, the permanent commissions, and the deputies must make a great contribution to the implementation of these principles and to the development of contacts with foreign countries.

Now that our people are advancing toward the celebration of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, and the draft of the new fundamental law of the country is being discussed comprehensively, the active and creative participation of the Soviet people in the implementation of the plans earmarked by our Leninist party and the building of communism is particularly tangible.

The trust of the people in the party and the government imposes great obligations. It demands of all of us even better work and even greater attention to the increasing requirements of the Soviet people.

On 19 June, elections will be held throughout the country for the local soviets. Without a doubt, they will demonstrate yet once again the unity of our people and their monolithic solidarity with the communist party.

Therefore, the inclusion on the agenda for this session of the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the problem of the work of the soviets in two of our republics -- the Ukraine and Lithuania -- in organizing the nationwide discussion of the draft constitution is entirely legitimate.

At the conclusion of the session, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said:

I believe that the reports submitted by the comrades on the development of the nationwide discussion of the USSR Constitution in the Ukraine and the Lithuanian SSR show quite vividly the tremendous work done by the soviets and party organizations in connection with the discussion of the draft of the constitution and the materials of the May Central Committee Plenum. There is a great political and labor upsurge in the country in connection with the discussion of these documents.

Our information work must be well organized at all stages in the discussion of the draft constitution. I believe that the tasks I formulated in the report to the May Central Committee Plenum are quite clear and require no additional explanation. The essence is to develop everywhere now extensive organizational and mass-political work on the interpretation of these documents and decisions and the practical tasks confronting the country.

5003

CSO: 1802

ANSWERS BY L. I. BREZHNEV, CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE GENERAL SECRETARY, TO
QUESTIONS POSED BY S. HATA, EDITOR IN CHIEF OF THE NEWSPAPER ASAHI

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 11-17

[Text] Question: Sixty years have passed since the making of the October Revolution. In this connection, allow me to ask you for your assessment of the successes achieved during that time, and the further prospects for development in your country, including the question of competition with the capitalist system.

Answer: In the past 60 years, under the guidance of the Communist Party, the Soviet people have covered a distance of which we are justifiably proud. In the life of a single generation, backwardness dating back centuries has been ended. Our country has reached a high level of economic and scientific-technical development. Whereas prerevolutionary Russia accounted for only slightly more than 4 percent of the world's industrial output, the Soviet Union today accounts for one-fifth of that output.

Having set the building of a new society as our objective, we followed historically unknown paths. The type of difficulties we encountered was understandable. Today, however, a developed, a mature socialist society has been created in our country. What do we mean by this? Above all, the fact that the exploitation of man by man has been long since and forever eliminated in the Soviet Union, the fact that all its citizens have been guaranteed true freedom and real democracy, and that it is a society turned toward the future and confidently making its way toward it.

We consider it unnecessary to cite specific data to prove the continuing development of the national economy of the Soviet Union. Such data have been published by the press. I merely wish to emphasize that the supreme objective of our party is a constant upsurge in the economy and the material and cultural living standards of the Soviet people. This objective is being implemented.

We have full justification for viewing the future with optimism. As you perhaps know, the 25th CPSU Congress earmarked new levels to be reached. I will mention just one indicator. The fulfillment of the assignments of the 10th Five-Year Plan, which we have no doubt will be achieved, will

enable us to double the country's industrial potential by 1980, as compared with 1970.

Several days ago, the CPSU Central Committee Plenum approved, in its major aspects, the draft of the new constitution of the Soviet Union. It has been submitted for nationwide discussion. We believe that the adoption of the new constitution will be a major event, and not for our country alone, but winning broad international response as well.

Throughout the whole of the 60 years the Soviet Union has existed, our foreign political course has been oriented toward insuring peace and security for our country and for all nations. Today as in the past the initiatives of the Soviet Union in the international arena are directed toward removing the threat of war, restraining the arms race, and intensifying and broadening cooperation which would be useful to all countries. We intend to continue to pursue a policy of detente and to promote its extension to all parts of the globe. I believe that I am correct in saying that the dynamism of our foreign policy and its realistic and duly weighed nature, and our readiness to take into account the legitimate interests of others are acknowledged throughout the world, except, naturally, for the circles which deliberately represent this policy in a distorted fashion and mislead the public for evil purposes.

Now as to that part of your question relating to the competition between the two systems. Let me say first of all that since Lenin's day, we have systematically pursued the line of peaceful coexistence among countries belonging to different social systems and the resolution of disputes not in terms of the language of weapons, but around the conference table. As to the question of to whom the future belongs, we have a firm faith in the advantages of the socialist system.

Question: I would like to ask this question on behalf of the only nation in the world which has been the victim of nuclear weapons. What are the long-range prospects for nuclear disarmament and the talks with a view to limiting strategic armaments?

Answer: The Soviet Union remembers the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, when mankind saw for the first time what nuclear weapons mean. We share the feelings of the Japanese people on the subject of the unnecessary victims of the first atomic bombings.

Today the power of such weapons has increased by many times, and everyone agrees that the nuclear arms race threatens peace and security on our planet. It would seem that all countries should devote efforts to preventing the further proliferation of nuclear weapons, to ban testing of them, and in the final analyses, not only to put an end to the nuclear arms race, but to nuclear weapons themselves. This is precisely what the Soviet Union is trying to achieve. Our country has invariably favored a total ban on nuclear weapons ever since they first appeared. As is known, on the

initiative of the Soviet Union, the United Nations General Assembly passed a resolution in 1972 on the nonuse of force in international relations and on a simultaneous and permanent ban on the use of nuclear weapons. It is also known that the United Nations is currently considering the draft of a universal treaty on the nonuse of force in international relations, which was submitted by the Soviet Union and which calls for the abandonment by the nations of the use of many types of weapons, including nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, progress in the matter has been slow due to the negative attitude of certain countries. Let me state most clearly that the Soviet Union is ready to sit down at the conference table with all the other nuclear powers at any time, in order to jointly draft specific means of resolving the nuclear disarmament problem.

For the past several years, the Soviet Union has been holding talks with the United States on limiting strategic weapons. We believe that substantial results have been achieved. The talks are still continuing. They are based on the familiar Vladivostok agreement. We are striving toward the most rapid and effective conclusion of these talks. This would be possible, of course, if our partners ceased to seek unilateral advantages for themselves. We will not accept an agreement which would threaten the security of the Soviet Union or our allies.

Question: Considering the situation in Asia, one is aware that the Asian policy of the USSR is of great importance. What is your view on relations with the People's Republic of China, the future development of circumstances on the Korean peninsula, and the policy of Southeast Asian countries, including Vietnam?

Answer: Historically, economically, and geographically, our country has been and remains inseparably linked with the Asian continent. Naturally, we are greatly interested in strengthening the peace in this part of the globe. We believe that detente, which has become the dominant trend in world progress, should not bypass the Asian continent, where over half of mankind lives.

Following the historical victory of the Vietnamese people and the establishment of a large peaceful state -- the Socialist Republic of Vietnam -- and the settlement of the conflict in Southeast Asia and the withdrawal of the American forces from Indochina, it seems to us that, on the whole, more favorable prerequisites have developed for insuring lasting peace and security in Asia through the joint efforts of all the countries on that continent. The Soviet Union favors just such a development of events in Asia.

As to the Soviet-Chinese relations, our position is well known. We favor the normalization of intergovernmental relations with China. The resumption of truly good-neighborly relations between our countries would be of great importance not only to the USSR and the People's Republic of China, but to the improvement of international circumstances as a whole.

Whereas thus far, no changes for the better can be seen in Soviet-Chinese relations, the responsibility for this lies with the other party. Unfortunately, the new Chinese leadership is following the old, beaten track. It is a fact that a campaign of attacks on the policy of detente is being pursued, and every possible hindrance is being offered in the field of disarmament. Or we can consider the thesis of the struggle against "hegemony." Some may see no danger here. Yet are there not attempts to create discord among nations under cover of this thesis, or at least to prevent improvement in the relations between them? What is the purpose of all this? Does it not conceal objectives contrary to the interests of peace and cooperation? In any case, our view of this is quite clear, and Japan is familiar with it.

As to the circumstances on the Korean peninsula, we support the suggestion of the Korean People's Democratic Republic as to the withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea, and the creation of conditions favorable to the unification of the country on a peaceful democratic basis, with no outside interference whatsoever. We are not alone in this position. It is shared by the majority of UN members, to judge from the resolution passed by the UN General Assembly on the creation of favorable conditions for transforming the armistice in Korea into a lasting peace and accelerating the peaceful unification of Korea.

Question: What is your view on the problems of peace in the Middle East, the national-liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia and Africa, and the south-north problem?

Answer: For many years the Middle Eastern crisis, whether flaring up or dying down, has been one of the sources of international tension. Today no one challenges the urgent need for a peaceful settlement of it. In our view the current problem is to insure the resumption of the Geneva peace conference on the Middle East without any strings attached.

As to the essence of a Middle Eastern settlement, our viewpoint, briefly stated, is as follows: A truly lasting and a just peace can only be established in the Middle East on the basis of the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, and respect for the right of all countries and peoples in this area to an independent and secure life, including Israel and the Arab people of Palestine, and satisfaction of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine to create their own state.

The Soviet Union, for its part, is ready to do everything it can to bring such a peace closer.

Now as to the second part of your question. The whole world can see that a profound process of breakdown in the colonial heritage, the vestiges of national oppression and inequality and basically exploitive relations is gathering strength in Asia and Africa. These radical changes will probably continue. Why am I confident in saying this? Because these changes are based on the irrefutable desires of the peoples to achieve independent

development and national and social progress. It is well known that the Soviet Union has always supported and will support such legitimate aspirations.

You used the term south-north. Clearly, this should be understood in terms of the relations between developing countries, wherever they may be located in regard to the Equator, and the developed capitalist countries.

Our position on this matter is clear. The Soviet Union supports the demand of the developing countries for a reorganization of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis. This means, above all, that the process of eliminating colonialism must be extended to the economic area. It is necessary to put an end to oppression by multinational imperialist monopolies and the exploitation of the natural and manpower resources of the developing countries by the developed capitalist countries.

Question: During the visit paid by former Prime Minister Tanaka to the Soviet Union, it was acknowledged that the problem of the northern territories remained "unresolved" as a problem between Japan and the USSR. Does the position recently held by the Soviet Union on this matter represent a deviation from the agreement referred to?

Answer: We clearly recall the talks held with the Japanese leaders at that time. In our view, these were useful talks, in the course of which a broad range of problems in the reciprocal relations between our countries, among them a peace treaty between the USSR and Japan, were discussed. As you will recall, the joint Soviet-Japanese declaration of 10 October 1973 included an agreement to continue the talks with a view to the conclusion of a peace treaty. The Soviet Union is ready to complete this matter of importance to our country, providing, naturally, that no obviously unacceptable conditions are presented by the Japanese side. With a sober approach on the part of the Japanese to the realities which developed as a result of World War II, this could be accomplished, and accomplished rapidly.

It is known that as a rule, peace treaties cover a broad set of problems, including the problem of boundary lines. This would apply to a Soviet-Japanese peace treaty as well. To say that a certain "unresolved territorial problem" exists in the relations between our two countries would be a one-sided and erroneous interpretation.

Our position has been repeatedly formulated in talks with Japanese leaders and is well known. If we understand it correctly, Japan is not as yet ready to sign a peace treaty. Bearing this in mind, we have voiced the suggestion that without interrupting talks on a peace treaty, views could be exchanged and a treaty on good-neighborly relations could be concluded, which would cover areas in our relations which are already ripe for being placed on a solid contractual basis. In our view, this would create a sharp turn in the direction of surmounting the vestiges of mistrust and the reliable development of mutually profitable cooperation in all directions.

We have described our suggestion as a treaty on good-neighborly relations and cooperation. In the final analysis this is a matter of essence, rather than name. We are willing to consider the possible initiatives of the Japanese in this direction. It is important for such a bilateral state document to meet the purposes of establishing truly good relations between our countries, in the interests of the Soviet and Japanese peoples and of peace and security in the Far East and throughout the world.

Question: What do you think about Japanese-Soviet economic relations and, in particular, the question of fishing and cooperation in the development of Siberia?

Answer: On a number of occasions, I have had an opportunity to speak about the relatively good potential for the development of Japanese-Soviet trade and economic relations, including relations based on mutually profitable cooperation in the development of natural resources of the Far East and Siberia. Over the past 20 years, trade between our countries has increased by more than 70 times. In 1976, it exceeded 2 billion rubles. Japan has become one of the three major partners in USSR trade with developed capitalist countries.

There are reasons for hope for a further expansion of trade and it can be presumed that in the next 5 years, overall trade will exceed 10 billion rubles. This will be the purpose of the new 5-year trade and payments agreement which was recently signed in Tokyo. We believe that at the coming seventh conference of the Soviet-Japanese and Japanese-Soviet committees for economic cooperation, the further expansion of trade and mutually profitable economic cooperation could be discussed on a more specific level.

I recall with satisfaction the business talk held last August in the Crimea with a delegation representing the Federation of Economic Organizations of Japan and headed by its president, Mr. (Tosio Doko). At that time, we made a number of suggestions aimed at the further development of economic relations between the Soviet Union and Japan. In particular, we discussed a possible long-term 10-15 year economic cooperation program, mainly based on the more intensive use of the resources of Siberia and the Far East. We also discussed the expediency of concluding agreements between our countries on the principles of economic cooperation of the type of similar agreements reached between the USSR and Britain, France, Canada, and several other countries, which are already in effect and have proved their worth. Why couldn't the Soviet Union and Japan build their relations in this field on such a basis? I am confident that they could.

I would not want the readers of your newspaper to develop the impression that the Soviet Union is unable to develop the very rich resources of Siberia and the Far East through its own efforts. It is entirely obvious, as has been confirmed by the entire history of our state, that we have the full capability to cope with this task. We use cooperation with other countries only to accelerate the implementation of our plans for the development of these areas. I do not know to what extent the voices

occasionally heard in Japan objecting to extensive business cooperation with the Soviet Union are consistent with Japan's interests.

Let me say a few words on the fishing problems involving the USSR and Japan. As we know, fishing has always played an important role in the overall context of Soviet-Japanese relations. This is natural, since our countries have fished the same maritime areas. In connection with the new situation in international fishing created by the establishment of 200-mile zones by many countries, the need to make Japanese fishing on the Pacific coast of the USSR consistent with the ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on the introduction of provisional measures for the preservation of living resources and the regulation of fishing has developed.

We must say that the Soviet fishing fleet is interested in making full use of all fishing possibilities acceptable from the scientific point of view in the Soviet coastal areas, in order to compensate to a certain extent for the losses suffered by our fishing potential as a result of restrictive measures adopted by other countries.

Nevertheless, understanding the vital importance of fishing to Japan, and its desire to continue to fish in waters adjacent to the Soviet coast, we expressed our readiness to conclude a suitable agreement. The talks, although protracted, ended in a mutually acceptable solution, and, as we know, an agreement was recently signed.

In connection with these talks, I would like to say the following. The Soviet Union devoted concern to the fact that some people in Japan, clearly not without foreign influence, tried to utilize these talks to promote a campaign unfriendly to the Soviet Union, and to formulate illegal territorial claims against the USSR. Such actions could result in nothing but harm to Soviet-Japanese relations. They suit only those who do not wish true good-neighborly relations and friendship between the Soviet and Japanese peoples.

Question: Is there a possibility for you and other Soviet leaders to visit Japan?

Answer: I gratefully accepted the invitation of your government to pay an official visit to Japan, and I intend to make use of that invitation under suitable circumstances.

Let me say a few words in conclusion. Recently, not every aspect of our relations has developed as we would like, and, in our view, as the interests of the Soviet Union and Japan would require. I would say that recently you and I experienced a rather difficult period when we had to determine the direction in which Soviet-Japanese relations should develop further. Would they take the path of good-neighborly relations and cooperation or that of inevitable further aggravation. It seems to me that through the efforts of both countries, the only proper choice was made -- a choice in favor of the further development of cooperation. This fact is in itself encouraging, and leads us to hope that our relations will continue to develop not on the basis of the past, but with a thought for the future.

I can state categorically that we would like to deal with Japan honestly, on the basis of good-neighborly cooperation and mutual advantage. The Soviet Union has not had and does not not have any ulterior motives with regard to your country, our close neighbor.

I take this opportunity to present my best wishes to the readers of your newspaper and to the entire Japanese people for prosperity and happiness.

5003

CSO: 1802

L. I. BREZHNEV'S ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS POSED BY THE FRENCH NEWSPAPER
LE MONDE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 18-23

[Text] Question: Mr. General Secretary, this is your second visit to France since V. Giscard d'Estaing was elected president of the republic. Could you tell us what changes have occurred in the relations between our two countries since the December 1974 meeting in Rambouillet?

Answer: The period since the Rambouillet meeting is simply a part of the long path traversed jointly by the Soviet Union and France. It began with a meeting between Soviet leaders and General de Gaulle in 1966. It was then that a turning point was reached in relations between the Soviet Union and France. A course of development in cooperation between the two countries in a broad range of areas was adopted. Since that time, excellent results have been achieved in the field of bilateral relations and in interactions between our countries in international affairs.

I note with satisfaction that this positive process continued after the Rambouillet meeting as well.

Allow me to single out from the number of agreements and protocols signed by our countries within this period that signed on the prevention of accidental or unsanctioned use of nuclear weapons. It is important not only to our two countries, but to the cause of universal peace. It is to be hoped that this will be followed by other actions on the part of our countries to block the threat of a nuclear conflict and to diminish and terminate the arms race.

I have already had an opportunity to speak of the successful development of Soviet-French economic relations. This is a kind of material foundation for relations between countries. In the past, we have posed and resolved the problem of doubling the volume of trade. Now we are going farther, seeking to triple it. Judging from the results of the past two years, this too will be achieved.

However, I cannot fail to note that, on the whole, France's role in the foreign trade of the USSR and ours in French foreign trade fall below the potential of our two countries.

Many good things could be said about the scientific and technical relations and the cultural relations between our two countries. They mutually enrich the peoples of both countries and they contribute to the improvement of mutual understanding and the creation of a friendly atmosphere between them. We have scored many achievements on this level. These include the joint studies carried out in a number of key areas of contemporary science and technology, the now traditional USSR week on French television and the French week on Soviet television, regular exchanges of large performing groups, and many other projects.

In a word, we in the Soviet Union have a positive view of the path covered, and we believe that good foundations have been laid for stable, long-term future relations. It is important now not to lose the impetus in the development of our cooperation, but to increase it instead. This is the sincere wish of the Soviet Union.

Question: Within this period, many events have occurred in the world. The arms race is continuing. Tempestuous movements are convoluting Africa. Do you anticipate a stabilization of international relations, or do you think that detente is threatened?

Answer: Allow me to stress as the most important thing that the past 3 years have indicated that the process of detente, the development of varied and equal cooperation in the interests of all states and peoples, and the establishment of peaceful coexistence in international relations are a reality which is determining to an ever-greater extent the course and nature of events in the world arena.

Furthermore, the atmosphere of detente is gradually enveloping the life of the people and becoming habitual. Suffice it to note the extent to which economic, cultural, sports, and other relations have increased among dozens of countries, and the increase in international tourism, which has tangibly documented the progress made in the development of peaceful coexistence, compared with the period of the so-called Cold War and acute confrontation.

Nevertheless, we have never believed that all has been accomplished and that we can calmly harvest the fruits of detente. We are just at the beginning of a reorganization of international relations, which must be carried out by all of us together. I say "all of us together" because detente must be universal and ubiquitous. In our time, with the tempestuous development of technology, military technology included, when reciprocal relations among different parts of the world are becoming ever closer, any local conflict could easily develop into a general one.

You mentioned the arms race. Unfortunately, it is continuing and even increasing. The latest NATO recommendations for an increase in the military expenditures of the members of that organization, the ever-expanding military budget of the United States, and the constant effort made by that country to develop new types of weapons, are all proof that the ground is being laid for a new round in the arms race. We are deeply convinced that the task of limiting armaments is the main one in the preservation of the peace and the further development of detente. Unless this hellish race comes to an end all of us will find ourselves once again on the brink of the unforeseeable, as during the Cold War.

That is why our country is working so adamantly and persistently for the adoption of factual measures aimed at a cessation of the arms race and, in the final account, at disarmament. No country in the world has submitted on this level so many different initiatives or formulated so many proposals as the Soviet Union. I declare with a full feeling of responsibility that we are ready to support any suggestion which truly leads to a cessation of the arms race. However, we firmly refuse to support proposals which contain only words on the reduction of armaments while essentially representing nothing but an attempt to disturb the balance of forces and gain unilateral military advantages and thus endanger the security of other countries.

We are realists and, naturally, clearly imagine the difficulties involved in the solution of such problems. However, it is precisely as realists that we claim the following: Today substantial prerequisites exist in the world for giving detente a stable and irreversible nature, and for concentrating the efforts of the countries on insuring a radical change in the matter of disarmament.

Naturally, in this matter a great deal depends on public opinion. We know that wide public circles in all countries, including France, take close to heart the task of disarmament. They have long and persistently asked for declarations in favor of disarmament to be supported by practical actions and for a turn in disarmament to become a reality in world politics. We in the Soviet Union have great respect for the voice of these circles. It is the factual expression of the expectations of the peoples on the planet and must be heard everywhere.

You mentioned Africa. You mentioned it as though the "tempestuous movements" developing there harm detente and create instability in international relations. Yet, matters are entirely different.

The peoples of the African continent are actively fighting for their freedom and independence and for the right to choose their path of development themselves. They are struggling against shameful phenomena such as racism and apartheid. This is a just struggle and our country has always supported and will continue to support such a struggle.

Others create instability in Africa. It is created by external forces which are trying to prevent the African peoples from selecting the path they deem most suitable for themselves. These forces are trying to set some African countries against others. They promote and encourage discord, and provoke disputes on problems inherited by the African peoples from colonial times. It is precisely such a policy that conflicts with the requirements of detente and the principles of peaceful coexistence, and could lead to the appearance of new hotbeds of international tension. This is what we consider as the reason for the unstable situation in Africa.

The Soviet Union is firmly opposed to interference in the domestic affairs of African countries. We seek no advantages and privileges for ourselves in Africa. Our policy on that continent as well is directed toward the building of peaceful and friendly relations with all peoples and toward helping them follow successfully their chosen path of independence and progress.

Question: The view is becoming evermore popular in the West that the solution to the economic and moral crisis experienced by our societies lies in the search for a new world economic order, i.e., in changing relations between industrially developed and developing countries. Do you share this view? To what extent could the Soviet Union participate in the search for and the support of this new order?

Answer: Let us first define one thing: It is a question, obviously, of the crisis afflicting the capitalist countries. Neither the Soviet Union nor the other socialist countries are experiencing a crisis. True, to a certain extent, we feel indirectly the consequences of the economic upheavals experienced by the capitalist world: for example, in the course of our foreign trade operations we must take the inflationary process into consideration. However, this is an entirely different matter.

The reorganization of international economic relations on a democratic basis and the elimination from such relations of discrimination, dictate, and inequality are among the important requirements of the present time. The Soviet Union is systematically working to achieve this. As is known, we have submitted specific suggestions on this account including those submitted to the United Nations. Our country builds its economic relations with countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, as with all other states, on the basis of the strict observance of equality, mutual benefit, and noninterference in domestic affairs. We are doing what we can to assist many liberated countries to surmount an economic backwardness inherited from the past.

We are convinced that the development of international economic relations on the just foundations of equality and mutual advantage and the prevention of discrimination would be consistent with the interests of every nation and of the consolidation of the peace and international security, even though this would not save capitalism from crises.

I shall emphasize something else as well: Both the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, naturally, bear no responsibility for the consequences of colonialism or for the fatal influence which the remaining inequality in economic relations have on the developing countries.

Question: Are you satisfied with the course of the implementation of the Helsinki agreements?

Answer: I think that no one doubts today that the Helsinki agreements contain a great potential for exerting a positive influence on relations among countries and on the circumstances in Europe and beyond it. Furthermore, the Final Act signed in Helsinki has already become a substantive political reality in international life and is being implemented quite energetically. A great deal has already been accomplished even though, naturally, the progress achieved in various fields has not been uniform. All participants to the European conferences agree that the Final Act is a broad program for long-term activities on the part of the states aimed at strengthening the peace in Europe. I wish particularly to emphasize that this program will become more successful the more it is implemented and the less attempts are made to poison the atmosphere of relations among countries.

Question: At the present time both parts of Europe are in a state of peaceful coexistence on the military and political levels, of cooperation on the economic level, and antagonism on the ideological level. In your view could such a situation last a long time?

Answer: Indeed, in recent years substantial progress has been achieved in Europe in the development of equal and mutually profitable cooperation based on the principles of peaceful coexistence. Good forward steps have been made toward turning Europe into a continent of lasting peace and security. In our view, this objective as well is achievable. However, it is our view that even then the ideological struggle, i.e., the struggle of ideas, will not cease. This is no contradiction whatever. As long as there exist on earth or, to be more precise, there coexist on earth countries with different social systems, the differences in views, ideas, and ideologies inherent in these systems will remain and no accords could eliminate them. However, it would be senseless and dangerous in our time to try to insure the victory of one or another idea or one or another ideology through force or weapons. The ideological struggle must not grow into "psychological warfare." It must not be used as a means for interfering in the domestic affairs of countries and peoples or lead to political and military confrontation.

Otherwise this ideological dispute may turn into a catastrophe in which the concepts held by millions of people could disappear along with them.

The dispute between the two social systems and between their ideologies could be resolved by life itself, by historical practice, by a practical test. We, communists, naturally, are profoundly convinced of the advantages

of the socialist system, and of the fact that socialist and communist concepts are better consistent with the vital expectations and interests of society and of the individual, and the interests of universal peace and social progress.

Question: Of late the USSR has somewhat softened its position concerning the European Economic Community. Could we expect that the USSR would establish official relations with the community?

Answer: Our approach to this matter is that of one of the members of CEMA. We consider the Common Market a reality and deem it important for the West to develop the same view concerning CEMA.

It is known that on behalf of the governments of the member countries, and acting in the spirit of the Final Act of the European conference, CEMA has asked the EEC to establish official relations. Last April it submitted new proposals on this matter. The answer, therefore, must be given by the Common Market.

Question: Of late, with every passing election, the left-wing forces in France are achieving obvious successes. Their assumption of power next year has become an entirely likely possibility. Would this change Soviet-French relations in any way?

Answer: This is a matter exclusively related to domestic French problems. In this case the word belongs to the French people and to no one else.

As to the future of Soviet-French relations, we look forward with optimism, for we are profoundly convinced that their further development will be fully consistent with the basic interests of the peoples of the USSR and France.

Question: How do you conceive of a change in circumstances in the Middle East? Do you assume that Israel might agree to the idea of a Palestinian state?

Answer: Our position concerning affairs in the Middle East is imbued with concern for eliminating the dangerous hotbed of tension, the restoration of justice, and the securing of a lasting peace in this area.

The task of a peaceful Middle Eastern settlement is becoming evermore urgent. In light of this I think that we must positively assess the fact that the Soviet Union and the United States, who are co-chairmen of the Geneva Middle East peace conference, have agreed to work for the resumption of the conference in the Autumn of 1977.

Naturally, a Middle East settlement affects not only the participants to the Geneva Conference but anyone interested in the elimination of the conflict. We have always ascribed great importance to cooperating with France on this

matter. We believe that in accordance with its international weight and influence, France could effectively contribute to a Middle Eastern settlement and participate in its guarantees.

As to the second part of your question, obviously, it should be addressed to the government of Israel.

Question: How do you conceive of the future of the Soviet Union? Do you think that the increased growth of the population of the national republics could lead to certain structural changes?

Answer: Like all my compatriots I look at the future of my homeland with confidence and inexhaustible optimism. This year is particularly noteworthy for us: we shall celebrate the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and adopt the new constitution of the country. Work is underway on formulating a long-term program for the development of the Soviet Union extending to the end of the 20th century.

As to the growth of the population of one or another republic in our country, it is a phenomenon which does not alarm us. On the contrary, it pleases us, for it reflects, above all, the powerful upsurge of the economic level of our republics, including the tremendous improvement in the prosperity of the population of the former outlying areas of tsarist Russia, and the tremendous progress they achieved on the path of socialist changes. In the final account, all this strengthens the alloy which we describe as a new historical community--the Soviet people.

5003

CSO: 1802

OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND NATIONAL-LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 24-38

[Article by G. Aliyev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and first secretary of the Azerbaydzhan Communist Party Central Committee; based on a report delivered at the international scientific conference on "The Great October Socialist Revolution and the National-Liberation Movement of the Peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin American," held in Baku on 26-28 May 1977]

[Text] A few months separate us from the day when the Soviet people and all progressive mankind will solemnly celebrate the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. There is no event in world history equal to the October Revolution in terms of the strength of its impact on the fate of the peoples of the world. History does not know of a name greater than that of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin--the founder of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the inspirer and organizer of the October Revolution, the creator of the first socialist state in the world, the leader of the Russian and international working class, and the brilliant thinker and revolutionary.

The 60th anniversary of the October Revolution is an outstanding holiday of the multinational family of Soviet peoples, of our foreign friends, and of all honest people on earth. It is a review of the revolutionary forces of our time. The preparations for the great anniversary triggered a tremendous political and labor upsurge in our country and in the working people of the fraternal socialist countries, and are being extensively made on all continents.

1

The socialist revolution which was made in Russia in October 1917 was the first and the greatest victorious proletarian revolution in history. It was the main event of the 20th century which radically changed the course of development of all mankind. As a result of the victory of the Great October Revolution mankind began a transition from its many centuries of prehistory to its real history.

The October Revolution was the natural consequence of Russian socioeconomic and political development. It was the result of the extreme aggravation of social contradictions and of the class struggle. At the beginning of the 20th century Russia became the weakest link in the imperialist chain and the focal point of all its contradictions. The center of the world's revolutionary movement shifted here. It was here that a powerful liberation struggle was launched by the workers and peasants, in the course of which, together with its allies, the proletariat resolved a revolutionary problem of tremendous historical scale. "The implementation of this task, and the destruction of the most powerful bulwark not only of European but also (we could say now) of Asian reaction," wrote Lenin at that time, "would make the Russian proletariat the vanguard of the international revolutionary proletariat" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 6, p 28).

The entire subsequent course of events brilliantly confirmed the correctness of Lenin's analysis, convincingly proving how well-substantiated was Lenin's faith in the revolutionary possibilities of the proletariat in multinational Russia.

Proceeding from the overall laws of the socialist revolution and taking comprehensively into consideration the specific conditions and characteristics of the development of the liberation movement in the country, Lenin's party was a model of scientific strategy and tactics in the class struggle and of the ability to mobilize the revolutionary energy of the masses and arm them with a great idea for the sake of reaching a great objective. It assumed the leadership of the powerful revolutionary current which rallied the struggle of the working class for socialism, the nationwide actions for peace, the struggle of the peasants for land, and the national liberation movements of oppressed peoples, and channeled this entire stream to the overthrow of capitalism.

Proletarian in content, the October Revolution also reflected the basic interests of the absolute majority of the country's population. As in no other revolution it expressed with particular emphasis and depth the inflexible will, purposefulness, and resolve of the people--the creator of a new social order. In revolutionary periods which, as Lenin noted, are the holidays of the oppressed and the exploited, the people can make miracles. The October days of 1917 which shook up the world were precisely such a holiday for the working people and the Russian proletariat brilliantly accomplished its great universal-liberation mission.

Laying the first path to socialism in history was an exceptionally difficult task, for each step was to us a search and each movement forward required adamant struggle.

Despite the difficulties, under the wise and tried leadership of the Communist Party the Soviet people successfully fulfilled the main and most complex task of the socialist revolution: the task of construction. It built in our country a developed socialist society. This society is characterized by

the high level of maturity of socialist social relations, gradually growing into communist relations, the unbreakable ideological-political and social unity of the working people, and their boundless loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The building of developed socialism in the USSR is the triumph of the party's Leninist general line and a victory of the noble ideals in the name of which the October Revolution was made.

In the 60 years which have passed since that time the homeland of the October Revolution achieved tremendous successes in all fields of the national economy, and in all realms of governmental, political, social, and cultural life. Compared with the prerevolutionary level the national income rose 65 times. The Soviet Union accounts for 20 percent of the world's industrial output, whereas before the revolution we accounted for slightly over 4 percent. These figures express a powerful socialist industry with contemporary industrial production sectors, supplied with the latest equipment, large-scale mechanized agriculture, rapidly developing scientific and technical progress, and continuous growth of the material prosperity and cultural standard of the Soviet people. All this was created through the selfless toil of the heroic working class, kolkhoz peasantry, and people's intelligentsia. It is a true exploit of the Soviet people who built the great structure of socialism and are successfully building communism.

The adoption of the new USSR Constitution will be an important landmark in the political history of our country. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized at the May 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, it will become another historical contribution made by our Leninist party and by the entire Soviet people to the great cause of building communism and to the international cause of the struggle waged by the working people the world over for freedom, human progress, and lasting peace on earth.

The Great October Socialist Revolution laid the beginning of all-embracing social changes in the contemporary world. It gave a powerful impulse to all detachments of the worldwide anti-imperialist front. It opened new opportunities and prospects for the development of the international workers and national-liberation movements. Under the influence of the Great October Revolution communist parties began to appear in a number of countries, including those within the zone of the national-liberation movement. The October Revolution marked the beginning of a historically significant process of establishment, strengthening, and development of the contemporary communist movement. Today 90 communist and workers parties, rallying within their ranks over 60 million people, are marching in the vanguard of social progress, actively and consistently fighting for the interests of the working class and all working people.

The October Revolution shook to its foundations the capitalist world while subsequent revolutionary developments radically changed the appearance of our planet. The defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism in World War II, and the victory of the socialist revolutions in several countries of Europe, Asia, and Latin America accelerated the development of the world

and gave the contemporary historical process qualitatively new features. The world socialist system was organized. This brought about a radical change in the ratio of forces in the international arena.

The example of the socialist countries clearly proved that the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism and the process of the shaping of the new society share a number of common laws. Each nation and country introduces a variety in the forms of this transition. Despite all differences in the ways and means for building socialism, all of them coincide in their essential and main features and the general path in the building of socialism is single and common to all.

Together with the blossoming of each socialist nation and the strengthening of the sovereignty of the socialist states their interrelationships are becoming ever-closer. Ever-greater common elements in their politics, economics, and social life appear. The levels of their socioeconomic development are becoming equalized.

The socialist comity--the offspring of the international working class--has become the most dynamic economic power on earth and a leading political factor. It is having an ever-growing impact on the course of the historical process and is determining the main trends and directions in the development of all mankind.

2

The Great October Socialist Revolution, which was a very strong blow at imperialism and its colonial system, triggered a crisis in the entire system of imperialist oppression, energized the multimillion-strong people's masses of the colonies and the dependent countries, led them to an active struggle for their liberation, and gave this struggle unparalleled scope and organization.

From its very birth the organized international workers movement invariably supported the struggle of the oppressed peoples. The founders of scientific communism saw the close and organic link between the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and the struggle waged by peoples who were oppressed not only socially but nationally. The fiery words expressed by Engels that "no free people could oppress other peoples" called for unity between the class struggle of the proletariat and the liberation movement in colonial and dependent countries.

Developing the basic concepts and conclusions of Marx and Engels on the national-colonial problem, under the new historical circumstances Lenin provided a comprehensive elaboration of the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle in colonies and semicolonies and determined its historical place and prospects. As the greatest revolutionary and leader and teacher of all nations he profoundly believed in the revolutionary possibilities and creative forces of the toiling masses of Asia, Africa,

and Latin America, "...The toiling masses and the peasants of the colonial countries, despite the fact that today they are still backward," Lenin said, "will play a very big revolutionary role in the subsequent phases of the world's revolution" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, p 38). Lenin linked the new epoch of universal history inaugurated with the October Revolution not only with the victory of the socialist forces in Europe but the awakening of the peoples of the East. In 1919 he stated that "The socialist revolution will be not only and mainly a struggle waged by the revolutionary proletariat in each country against its own bourgeoisie but a struggle waged by all colonies and countries oppressed by imperialism, and of all dependent countries against international imperialism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 39, p 327).

The peoples of the colonial and the dependent countries saw in the October Revolution and in Soviet Russia a beacon which illuminated brightly their own path to freedom and national independence. The socialist revolution carried out in a country which belongs not only to Europe but to Asia geographically, economically, and historically, and its great liberation mission and the nature of the problems it resolved were all close to and understood by the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The characteristics of the social development of Russia which was a developed industrial center surrounded by a backward colonial periphery determined the durable significance of the victory of the Great October Revolution and of its revolutionary and constructive experience to the colonial and dependent countries. The peoples of these countries clearly felt the inseparable link between their struggle and the October Revolution.

New Russia became the hope of the oppressed peoples for a forthcoming liberation. The selfless material and tremendous moral support given by the state of workers and peasants was of prime significance to the peoples of the East who were rising to the struggle against imperialism. The initial decrees of and specific steps taken by the young Soviet state for the liberation of the former colonies of tsarist Russia had an invaluable influence on the oppressed masses of the Orient. In the first days following the October Revolution the Bolshevik Party and Soviet government elaborated program documents which formulated the basic concepts of Soviet policy toward the oppressed peoples. The Decree on Peace, passed at the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets on 8 November 1917, most clearly stipulated the principled position of the Soviet system which firmly opposed annexations and seizures of foreign lands and the forceful annexation by a big or powerful country of a small or weak nationality in any part of the globe.

The words of the address issued by the Council of People's Commissars "To All Toiling Moslems of Russia and the East" were heard throughout the world: "You yourselves must organize your life your own way. You have the right to do so, for your fate is in your own hands."

The young Soviet state solemnly stated that our Eastern policy remains diametrically opposed to the Eastern policy of the imperialist forces, that it aspires for the autonomous economic and political development of the Eastern nations, and will support them comprehensively in this. We consider our role and vocation as being the natural and selfless friends and allies of peoples fighting for their full autonomous economic and political development, the Soviet government's documents stated.

For the first time in the history of international relations readiness to provide moral and material support to peoples waging a just struggle for their national independence was proclaimed on the scale of the government. This was a clear manifestation of the anticolonial direction of the October Revolution; these principles determined one of the main lines followed by Soviet foreign policy. It is indicative that one of the first constitutional acts of the Soviet system was the "Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia." It proclaimed as the basis of the activities of the Soviet state in the field of national policy the equality and sovereignty of all the peoples of Russia and their right to free self-determination, including secession and the establishment of autonomous states, the elimination of all national privileges and restrictions, and the free development of all national minorities and ethnic groups.

Our party and Lenin ascribed tremendous importance to the establishment of a strong and close alliance between victorious socialism and the national liberation forces. An important step along this path, the path of the strengthening and consolidation of the forces of national and social liberation and of the young socialist state was the congress of Eastern peoples, summoned on Lenin's initiative, held in Baku in September 1920.

The Baku Congress of Eastern Peoples, as Lenin described it, rallied nearly 2,000 delegates representing about 40 nations. They included representatives of Afghanistan, India, Egypt, Iran, China, Korea, Syria, Turkey, Japan, the peoples of Central Asia, the Caucasus, and others. The congress was attended by communists from Britain, France, the United States, Bulgaria, Spain, Austria, Hungary, and the Netherlands. On behalf of the Comintern Executive Committee the congress was opened by N. N. Narimanov, chairman of the Azerbaydzhan Council of People's Commissars. Lenin was elected honorary chairman of the congress.

The congress expressed its full solidarity with the Leninist theses on the national and colonial problems accepted at the Second Comintern Congress, and discussed a number of other problems: the international situation, Soviets in Oriental countries, the agrarian-peasant problem, and others. The First Congress of the Eastern Peoples supported the decisions of the Second Comintern Congress and, on their basis, drafted a number of resolutions and two appeals: to the fighting peoples of the Orient and to the working people of Europe, America, and Japan, calling upon them to actively support the national-liberation movement. The slogan of "Proletarians of All Countries and Oppressed Peoples, Unite!," approved by Lenin, was proclaimed at the congress.

The First Congress of Eastern Peoples played a noteworthy role in the development of the national-liberation movement and in strengthening the unity and solidarity among all revolutionary detachments and their solidarity with Soviet Russia.

The Great October Socialist Revolution and the first country of victorious socialism were tremendously attractive to the oppressed peoples. They were a clear example of the practical solution of political, economic, and social problems, many of which were directly related to the working people of Asian, African, and Latin American countries fighting for freedom from colonial oppression and for national freedom.

The slogan of the right of nations to self-determination and to setting up sovereign states, scientifically developed by Lenin and concretely implemented in the revolutionary practice of the young socialist state, triggered the most lively response and understanding among the peoples oppressed by imperialism. Throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America a broad movement of solidarity with the Russian working class and peasantry developed. Initial Marxist circles were created and communist parties appeared. The growth of national self-awareness and class feeling helped the peoples who rose to the struggle against the oppressors to understand the inseparable link between the possibilities for their own liberation from the imperialist yoke and the successes of the socialist revolution in Russia.

The powerful upsurge of the national-liberation movements, under the influence of the Great October Revolution, brought about the victory of the people's revolution in Mongolia and the acquisition of national independence by Afghanistan. It strengthened the national sovereignty of Turkey and seriously weakened the imperialist positions in China. The grounds under the feet of the colonizers in India, Iraq, Syria, and Egypt began to shake. The national-liberation movement grew in Indonesia, Vietnam, Burma, Iran, Malaya, the Philippines, and the Latin American and African countries.

With the victory of the Great October Revolution the revolutionary liberation movement of the oppressed peoples rose to a qualitatively higher stage. The developing proletariat, the peasantry, and the progressive intelligentsia began to participate actively in the national-liberation struggle. The appearance of communist parties in a number of Asian, African, and Latin American countries marked a new stage in the development of the workers and peasant movements. Conditions arose for establishing alliances between workers and peasants, and for rallying all patriotic forces in a single anti-imperialist front. Each stage of the national-liberation movement, closely linked with the common struggle of the world's revolutionary anti-imperialist forces, represented a specific historical line along the victorious path to the total national liberation of the oppressed nations.

In 1919 colonial, semicolonial, and dependent countries accounted for 72 percent of the territory and over 69 percent of the population on earth. In 1938 the ratios were still 59.9 and 63.6 percent; toward the end of the 1960's,

however, colonies accounted for only 3.6 percent of the territory inhabited by less than 1 percent of the population on the planet. The past few years marked the breakdown of the last colonial empire--that of Portugal.

Tens of sovereign countries arose in the place of the former colonies and semicolonies, acting in the international arena as an energetic anti-imperialist force.

The 60 years which have passed since the Great October Revolution are a history of headlong breakdown and total elimination of the shameful system of colonial slavery and glorious pages of the struggle and victories of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America who have emerged in the arena of active political efforts and taken the broad path of building a new independent life.

3

Lenin deserves historical credit for the formulation and profound scientific elaboration of the theory of social progress of oppressed nations. The efficient and integral concept of noncapitalist development he created was concretely embodied in our country. The conversion of the peoples of Central Asia, Kazakhstan, the Extreme North, and other areas to socialism, bypassing the capitalist stage, was a triumph of the Leninist ideas and the practical confirmation of their great vital power. This was the greatest socioeconomic and political experiment successfully conducted for the first time in the world by Lenin's party and by the Soviet socialist state.

From the very first days following the victory of the October Revolution the question of the ways of development of the peoples of the Soviet East and of all outlying areas of the former tsarist Russia occupied an important position in the revolutionary-practical and scientific-theoretical activities of Lenin and the Communist Party who believed that "this is a universal problem with no exaggeration" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 53, p 190). Lenin formulated and brilliantly resolved the problem of the correlation between the general laws governing the transition to socialism and the characteristics of this transition in countries lagging in their social development.

The building of socialism in the USSR is a single revolutionary constructive process consisting of individual links the most important among which were the country's industrialization, agricultural collectivization, and the cultural revolution.

The principles governing the solution of socioeconomic problems in the period of building socialism were essentially the same throughout the entire territory of the Soviet Union. At the same time, however, the party took into consideration the characteristics of each of the national republics and, on the basis of their specific natures, applied various ways and means in the transitional period while resolving the complex problems related to the need to surmount age-old backwardness. Addressing himself to the communists of the Soviet East, Lenin adamantly advised them to "understand the characteristic

nature of their position, and the position of their republics, unlike the position and conditions of the RSFSR, and understand the need not to duplicate our tactic but to change it thoughtfully in accordance with differences in specific conditions" ["Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 43, p 198).

The building of socialism in our country was marked by outstanding achievements of Leninist national policy. The scientific substantiation and successful implementation of the ideas governing the creation of a multinational socialist state--the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics--is Lenin's and the Communist Party's great service to all mankind. The founding of the USSR was the natural result and direct continuation of the cause of the Great October Revolution, and the outstanding result of the revolutionary creativity of all Soviet peoples headed by the working class under the leadership of the Leninist party.

Sixty years of Soviet system represent a tempestuous blossoming and headlong progress achieved by all nations and nationalities in the Soviet Union. The victory of the Great October Revolution exposed all the peoples of our country to modern civilization and opened for them a real and effective way for rapidly surmounting age-old backwardness. The great alliance of more than 100 nations and nationalities bound by the ties of fraternal friendship, common class interests and common objectives, was born. A new historical community--the Soviet people--developed.

The inviolable unity and fraternal friendship among the peoples of the USSR, which was tested by time and which withstood the most severe trials, are the great accomplishment of socialism and the priceless acquisition of the Soviet society. "All the peoples of our homeland," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized, "are making a tremendous contribution to the great cause of building socialism and communism. The friendship and fraternity among the peoples of the Soviet state are strong and unbreakable. Thanks to this friendship our homeland reached new outstanding successes at all fronts of the building of communism. That is why, while praising the great October, we also praise all the peoples and nationalities of our country and their aspiration to live as a single family, fraternally sharing concerns and alarms and the fruits of successes and victories."

From the experience of our country the peoples of the world are convinced of the wise solution of the age-old national problem by the Communist Party and Soviet state. Predicting the possibilities of a tremendous revolutionary impact of the experience in building a socialist multinational state on the world's liberation movement, as early as December 1922, when the foundations of the USSR were being laid, Lenin wrote that this will be of tremendous importance "not only to us but to the entire International, and to hundreds of millions of people in Asia who will take the foreground of history in the immediate future, following us" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 45, p 362). This brilliant Leninist prediction is being confirmed today more convincingly than ever with the example of many countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America which are experiencing their revolutionary epoch of national and social renovation.

The Azerbaydzhan Soviet Socialist Republic is a clear proof of the life-creating force of socialism and the triumph of the Leninist national policy. The difficult path of revolutionary struggle against tsarist autocracy, the capitalists, the nobility, and the khans was followed by the working Azerbaydzhan people, and the workers and peasants of multinational Azerbaydzhan leading to the victory of the Soviet system. At the dawn of the century a Bolshevik organization developed in Baku, one of the biggest proletarian centers in Russia, which stood firmly on Marxist-Leninist positions. Lenin highly valued the activities of the Azerbaydzhan Bolsheviks. He was in constant contact with them and gave them valuable advice and recommendations.

Several days following the October armed uprising a Soviet system was proclaimed in Baku. The Baku Sovnarkom, established in April 1918, was the first representative governmental organ of the proletariat in the Transcaucasus which undertook the implementation of most important socialist changes. Headed by Stepan Shaumyan, Meshadi Azizbekov, Aleshi Dzhaparidze, Ivan Fioletov, and other legendary commissars, the Baku Commune waged a courageous struggle against the united forces of the internal counter-revolution and world imperialism and for strengthening and expanding the positions of the Soviet system. However, the forces were quite uneven. Under the pressure of superior enemy forces, the Soviet system in Baku was temporarily overthrown in July 1918. The courageous fighters for communism--the 26 Baku commissars--were criminally executed by the British colonizers in the Transcaspiian sands.

The death of the great revolutionary heroes triggered a painful reaction in the working people and the anger and indignation of the working people of many nationalities. Addressing the funeral meeting during the burial of the remains of the commissars in Baku, in September 1920, attended by delegates to the First Congress of Eastern Peoples, Nariman Narimanov said: "We are now surrendering to the earth of Soviet Azerbaydzhan our best and dear comrades who valorously stood on their revolutionary posts to the last moment." These firm heroes, he went on to say, fell from the hands of the imperialists who boast of their imaginary humanity. "Here is the result of such 'humanity'--26 graves. Today fate deemed it suitable to show this 'humanity' to the East. Let the East be aware of it. However, you must know that the hour of retribution is approaching...Sleep, dear Comrades; the idea for which you fought will shine brightly throughout the earth."

The cruel repressions and violence of the imperialists and the domestic counterrevolution did not break the will of the working people of Azerbaydzhan to fight for social and national liberation. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, on 28 April 1920 they restored the Soviet system and raised once and for all the banner of the Great October Revolution on the soil of Azerbaydzhan.

Within a historically brief time life in Azerbaydzhan, illuminated by the rays of the October Revolution, changed unrecognizably. Under the Soviet system industrial output in Azerbaydzhan increased 123 times. Our country exports to 65 different countries in the world 350 types of goods produced in Azerbaydzhan: petroleum extraction equipment and machinery, pipes, aluminum, electric motors, cotton, transformers, bearings, and many others. Azerbaydzhan is 100 percent ahead of countries such as the FRG and Great Britain and considerably ahead of Italy, Japan, and France in the number of students attending higher educational institutions per 10,000 population. Over 21,000 scientific workers are doing fruitful work in the republic's academy of sciences, sectorial scientific research institutes, and other establishments and organizations.

"Having turned from a former colonial suburb of the Russian empire into one of the flourishing republics of our country building communism," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev speaking in Baku, "Soviet Azerbaydzhan offers convincing proof of the powerful creative force of socialism and an inspiring example to the young national states and to peoples fighting for social and national liberation."

The Russian working class and the great Russian people play an outstanding role in the blossoming of the economy and culture of the Azerbaydzhan people as of the other peoples of our country, and in strengthening their fraternal friendship. The Russian people made a tremendous contribution to the elimination of the factual inequality among nations, inherited from the past, and in the practical implementation of the Leninist course of accelerated economic, cultural, and sociopolitical development of the Soviet nations and nationalities. This is the great exploit of the working class and all working people accomplished in the name of proletarian internationalism.

The international nature of the October Revolution was profoundly manifested in the labor accomplishments of the Azerbaydzhani people as in those of all nations in our great homeland. The October Revolution was an example of skillful combination and proper solution of national and international problems. It was precisely in this that Lenin saw the guarantee that the Soviet republic "will stand firmly as a torch of international socialism and as an example to all toiling masses" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 35, p 279).

Naturally, we do not impose our experience or way for the solution of political, socioeconomic, national, and ideological problems on anyone. The CPSU has frequently emphasized the need for the objective and all-round consideration of the national-specific features and socio-class characteristics of each individual country. The historical inevitability of the advent of all nations to socialism does not exclude but, conversely, presumes a wealth of forms of democratic organization of social life and methods for economic management, as well as a different pace of economic and social development. At the conference of communist and workers parties of Europe Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted the tremendous significance gained today

by the "experience in the building of socialism in a great variety of conditions, acquired by the communist movement, demonstrating both its overall laws as well as variety of specific forms."

At the same time, the need for a comprehensive consideration of the specific characteristics and features of the individual countries in determining the ways, means, and pace of reorganization of society on a socialist basis presumes the constant consideration of the overall laws governing the transition from capitalism to socialism. This precisely explains the tremendous interest of revolutionary forces in the historical experience of the Soviet Union and the main and essential facts which, to use Lenin's words, make the peoples look at Russia as the center of attraction. The revolutionary experience of the first socialist state in the world is assuming ever-greater importance to the contemporary world revolutionary movement.

4

The contemporary national-liberation movement has entered a qualitatively new stage of development. Its main peculiarity and characteristic feature are the fact that the process of national liberation of colonial and dependent countries has been completed in the main and that the task of the social liberation of the peoples is gaining priority evermore persistently.

Sixty years is a short time in history. Yet, what tremendous changes these years have created! The imperialist colonial system crumbled. Over 100 colonies and semicolonies on all continents gained their national independence and state sovereignty. The great Lenin's prediction to the effect that the peoples of colonial and dependent countries, beginning with the struggle for national freedom, will reach the struggle against the very foundations of the exploiting system and will thus deal the strongest possible blow at imperialism and capitalism is coming true.

The decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress, the Central Committee Accountability Report, and the subsequent speeches by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev provide an expanded characterization of the contemporary stage of the national-liberation movement and contain a profound analysis of the positive changes in the domestic life of the liberated countries and in their international policy.

The favorable international situation is contributing to a tremendous extent to the successful development and intensification of the contemporary national-liberation revolutions. The Soviet state is the flag bearer of peace and the most active force in the struggle for detente and for the assertion of the principles of peaceful coexistence in relations among countries belonging to different social systems.

Our party's Central Committee, its Politburo, and, personally, Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, who plays an outstanding role in the struggle for a lasting peace, security and cooperation among nations, and the establishment of a new system of international relations are doing a titanic work to strengthen the cause of peace and security of the peoples. Such noble activities meet with the full support and the warm approval of the entire Soviet people and of all peace-loving forces on our planet.

The past decade in the development of international relations was crowned by particularly significant victories of the forces of peace and by tremendous positive changes. It was precisely during those years that the national-liberation movement achieved new major successes. The heroic people of Vietnam gained a historic victory. The biggest imperialist attempt after World War II to deal with a socialist state and suppress the national-liberation movement through the force of arms failed. The reunification of Vietnam, now proclaimed a single socialist republic, was completed with the elimination of imperialist aggression. "Vietnam with its great experience in the heroic struggle against imperialist aggression and for freedom and independence, and with its high revolutionary prestige," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "has become today an important factor of peace and progress in Southeast Asia as well as throughout Asia."

The victory of the patriotic forces of Laos, and the advent to power in that country of the Marxist-Leninist People's-Revolutionary Party was an important event. With Laos the family of socialist states was joined by yet another member.

A path to independent development was opened to democratic Cambodia as well.

The crushing defeat of the military intervention of American imperialism and the radical change in the situation in Indochina were a considerable contribution to the improvement of the political climate on the entire Asian continent.

The struggling peoples of Africa achieved great successes. The ranks of independent countries were reinforced by new young states. The peoples of Angola, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Sao Tome e Principi, the Cape Verde Islands, and the Comoro Islands and the Seychelles gained their national independence. The struggle of the peoples against bastions of racism and reaction and puppets of world imperialism as South Africa and Rhodesia intensified. Defeated in Angola and Mozambique, and fearing the further development of the liberation struggle, the imperialist forces are undertaking desperate attempts to increase the military potential of the racist regimes in the southern part of Africa and to preserve at all costs the final bulwark of colonialism and racism.

However, these attempts are doomed. The patriots of southern Africa are energizing the struggle under the leadership of acknowledged leaders and vanguard liberation movements such as the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front, and the People's Organization of Southwest Africa (SWAPO). They have the support and solidarity of the Soviet Union, the other members of the socialist comity, the international communist and workers movements, and all progressive mankind.

In the decades following the October Revolution the realm of imperialist domination narrowed considerably. The power of imperialism weakened and its organic contradictions became sharper. The general crisis of capitalism continues to intensify.

Imperialism is suffering major defeats in the areas of the national-liberation movement as well. However, with the desperation of the doomed, imperialism does not shy at any means in its attempts to retain and even enlarge its positions in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Imperialism particularly rages against countries whose peoples, having rejected the yoke of colonial dependence, are directly undertaking the socialist reorganization of social life. This can be proved by the aggression committed by American imperialism against the heroic Vietnamese people. It is confirmed by the repeated attempts on the part of U.S. imperialists to suppress the revolutionary movement in Cuba and to block the adoption by this country of the path to socialist change. However, the firmness and heroism of the Cuban people, the support of their courageous struggle by all progressive mankind, and the position assumed by the socialist states and, above all, the Soviet Union made possible the defense of the revolutionary gains of the heroic freedom island. Headed by the Communist Party, the Cuban people are successfully building a socialist society in their country. "Our people," said Fidel Castro at the 25th CPSU Congress, "has made its contribution to the cause of socialism: inflexible aspiration toward justice and freedom, sweat and blood, and loyalty to revolutionary ideals. However, all this would have been inconceivable without the October Revolution, without your fraternal support and solidarity, and without the existence of the state founded by Lenin, whose great Communist Party is now holding its 25th congress. This is irrefutable proof of the truly inspiring force of socialism and of its confidence in the future!"

The predatory aspect of world imperialism undertaking all efforts to hinder somehow the development of the revolutionary process clearly appears in the Chilean tragedy. The imperialists undertook open intervention in the domestic affairs of that country and contributed through their actions to the establishment of a fascist regime by a military junta.

The imperialist aggression in Angola and the foreign intervention in the domestic affairs of Zaire prove that in their desire to restore the colonial order and regain their lost positions in one way or another the imperialists

are resorting to all available methods for suppressing the liberation movement, including the unleashing of colonial wars. At the same time, today the imperialists are using not only methods of direct political pressure. They are launching a refined system of economic pressure, developing ideological expansion in the liberated countries, and bribing individual leaders and sociopolitical groups in former colonies and semicolonies.

Acts of military aggression, economic blockades, and implantation of corrupt puppet regimes are actions which radically contradict the national interests of the liberated countries. Attempts to promote capitalism in the individual countries are encountering the firm resistance of progressive forces. The liberated peoples link the prospects for their development not with an obsolete social system such as capitalism but with a progressive social system--socialism--to which belongs the future.

Currently Asia and Africa have a big group of socialist-oriented countries with a population of about 150 million and a territory in excess of 12 million km². The countries with a socialist orientation are in the vanguard of the national-liberation movement. They are waging a struggle against imperialism and for strengthening their political and economic independence decisively and systematically. It is precisely in those countries that a radical break is being made with exploitation relations; their political and social life is being democratized. The alliance between the working class and the peasantry is strengthening. Vanguard parties are being created guided by the ideas of scientific socialism.

Under our very eyes in a number of countries Marxism-Leninism and scientific socialism are being gradually combined with the national-liberation movement. "The principles of Marxism-Leninism in the national-colonial problem," wrote Ho Chi Minh, "were victoriously confirmed in the course of the liberation struggle waged by the peoples of the East to whom the October Revolution provided a decisive impetus and for whose rapid development the existence of the Soviet Union was a most important historical factor."

As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized at the Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of Europe, "Socialism has already sunk deep roots in many countries which rejected the colonial yoke of imperialism and took the path of free and independent development."

The current stage in the struggle waged by the liberated countries is noted by the remarkable energizing of their foreign political activities. This is manifested in a number of directions: in the political line of the movement for nonalignment, and the activities of the various economic associations created by the developing countries. Their contribution to the common struggle for the peace and security of the peoples and for detente is becoming evermore substantial. The progressive foreign political course of the liberated countries is contributing to the improvement of the entire international climate and to the development of contemporary intergovernmental relations on an equal and democratic basis. This position and, in particular,

the nonalignment political line with its clear anti-imperialist direction enjoys the profound understanding of the USSR, the members of the socialist comity, and all fighters for peace and international security.

The USSR fully supports the legitimate aspirations of the young national states in their struggle against imperialist aggression and exploitation and their right to handle their internal affairs themselves. It is in this light that the constructive suggestions made by the Soviet Union on a peaceful settlement in the Middle East should be considered.

The nationalization of foreign monopoly ownership is a major direction in the struggle waged by the liberated countries for economic independence. Today the pace of nationalization is 100 percent higher than in the previous decade. Nationalization of foreign property, conducted in a number of liberated countries, has affected important sectors such as the extraction and processing of petroleum, bauxites, phosphates, iron ores, and copper, as well as the activities of banks and insurance companies.

The aggressive nature of this struggle is being manifested evermore clearly. Its front which covers no longer individual countries but practically the entire area of the national-liberation movement is widening. Thus, the struggle for economic independence is exceeding the national frameworks evermore frequently and is confirming the further intensification of contradictions between developing countries and imperialism.

This struggle is closely linked with the efforts of the peace-loving forces opposing the arms race and favoring universal and total disarmament. The arms race is a heavy burden which falls not only on the shoulders of the working people of the developed capitalist countries. It forces the liberated countries to increase their military budgets and absorbs huge material values and funds, diverting them from constructive purposes. Today the military expenditures throughout the world exceed 30 times the amount of official international economic aid given the liberated countries. It is easy to imagine how greatly the situation of the developing countries would improve if some such funds were to be used for economic and social development. Guided by such noble intentions, the Soviet Union has formulated the constructive proposal of reducing the military budgets of the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council by 10 percent and using part of the funds thus saved as aid to the developing countries. Even a partial reduction of armaments and the "freezing" of the existing level of armed forces would be of substantial importance not only to the cause of peace and international security but of improving the overall economic circumstances. This would create favorable conditions for the reorganization of international economic relations on a just and equal base and the establishment of a new economic order in the world to which the liberated countries are aspiring and in which they are so greatly interested.

The successful development of the forces of national and social liberation depends to a decisive extent on the combat unity among all the detachments of the worldwide anti-imperialist front. Our party continues to oppose any attempt at dividing this front.

Guided by these principles and taking into consideration the interests of the struggling peoples, we are waging a systematic struggle against the divisive line of China's Maoist leadership which is promoting mistrust and hostility among countries, trying to drive a wedge between the national-liberation movement and the members of the world socialist comity, to pit these revolutionary forces of our time against each other, and to undermine their strengthening alliance.

The peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America have achieved outstanding successes in the difficult struggle for freedom and national independence. From historical objects they have turned into active makers of history. However, new political and social battles lie ahead for new and even more significant victories. We, the Soviet people, wish with all our hearts to our combat comrades and friends with whom we are linked by common basic aspirations and a single final objective, major successes in the struggle for the full triumph of the just cause of the national renaissance and social progress of all the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The Great October Socialist Revolution, its history, nature, motive forces, general laws and specific characteristics, and influence on the international revolutionary movement and the development of the world as a whole have been and will always remain a subject of deep attention on the part of all anti-imperialist forces, a subject for profound scientific studies, and a source of creative inspiration and activities aimed at resolving the basic problems of our time.

To us, the Soviet people, the Great October Revolution is not only the heroic revolutionary past of our peoples. It is our outstanding present and even more beautiful future. We are convinced that this future belongs to the working people who are everywhere in the vanguard of the struggle for peace and international security, for national liberation, and for social progress. We see in this the indivisible link and continuity between our current and future accomplishments and the ideals of the October Revolution and the legacy of the great Lenin.

In the days of preparations for the celebration of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution the Soviet people are working with tremendous enthusiasm and creative energy in all sectors of the bright front of the struggle for communism. They realize perfectly that the economic achievements of the Soviet state strengthen the positions of world socialism and increase the attractiveness of socialist ideas the world over, for the countries of victorious socialism are exercising their main impact on the world's revolutionary process through their economic policy, steady improvement in the population's prosperity, and factual successes in the

historic competition with capitalism. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that economic achievements also determine our possibility to support the revolutionary and liberation movements throughout the world. They also determine the power of the example given by the new social system which is becoming the best agitator for socialism both for the working people in the capitalist countries and the peoples who have rejected the yoke of colonialism.

5003

CSO: 1802

REDUCTION OF MANUAL LABOR--IMPORTANT FACTOR IN THE RATIONAL UTILIZATION OF LABOR RESOURCES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 39-50

[Article by L. Danilov, candidate of economic sciences, head of labor resources department, Scientific Research Institute of Labor]

[Text] Profound changes occur in social labor at the mature socialist stage. Its content, conditions, and nature change. The changes in the field of labor are inseparably linked with the further growth of production effectiveness and the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. One of the most important directions in changing the structure of social labor at the present stage is reducing the sphere of use of underskilled and heavy physical labor and reducing the number of production workers doing manual work.

This task is considered among the most important tasks of the Soviet state in the field of social development and culture in the USSR draft constitution submitted for nationwide discussion. "The state," states Article 21, "is concerned with improving labor conditions and reducing and, in the future, totally eliminating heavy manual labor on the basis of comprehensive production mechanization and automation."

The influence of the scientific and technical revolution on the content and nature of labor is expressed, above all, in the fact that it qualitatively changes its material and technical base--production tools and technology. On the basis of fundamental scientific discoveries and their technical application, in the past 10 to 15 years many new highly productive machines, mechanisms, and apparatus have appeared in USSR industry, agriculture, construction, communications, and transportation. A great deal has been done to accelerate the pace of comprehensive mechanization and automation of production processes.

At the end of the Ninth Five-Year Plan industry--the leading sector of the national economy--had 114,100 mechanized assembly lines, 17,100 automatic lines, 66,200 comprehensive-mechanized and automated sectors, shops, and

production lines, and 5,400 comprehensively mechanized and automated enterprises. Modern highly productive equipment is being applied in agriculture evermore extensively: grain- and corn-harvesting combines, cotton-ginning and potato-digging machines, more powerful tractors, specialized trucks, and so on. The dynamics of the power-labor ratio give a general idea of progress in the field of mechanization. Compared with 1940, in 1975 it was 7 times higher in industry and 11 times higher in agriculture.

The scientific and technical revolution presents great opportunities for reducing the area of application of manual and, particularly, physical heavy and unskilled labor. Its distinguishing features are the development of comprehensively automated production facilities, and replacement of individual machine tools and apparatus with automated machine systems which insure the continuity of production processes and make man's direct participation in them unnecessary.

In accordance with the decisions of the 25th party congress the five-year plan calls for substantially reducing the share of manual labor. Extensive measures are being implemented to improve working conditions and the comprehensive mechanization and automation of previously "unattractive" operations. Particular emphasis is placed on taking the people out of shops whose labor conditions have an adverse effect on their health. Systems for the remote control of machine units, machines, and mechanisms, and the use of industrial robots are very promising in this respect.

The implementation of an extensive set of measures to install progressive equipment in all economic sectors is assuming tremendous social significance. "The technical retooling of industry, agriculture, construction, and transportation, for which tremendous funds are being allocated," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, addressing the 16th Congress of USSR Trade Unions, "is considered by the party a decisive means for improving labor conditions and making all production facilities safe and convenient for man...We have taken this path and will follow it steadfastly."

Production mechanization and upgrading the technical-labor ratio change the content of labor as a whole. The share of functions related to the use of muscular energy is reduced while the share of all intellectual and engineering-technical functions (controlling and observing the work of machines and mechanisms) increases. Labor is thus facilitated and made more meaningful and interesting. This offers extensive possibilities for the manifestation of the creative capabilities of the worker and the use of his scientific and technical knowledge. Consequently, it encourages the raising of the general educational and cultural-technical standards. With the growth of mechanization and comprehensive automation in the developed socialist society the share of manual, underskilled, and physically difficult labor will be reduced to an ever-greater extent and, respectively, disparities in the income levels of the working people will be reduced. One of the most important results of this process is to make labor more attractive and increase the level of satisfaction of the workers with the content of the work.

The social aspect of the problem of reducing manual labor on the basis of comprehensive production mechanization and automation is closely linked with the economic aspect--the efficient utilization of manpower resources. The point is that in the course of a long period of time the increased use of manpower outstripped the increased number of workers and employees in the national economy. Additional manpower requirements are largely satisfied by recruiting the able-bodied population (mainly women) engaged in household work or private plot farming. As a result, employment in social labor and full-time training rose from 82 percent in 1959 to 92.4 percent in 1970.

Therefore, this source for increasing the number of workers has already been exhausted. In the future we should expect even a certain reduction in the level of employment. Naturally, this phenomenon has nothing in common with unemployment under capitalism. By creating more favorably conditions for combining professional activities of women with their motherhood functions, in the 10th Five-Year Plan, and in accordance with the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress, the Soviet state will grant working mothers partially paid leave to care for children under 1 year of age. Unquestionably, the majority of women will make use of this right. The trend toward increasing the percentage of population going to school on a full-time basis will be retained as well.

In the past three five-year plans the role of the natural increase of manpower resources rose steadily in supplying the national economy with manpower. Thus, between 1961 and 1965 young people met 29.1 percent of the additional needs of the national economy for cadres; the figure rose to 57.3 percent between 1966 and 1970, and to over 90 percent between 1971 and 1975. However, starting with the middle of the 1970's, a substantial decline was noted in the dynamics of the natural growth. This is explained not only with the fact that, starting with 1977, the enterprises will recruit young people born in the 1960's, when a decline in the birth rate was noted, essentially triggered by the remote consequences of the war, but also the fact that starting with the end of the 1970's an ever-larger number of workers born in periods of a relatively high population increase will reach retirement age. That is why the task of saving and insuring the more rational utilization of manpower resources is becoming most urgent.

The reduction of manpower outlays must play an important role in insuring the balanced nature of the Soviet economy. The release of the workers engaged in manual labor is a prerequisite for securing manpower for newly completed projects, and upgrading the shift coefficient of equipment at standing enterprises and, consequently, the more effective utilization of production capacities and the increased amount of material goods produced with the same volume of capital assets. Furthermore, since the labor of the worker becomes more skilled, his productivity rises sharply. All other conditions being equal, this reduces the need of the economy for manpower resources and enables us to free some of them to meet the requirements of the rapidly developing nonproduction sectors. In the final account, it contributes to the ever fuller satisfaction of the spiritual needs of society as a whole and of each of its members in particular.

The high pace of saturation of the national economy with equipment and the application of essentially new technological processes have had a positive influence on reducing the share of workers engaged in manual labor. However, their absolute number did not decrease. The reason for this phenomenon was that the volume of output rose considerably in a number of sectors at the expense of extensive factors, on a traditional technical basis. At the same time, however, new production sectors developed rapidly, characterized by multiple-operation technology related to substantial outlays of manual labor. As a result, the number of people engaged in manual labor rose in proportion to the increased overall number of workers.

Under the conditions of high employment level in the public economy and the future reduction of the natural growth of able-bodied population, the objective need has developed to reduce systematically the absolute scale of use of manual labor. This conversion has been prepared by the preceding stages in the development of the Soviet economy which insured the development in the Soviet Union of a powerful economic and scientific and technical potential on the basis of which the socialist society can resolve major and complex problems.

Manual labor is a heterogeneous phenomenon. The USSR Central Statistical Administration divides manual workers into three groups. The first is those who operate manually machines and mechanisms (rigging workers, conveyer belt loaders, carrier loaders, and others); the second is workers doing manual work without the use of machines and mechanisms (fitters-assemblers, loaders, auxiliary workers, and so on); the third group is that of workers who manually repair and tune machinery and mechanisms (tuners of machine tools and equipment, fitters-repair workers, electricians, and others). The workers of the second group account for the highest share of those engaged in manual labor and, consequently, are the main reserve. Most of them are concentrated in machine building and in the food and light industries. A large number of such workers may be found in the timber procurement industry and at coal mines as well. The number of workers in the third group, most of whom are engaged in skilled and highly skilled manual labor, will naturally increase as the production process become saturated with complex equipment.

As we know, manual operations exist in basic and auxiliary output. However, most of them are focused in auxiliary work. Looking at the professional structure of manual workers we could see that most of them are controllers, quality controllers, graders, auxiliary workers, loaders, transportation workers, warehouse workers, weighing workers, and packaging workers. In 1975 these professional groups alone accounted for nearly 2.8 million people in industry. Such skills are characteristic of auxiliary output whose level of mechanization and automation is far behind basic production facilities. Most of the manual labor here is used for loading, unloading, and warehousing operations. As the volume of output grows and with the breakdown of technological operations, increased number of interoperation deliveries and movements of semifinished goods, parts, and procurements, an ever-larger

quantity of manpower will be used for their storing. This slows down the growth of labor productivity for the enterprise as a whole, increases production costs, and has an adverse effect on the pace of increased production effectiveness.

Calling for the more rational utilization of manpower resources in the 10th Five-Year Plan, at the October 1976 Central Committee Plenum Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out that the main way for its solution is "to accelerate the growth of labor productivity above all through the mechanization of manual labor not only in basic production facilities but in auxiliary loading-unloading and repair operations."

The reduction of manual labor outlays is a complex and comprehensive problem. Its successful solution is possible only on the basis of the planned implementation of a system of technical, organizational, economic, and social measures on the level of the entire national economy and on the level of enterprises, on a sectorial and intersectorial scale.

As we know, basic and auxiliary output represent interrelated elements of a single production process. Yet, they are drastically different in terms of the level and pace of labor mechanization. At machine-building enterprises, for example, working facilities for auxiliary workers are considerably lesser than in basic production. The use of new equipment and technology still largely leads to the release of basic workers. In particular, as a study conducted by the Scientific Research Institute of Labor indicated, in machine shops of machine-building enterprises technical progress made it possible to release 21 percent of basic workers but only 15 percent of auxiliary workers. As a result, labor savings achieved by raising the technical level of basic production is greatly reduced by the increased number of auxiliary workers. A situation in which, metaphorically speaking, in many enterprises computers are installed next to sledge hammers could not be considered normal.

Manual labor in the "rear" of enterprises is being reduced at an insufficiently high pace largely because of the shortage of equipment for handling lifting, loading, unloading, and warehousing operations. Currently the needs of the national economy for such equipment are being met approximately 75 percent. Two ministries--the Ministry of Machine Tool and Tool-Building Industry and the Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building--produce only one-third of the required lifting equipment. Many sectors have been forced to organize the production of such equipment themselves. Naturally, this increases the cost of the machines, manual labor outlays, and so on.

Determining the directions of scientific and technical progress in the 10th Five-Year Plan, the 25th CPSU Congress emphasized the need to convert from the creation and utilization of individual machines to machine systems covering entirely the entire technological process and the mechanization and automation of labor intensive operations, above all in sectors where a number

of workers are engaged in heavy manual labor, as well as in underground work and in production conditions harmful to the health. Guided by the congress decisions, the State Committee for Science and Technology developed for the first time a specific scientific and technical program for the production of equipment for the mechanization and automation of lifting, loading-unloading, and warehousing operations. It stipulates a number of measures, starting with scientific research and ending with the industrial mastering of the new equipment (all possible kinds of conveyer belts, automated and electric loading mechanisms, lifting machinery for work with materials of big dimensions, shelf-loading cranes, and other machines and mechanisms, including machines operating automatically). Deadlines for the completion of assignments and for their intermediary stages were indicated. The implementation of this program involves the participation of 55 collectives of scientific research and design-planning organizations, and industrial enterprises of 8 different ministries and departments.

In the Ninth Five-Year Plan the rationalizers and inventors at many enterprises--production workers, engineers, and technicians--as well as plant, city, and sectorial organizations of the All-Union Society of Inventors and Efficiency Experts and scientific and technical departments did extensive work to reduce manual labor outlays in auxiliary production facilities. Making use of internal reserves and of anything valuable developed through the live creativity of the masses, the collectives of a number of associations, plants, and factories were able to reduce considerably the number of operations performed manually, and to upgrade the level of mechanization of labor intensive processes.

At the beginning of the last five-year plan over 20 percent of the workers of the Ryazan' Plant for Heavy Press-Forging Equipment were employed in the auxiliary subdivisions. The party committee and the administration mobilized the collective for the elimination of this disproportion. Commissions which included specialists and workers-innovators drafted a program for the retooling of the enterprise. A particular role in the program was assigned to measures making it possible to eliminate bottlenecks at auxiliary sectors. The USSR Ministry of Machine Tool and Tool-Building Industry did not include the enterprise in its reconstruction plan, for which reason the work was done by the enterprise itself. Shop collectives and plant construction workers joined in subbotniks, and participated in assembling metal structures and attachments most of which they manufactured themselves, paying for them from the production development fund and with the help of a bank loan. All in all, in the past five-year plan, over 3 million rubles from noncentralized sources were used to improve auxiliary production facilities. As a result, the level of mechanization of labor intensive processes at warehouses and in loading and unloading operations rose by one-third, while the number of workers declined approximately 30 percent.

In recent years the Gor'kiy automotive vehicles plant completed two powerful warehousing complexes equipped with the latest equipment and multiple-deck shelving. This made it possible to release 2,383 workers previously engaged

in loading and unloading operations, and to save 19.5 million rubles. The great achievement of the plant workers was the creation of automated casting shop number eight. The only manual operation here is pouring the core in the molds.

The uninterrupted transportation of freight was organized at the head enterprise of the AvtoZIL association. Extensive use is made of conveyer belts which carry parts and items from one workplace to another, one section to another, and one shop to another. General plant and shop warehouses were set up equipped with modern mechanization facilities. Thus, in the Eighth Five-Year Plan, the level of mechanization of transportation and warehousing operations at the head enterprise rose from 55 to 90 percent. Outlays for the release of one production worker averaged one-third less than of a basic worker, while measures for the mechanization of transportation and warehousing operations were compensated for in 2-2.5 years. In the Ninth Five-Year Plan the plant manufactured 70,000 units of standardized containers and purchased 250 automated and electric-powered loaders. This made possible the development of a unified system of uninterrupted transportation of freight from supply enterprises to ZIL shops and the exclusion of manual labor entirely. Complementing assemblies manufactured at the Bryansk automotive vehicles plant, electrical equipment and glassware produced by Moscow plants, enamels, dyes, brake systems, and other items produced at enterprises in Mtsensk, Sverdlovsk, Roslavl', Ryazan', and Yaroslavl' are supplied without transshipments. Big tonnage containers are extensively used in shipping the freight.

The Svobodnyy Trud lacquers and dyes plant in Yaroslavl' has provided an example of a truly creative approach to the problem of reducing manual labor. Here a thorough study was made of the shops and sectors and a list of operations using heavy manual labor was made. Basic measures were earmarked to reduce such labor outlays and priorities were established in their implementation in accordance with technical, material, and financial possibilities. In order to insure the practical detailed elaboration of such measures 45 creative brigades were set up which included engineers, specialists in labor organization and norming, and production innovators. As a result, as early as 1973, heavy manual labor was totally eliminated at the plant while the level of labor mechanization of the production workers reached 75.1 percent. The funds saved from the release of workers paid in full for a new shop and for a number of other production sectors. Many such examples could be cited.

Yet, we should note that the pace at which manual labor outlays are being reduced as a whole in auxiliary production facilities remains insufficiently high. One of the reasons is that, drafting plans for new equipment, occasionally sectorial ministries and departments do not engage in a thorough study of the technical and economic level of auxiliary operations and inadequately promote the progressive experience of enterprises in the field of mechanization and automation of operations. In our view attention should

be paid to the suggestion of scientists and practical workers who call for issuing assignments to ministries and departments on the conversion of workers from manual to mechanized labor (in both basic and auxiliary production). The expediency of such an approach was proved by the experience of the Lithuanian SSR where ministries and departments are issued such assignments through the republic plan for the development of the national economy.

Naturally, most enterprises do not have their own facilities for the manufacturing of minor mechanization means (various types of trolleys, reusable containers, lifting systems, and others), while their cost at enterprises which produce them is considerable. In this connection the enterprises of the Lithuanian SSR reviewed the type of heavy work performed manually, summed up data on the mechanization of auxiliary operations, determined the most successful organizational and technical alternatives, and established the needs of enterprises for minor mechanization facilities. By decision of the Communist Party of Lithuania Central Committee and the republic's Council of Ministers, on a cooperative basis one of the enterprises organized the specialized production of nonstandard minor mechanization facilities for plants, factories, construction projects, and transportation organizations, regardless of their departmental affiliation. By the end of the five-year plan the amount of minor mechanization funds allocated will exceed 6 million rubles. Obviously, it would be expedient to set up in each economic rayon such head specialized enterprises with their design bureaus and information-coordination centers.

Unfortunately, ministries and departments rarely undertake the active development of specialization and redistribution of funds in favor of intersectorial production facilities. Yet, at specialized enterprises producing goods for intersectorial use, assembly equipment, instruments, and forgings have a labor productivity which is frequently six to eight times higher while production costs are five to six times lower compared with the shops and sectors of small plants of various economic sectors. At such enterprises the number of production workers engaged in labor intensive manual operations is also considerably less.

The specialization and centralization of repairs yield great results. As we know, the number of machines used in the national economy is growing steadily and they are becoming evermore complex. Frequently, in this connection, the use of workers in repair operations is considered a natural phenomenon related to the higher technical level of output. However, we cannot fail to see that manual labor outlays for equipment repairs are frequently linked with low-level mechanization, great decentralization, and poor specialization in repair operations.

In machine building, for example, outlays for repairing various types of metal-processing equipment annually exceed 1.9 billion rubles and will continue to grow (with the increase in the number of machines and the intensiveness of their use), should the organization of repairs remain at the

same level. Most machine-building enterprises repair their machine tools themselves and are sometimes unable to regain their initial parameters. The share of manual work in such auxiliary services reaches 73 percent which is 2.5-3 times higher than in basic production. The service life of the machines, following capital repairs, is also 25 percent lower than initially stipulated.

Substantial savings in manual labor for repairs could be achieved as a result of the development of specialization and centralization of repair operations, and by increasing the centralized production of spare assemblies and parts by enterprises which produce the equipment, and by extending the service life of the most important machine assemblies and parts.

A certain experience in centralized repairs has already been acquired in the country. For example, currently the Soyuzstankoremont All-Union Industrial Association of the Ministry of Machine Tool and Tool-Building Industry has 11 specialized enterprises in different parts of the country and design and technological bureaus for the automation and modernization of metal-cutting equipment. The capacities of the association's plants makes it possible to satisfy the needs of the national economy for the centralized repair of jig-boring machines and, in the next 2 years, of thread-grinding, lens-grinding, and gear-cutting machines. The variety of parts of general use machine tools which could be rebuilt is broadening. Currently Soyuzstankoremont is rebuilding equipment for enterprises belonging to 45 different ministries and departments. The 1977 association's plan calls for modernizing the equipment along with providing capital repairs (so that equipment parameters may become maximally closer to those of currently produced machinery, and that manual operations may be mechanized).

Nevertheless, so far the centralization of repair operations in the country remains insufficient. We believe that, above all, the ministries must manage even more efficiently available facilities: transfer, wherever expedient, plant repair shops to specialized repair enterprises. Another promising method, in our view, would be the organization of such enterprises on a cooperative basis. Ministries (in areas where their enterprises are concentrated) could allocate some of their funds for production development to centralized repairs. This would tremendously benefit the national economy and release manpower.

The reduction of manpower outlays is one of the prerequisites for the dynamic development of the economy and for the growth of the people's prosperity. The successful solution of this problem will largely determine the implementation of the course of comprehensively upgrading social production effectiveness.

Along with the adoption of technical and organizational measures aimed at reducing manual labor, the economic and social conditions which insure the direct material and moral interest of production collectives and of individual workers to achieve maximal savings in labor, and increase volume of output with lesser personnel, release manpower and reassign it to national economic sectors needing additional manpower resources assume great importance.

Important prerequisites for upgrading the effectiveness of the utilization of manpower resources at enterprises were created in the course of the implementation of the economic reform and the conversion to the new methods of planning and economic incentive. The "Basic Directions for the Development of the USSR National Economy in 1976-1980" emphasize that increasing the role of economic incentive for improving the utilization of manpower resources will remain the topical task of the 10th Five-Year Plan as well.

The solution of the problem of reducing manual labor is largely determined by the extent to which the enterprises themselves will be interested in the rational utilization of manpower resources. We know that in the socialist society the recovery of outlays for the reproduction of manpower takes place in two forms---through wages included in enterprise production costs and through social consumption funds---cash payments, benefits, and free services. State budget funds, largely created through payments from profits and the turnover tax paid by enterprises and organizations, as well as assets from the economic incentive funds and other funds assigned for such purposes by associations, plants, and factories are sources for social consumption funds. Also paid to the state budget are withholdings for social insurance included in the production costs of enterprises.

Under such circumstances the factual labor outlays in enterprise production costs are not fully reflected (according to a number of economists they are reflected less than 75 percent). This distorts the factual proportions of labor and material outlays in the general commodity production outlays and inflates the amount of profits shown by associations, plants, and factories. A lowered assessment of labor outlays frequently leads to the fact that the enterprise finds it unprofitable to use machines and mechanisms insuring labor savings.

Yet, the amount of participation in enterprises in the establishment of the social consumption funds, which compensate for a considerable part of the funds spent for the reproduction of manpower, are determined essentially by the level of the overall profitability of the association, plant, or factory, and hardly depend on the effectiveness with which the manpower is used. This lowers the incentive of enterprises to utilize it rationally.

Noting said shortcomings, many economists have called for the introduction of special withholdings of enterprise funds by the budget, based on the quantity and quality of the manpower used. Such withholdings should stimulate the most efficient utilization of the manpower at each enterprise.

The introduction of such a system (in its different variants it is being tried by several socialist countries and, as a whole, reactions have been positive) would enable us to eliminate the underestimating of labor outlays in enterprise production costs. Furthermore, the direct connection among reducing the number of workers, the amount of payments, and the enterprise material incentive funds would create a further stimulus for accelerating the processes of production mechanization and automation and reducing the realm of application of manual labor.

However, we should bear in mind that the effectiveness of such withholdings will depend directly on the condition of the entire system of cost accounting relations. In order to insure the implementation of the main cost accounting principle in enterprise activities--returns--and the need to restore all production outlays and create an added product as a source of profit it would be expedient, in our view, to include in production costs (along with wages) the total outlays for the reproduction of manpower payed out of social consumption funds. This would require the elaboration of a scientific method for the consideration of such outlays, and the formulation of the necessary economic mechanism for their restoration by the enterprises. We must also improve the price-setting system: prices must come closer to socially necessary labor outlays and the excessive disparities among the profitability of enterprises should be eliminated.

In a word, the practical application of such a system of withholdings should be preceded by its profound theoretical substantiation, detailed elaboration, and experimental testing through the joint efforts of scientific and practical workers--specialists in cost accounting, material incentive, price setting, finances, and others.

The accelerated pace of reduction of manual labor and the reaching of high economic and social results from measures implemented in this area are largely predetermined by the extent to which they are implemented systematically and plannedly, the accuracy with which their social consequences have been considered, and the accuracy with which the enterprises direct their main efforts. Here again the comprehensive plans for social development of production collectives are of very great importance. In 1975 over 50,000 such plans were drafted by industrial associations, plants, factories, scientific and research establishments and design institutes, kolkhozes, and sovkhoses. Their implementation by many enterprises yields tangible results and narrows the sector of underskilled labor.

In the past 9 years the number of workers engaged in manual labor has been reduced by 50 percent at the Perm' Telephones Plant which, along with the Svetlana Association in Leningrad, the L'vov televisions plant, and a number of other enterprises, initiated social planning in the country. With the help of social planning a number of problems which arose at the Kirovskil Zavod production association were successfully resolved. The installation of a metal-rolling complex at the 350 Mill made it possible to eliminate entirely many skills at the mill involving primarily physical labor (or else change their nature radically). The association considered that those who would be released would not be young and would have a relatively low education level and would find it more difficult than other people to master new skills. That is why the association included in its social development plan measures for the retraining, upgrading of skills, and reassignment of some workers to other shops. All this made it possible to strengthen the cadres and to increase the level of satisfaction of the workers with their work.

Unfortunately, in the Ninth Five-Year Plan measures in the field of social planning were not always linked with the real possibilities and the material-technical and financial resources of the enterprises. Many plans did not stipulate measures to replace manual labor or include indicators on changing the correlation among workers' groups based on the level of labor mechanization during the base and the planned periods, or measures to improve the qualificational structure of the collectives.

The 25th party congress assigned for the 10th Five-Year Plan the task of improving the comprehensive planning of economic and social development at enterprises and associations. This changed the very approach to the problem. Today the elaboration and implementation of the plan for social development are becoming a mandatory planning element. Whereas in the past the enterprises frequently included several different planning documents--production assignment, plan for new equipment and for labor, and social development--today it is a question of an integral comprehensive program, of organically combining economic with social aspects, of upgrading the overall level of planning, and of intensifying its influence on the life of the collective.

This faces the economic managements, party and trade union organizations, and economic services of enterprises with major requirements. Above all, we must be well-acquainted with the possibilities for the development of production facilities in the association, plant, and factory, the means of technical progress, and the directions to be followed in improving organization and management. This would enable us realistically to assess the economic possibilities and resources of the collective--the material foundations of social changes which should pertain to the education and skill of the workers, and their working, living, and recreation conditions. Therefore, the essential difference of today's comprehensive plans is the fact that they establish the precise quantitative correlations between the technical and economic changes in production and the social changes which follow them.

Sectorial ministries, main administrations, and administrations are scheduled to play a major role in the improvement of comprehensive planning. The enterprises must be given prompt methodical aid. Scientists must be involved in the formulation of comprehensive plans. The experience acquired by the collectives must be summed up; the reasons for omissions must be studied and systematic control over the implementation of measures must be provided.

This is precisely the way the personnel of the Main Moscow Automotive Transportation Administration try to organize their work. Let us take as an example the social development plan of the Automotive Repairs Plants Administration for 1976-1980. The administration set up five groups for each of its sections (production, economic, political-educational, organizational, and labor safety), which included managers and specialists, and representatives of the party, trade union, and Komsomol organizations. Methodical guidance was assigned to the laboratories for scientific organization of

labor, management, and sociological studies. The drafters tried to make the plan concrete, above all: to exclude from it general loose formulations and measures which could not be objectively and directly controlled. Since the plan for the social development of the administration could not be the simple total of the plans of the different plants, efforts were made in its elaboration, on the one hand, to sum up the experience of the administration's enterprises and to select the most valuable initiatives, and, on the other, to include measures and indicators specific to the individual plants. In order to determine the biggest bottlenecks and establish the most effective way for the use of social development funds, comprehensive sociological studies were conducted at 10 enterprises. About one-third of the workers were polled (an attempt was made to insure a proportional representation of all categories and social groups). As we know, social planning is based on changes in the production process itself which has a determining impact on the various aspects of the collective's social life. For this reason over 40 percent of the questions in the surveys dealt with clarifying the views of the workers on labor conditions, and the organization of production processes and management systems. The study of the results of such an investigation made it possible to determine the plants and sectors where priority attention should be given to improving labor conditions. In this connection the social development plan calls for a number of operations related to labor mechanization and automation. In particular, 21 assembly lines will be installed, 118 different nonstandard types of equipment and mechanized instruments will be manufactured, and progressive technological methods will be developed for the manufacturing and rebuilding of parts reducing manual labor outlays. The implementation of these and other measures will make it possible to increase the share of workers engaged in highly mechanized or mechanized labor by 10.8 percent and lower the number of workers engaged in manual work by 23.6 percent (the overall number of production workers engaged in heavy work or work dangerous or harmful to the health will be reduced 86.6 percent in the 5-year period). A system for controlling the implementation of social development plans has been created. The plants submit to the administration annual programs for the development and application of stipulated measures (with quarterly breakdowns). Once every 3 months they report on their implementation. The reports mandatorily must include the measures which have not been implemented, indicate the reasons, and set new deadlines. The administration workers periodically visit the plants and check on the implementation of the plans.

Such a system for the elaboration and the sociological and economical substantiation of integral comprehensive programs and for controlling their implementation is a guarantee for the effectiveness of the search for and mobilization of social reserves for upgrading production effectiveness and reducing manual labor outlays.

In conclusion, let us note the following. As we know, in the 10th Five-Year Plan increases in the number of workers and employees will be met almost entirely by young people essentially with full secondary education. At the same time, workers who, in their time, did not acquire adequate general

educational training and were primarily engaged in work not requiring high skills or doing heavy physical work will pass the able-bodied age limit. It is no secret that today's youth--literate and with a broad outlook--is not attracted by this type of work. It is obvious that social planning today more than in the past should be oriented toward preventing an acute shortage of cadres at such workplaces, high manpower turnover, and so on. Therefore, each enterprise, city, region, or sector must determine and, within a short time, do everything possible for the maximal reduction of the number of workplaces using manual underskilled and heavy physical labor. At the same time, the plans for social development must take into consideration the fact that such work cannot be fully eliminated in the foreseeable future. Consequently, it would be expedient to formulate measures aimed at the psychological preparation of the young people to engage temporarily in such work, and for a realistic (accurately determined in terms of time) vocational-qualificational promotion of young workers.

Reducing manual labor outlays is becoming today one of the most important socioeconomic tasks earmarked by the 25th CPSU Congress. The solution of this problem is a major prerequisite for lowering further the share of unskilled and heavy physical labor and is inseparably linked with the exercise of the right to work, supplemented in the draft of the new USSR Constitution with the right to choose one's own profession and type of employment and work in accordance with one's vocation, capabilities, professional training, and consideration of social requirements. The adoption of a comprehensive approach to reducing manual labor outlays, and the coordinated implementation of scientific and technical, organizational, economic, and social measures at all levels of economic management will have a positive influence on balancing the Soviet economy, and upgrading social production effectiveness. This will create prerequisites for the all-round development of the individual and for making labor a first vital human need.

5003

CSO: 1802

COURSE TOWARD THE QUALITATIVE REORGANIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL OUTPUT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 51-62

[Article by S. Sdobnov, doctor of economic sciences]

[Text] Upgrading social production effectiveness and improving the quality indicators of all types of work for the sake of the further growth of the economy and the people's prosperity is the long-term task of our party's economic strategy. Agriculture plays an exceptionally great role in its implementation. This economic sector produces the bulk of the food products and the necessary materials for the manufacturing of clothing, shoes, and other mass consumer objects. Agriculture is a major source for socialist accumulations, and for the expanded reproduction of the overall product. Without a strong agricultural base, V. I. Lenin pointed out, no economic construction is possible. That is why problems of agricultural development are always the center of attention of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

I

Having emphasized the continuity of the basic directions of Lenin's agrarian policy, the 25th CPSU Congress developed further its essential stipulations in terms of the present stage and formulated a number of new concepts. The congress documents profoundly substantiated the party's course toward a qualitative reorganization of overall agricultural output and the conversion of agriculture to a contemporary industrial base.

The qualitative reorganization of all agriculture is a matter of tremendous economic and political importance. The further successful solution of many major problems related to the building of communism--the planned and dynamic development of the national economy, the creation of a powerful comestible and raw material base, the acceleration of the growth of the people's prosperity, and the rapprochement between town and country are inseparably linked with the all-round development and strengthening of agricultural output. The CPSU Central Committee decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution" notes that the party's agrarian policy aimed at converting agricultural production into a highly developed economic sector pursues the reaching of most important economic and social objectives.

The course formulated by the party is based on the general line followed in the economic development of the country and is aimed at drastically upgrading social production effectiveness. This course is dictated by the objective requirements of the building of communism. It is a question of developing a highly intensive agricultural output on an industrial basis as a structural part of building the material and technical foundations for communism.

The level of intensive agricultural development, as we know, is determined by the condition of its material and technical base, the fertility of the soil, which is the main capital asset in this economic sector, the vocational-technical training of the workers, production concentration and specialization, and the social division of labor and its productivity. All this is inseparable from the development of science and technology and from the use of their achievements in farming and animal husbandry, and from improving and expanding the infrastructure. Therefore, the qualitative reorganization of agricultural output covers all its most important aspects. It presumes the total technical retooling of agriculture in accordance with the requirements of the scientific and technical revolution, the profound technological restructuring of its sectors, the reorganization of social conditions, the nature and content of agricultural work, and the all-round development of production and technical services to the countryside.

The solution of such a complex problem, as was noted at the 25th CPSU Congress, will require time, work, and huge capital investments. We know that in terms of its capital-labor ratio our agriculture is 70 percent behind industry. This is explained by the fact that for a number of reasons, mainly of an objective-historical nature, it was only of late, when a powerful economic potential was created in the country and when material and technical possibilities increased greatly, that the state was able to allocate substantial funds for agriculture.

In recent years tremendous work has been done to develop and implement a system of governmental measures aimed at the faster development of agriculture. To this effect a more extensive use is being made of the overall economic potential of the country. This is convincingly proved by the following fact: of the 352 billion rubles of capital investments received by agriculture throughout the Soviet system, 244 billion were invested in the past 11 years. This made it possible to strengthen considerably the material and technical base of kolkhozes and sovkhoses, and to upgrade the technical level of agricultural output.

In 1 decade (1966-1975) the kolkhozes and sovkhoses were supplied with over 3 million tractors, 900,000 grain-harvesting combines, 1.8 million trucks and specialized motor vehicles, and many billions of rubles worth of other agricultural equipment. Within that time the capital-labor ratio in agriculture rose 2.5 times; its power-labor ratio more than doubled, while electric power consumption in agriculture rose 3.5 times. A great deal was done to improve soil fertility. The amount of chemical fertilizers used

tripled. Over 14 million hectares of land were reclaimed and investments in the building of livestock premises, complexes, and poultry farms, and for mechanizing livestock farm labor more than doubled.

Increased intensification called for a considerable development of the industrial sectors supplying equipment, chemical fertilizers, petroleum products, and other material and technical facilities to the villages. Of late the reconstruction of plants for the production of tractors, combines, and other agricultural machinery, and of chemical enterprises is being expanded; new plants are being built. In the Ninth Five-Year Plan the production of agricultural machinery rose 80 percent and capacities for the production of 38 million tons of chemical fertilizers were installed.

All this made it possible to achieve the accelerated development of crop growing and animal husbandry. Since the March (1965) CPSU Central Committee Plenum the average annual output of agricultural commodities, compared with the previous decade, rose 40 percent, as follows: grain production, 40 percent; cotton, 50 percent; meat, 50 percent; milk, 40 percent; and eggs, 60 percent. In the Ninth Five-Year Plan alone the overall growth of output, compared with the Seventh Five-Year Plan, was 256 million tons of grain, 13.4 million tons of cotton, 23.3 million tons of meat, 113.7 millions tons of milk, and 113.5 billion eggs. These figures convincingly prove the high returns of the financial and material funds invested in agricultural development. Such returns could have been even higher had there not been severe droughts which afflicted our agriculture in the past five-year plan twice. Thanks to intensification yields of grain and other farm crops rose and the productivity of the cattle and poultry increased. Agriculture took confidently the path of dynamic development. Achievements in the development of agriculture are among the most important economic and political results of the party's activities in recent years.

"Giving our accomplishments their proper due," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 25th CPSU Congress, "we also clearly see that in order to insure the level of saturation of agriculture with equipment, fertilizers, and power facilities needed under contemporary conditions, a great deal more remains to be done. Therefore, the task is to implement the party's course with the same persistence."

II

The comprehensive intensification of crop growing and animal husbandry is the decisive factor for the radical reorganization of agricultural output and its conversion to a contemporary industrial base. This is one of the most important conditions for building the material and technical foundations for communism. "...Insuring the foundations of communism in agriculture," Lenin noted, "could be accomplished through a tremendous technical evolution" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 42, p 187).

The development of agriculture as of the other realms of social output is based on expanded reproduction which has two aspects: extensive and intensive. These forms are interrelated. However, they play different roles in the different stages of social economic progress. Their ratio is determined by the existence of resources, the level of scientific and technical development, the condition of the country's economy, and socioeconomic relations.

A primarily intensive economic growth is inherent in the higher stages of development of social production forces. This is characteristic of agriculture as well. The Marxist-Leninist classics considered agricultural intensification as organically linked with scientific and technical progress and related it to increasing output per unit of land area. Lenin pointed out that intensification means technical changes in agriculture, conversion to progressive crop-growing systems, increased utilization of chemical fertilizers, improved labor tools and machines, and increased scale of their use. The development of agriculture on such a basis presumes a sufficiently high level of industry capable of producing such capital assets and the existence of skilled cadres able to apply the achievements of science and technology.

Today one can no longer rely on a considerable growth of output without the extensive utilization of the achievements of science and technology in any economic sector, and even more so in such a complex and comprehensive sector as agriculture. The intensification of crop growing and animal husbandry becomes particularly urgent also because our country can no longer expand on a large scale its areas in crops. In turn, the population expansion leads to the fact that the availability of arable land per capita is showing a declining trend. Whereas in 1960 it averaged 1.03 hectares per capita, it averaged 0.97 in 1965, 0.92 in 1970, and 0.88 hectares in 1976. Naturally, this trend will be retained in the future. This is one of the most important reasons why under contemporary conditions the role of intensive factors in the development of agricultural output has been given priority.

Our party has concretized and profoundly revealed the nature and significance of agricultural intensification in terms of the contemporary stage of development. Above all, the important conclusion that agricultural intensification under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution is inseparably linked with its industrialization was profoundly substantiated. Intensification calls for systemic investments, evermore skilled labor, new and more advanced equipment, and extensive use of progressive technology in the production process. The all-round strengthening of the material and technical base of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and the conversion of agricultural output to an industrial base are the main links in agricultural intensification, insuring the accelerated pace of its development, higher labor productivity, and reduced production costs.

The qualitative reorganization of leading agricultural sectors--crop growing and animal husbandry--following the model of big machine industry, and the conversion of agricultural labor into a variety of industrial labor represent the main content of agricultural industrialization. It is a question of creating a highly intensive agricultural output based on the comprehensive mechanization of labor and extensive development of automation. This means that the technical facilities for agricultural work must be on the level of industrial work in a highly developed modern industry or even exceed this level. This is precisely the essence of the problem of agricultural industrialization. Here we must bear in mind that, unlike industry, agriculture is related to the reproduction of living organisms--plants and animals. It is characterized by the need for a great deal of space, non-coincidence between times of output and periods of work, and the existence of biological characteristics in growing farm crops and raising cattle breeds. Here the economic reproduction process is inseparably interwoven with the natural process. "Farming has characteristics which absolutely cannot be eliminated...As a result of such characteristics large-scale machine industry in agriculture will never acquire all the features it has in industry" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 5, p 137). Despite the growing level of technical labor facilities and production socialization, agriculture is bound to retain its distinguishing features determined by natural factors.

Elaborating problems of agrarian policy, the party developed further the Marxist-Leninist view that intensification leads to increased soil fertility and productivity in crop growing and animal husbandry and, consequently, to increased output per unit of land area. Intensifying the reorganizing impact of production processes on crop growing and animal husbandry, intensification enables us to reach the objectives faster. It insures the ever-greater stability of output in terms of adverse weather conditions and makes possible the successful solution of the major national economic problems facing agriculture. In a word, it is a question of "creating the type of material and technical base for agriculture," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 24th CPSU Congress, "which will enable us in the future to resolve fully problems of agricultural production and of the organization of the villages, and lower the dependence of farming on the elements of nature."

Increased intensification does not exclude the need to make use of quantitative factors in the growth of agriculture. We know that under the conditions of fast scientific and technical progress new possibilities arise for involving farmland in agricultural circulation and for increasing the size of cattle herds. This is confirmed, in particular, by the experience of our country in which reclamation projects aimed at the development of desert and semidesert steppes, and of droughty and swamped land are conducted on a broad scale with a view to expanding the size of arable land. Engaged in intensification, the problem is not only that of not reducing areas in crops but increasing them if possible and, on the basis of the extensive use of contemporary economic management methods and progressive technology,

upgrading the effectiveness of all utilized land and increasing output per hectare of farmland, and steadily upgrading crop growing and animal husbandry productivity, thus reaching the level of development of agricultural output needed by society.

The party's course toward all-round agricultural intensification and industrialization is materially backed above all by considerably increased capital investments in that sector. Whereas between 1961 and 1965 they averaged 3,800 rubles per 100 hectares of farmland for the entire set of projects, they rose to 6,200 in 1966-1970, and 10,300 rubles in the 1971-1975 period. In other words, in a single decade investments per unit of land area more than tripled. This is precisely one of the main indicators of increased intensification.

The industrialization process of our agriculture is characterized by the growing quantity of various machines supplied the countryside. Whereas in 1940 it received 84 different types of agricultural equipment and machinery, it received 222 different types in 1950, 490 in 1965, 724 in 1970, and some 1,500 in 1975. The changes which have taken place in this respect in recent years have been particularly noteworthy. In 1975 agriculture received three times more different types of machines compared with 1965. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes are being supplied with evermore advanced equipment, specialized transportation facilities, and means for comprehensive mechanization and automation.

Our industry is producing on a serial basis new machines with high operational speeds, powerful tractors, broad-range and combined machine units performing several technological operations, and many others. Noteworthy by their high productivity among the new types of equipment developed are the K-701 and T-150 tractors, the Kolos and Niva grain-harvesting combines, and the Fregat and Volzhanka spraying systems. The production of machines and equipment for the mechanization of labor processes at animal husbandry farms and complexes is expanding as well.

The solution of problems related to substantially strengthening the material and technical base of agriculture is consistent with the continuation of the course of considerable redistribution of accumulations in favor of agriculture. In the 10th Five-Year Plan capital investments totaling 170 billion rubles will be allocated for the entire set of operations, including industrial, housing, and consumer construction, and equipment purchases. As in previous years, these funds will be concentrated along three main directions of agricultural production intensification--mechanization, chemization, and reclamation.

Above all, the technical retooling of agriculture will be continued on the basis of new equipment and the use of assembly line-industrial production methods and progressive technology, and increased level of mechanization of agricultural operations. In the 5-year period equipment deliveries to agriculture will be increased 50 percent. This equipment will be modern,

highly productive, and varied. The villages will receive on an ever-greater scale power-saturated tractors, highly productive combines, wide-range machine units, and other more advanced machines distinguished by their reliability, durability, and high productivity. As a result of the implementation of such measures, at the end of the five-year plan per capital power facilities available for agricultural labor will reach 27 horsepower or an increase of 60 percent compared with 1975; power facilities per 100 hectares of areas in crops will be increased 50 percent.

This will raise considerably the level of agricultural mechanization. This applies not only to crop growing but, particularly, to animal husbandry in which the share of manual labor remains high. The plan for 1976-1980 calls for completing the comprehensive mechanization of grain, and sugar beet growing and increasing mechanization in cotton growing and in the growing of other farm crops. The machine system planned for the 10th Five-Year Plan includes over 2,850 types of different technical facilities. This five-year plan over 950 new machines and equipment will be developed, and the majority of them will be produced on a serial basis. Particular attention is being paid to upgrading the quality of the equipment, increasing the power of engines and motors, lowering the material intensiveness of machine units, and improving other technical and economic parameters.

Chemization and land reclamation are powerful factors in the qualitative reorganization of agricultural output. These directions of intensification have an immediate impact on changing the fertility of the soil and on upgrading its production power. In the 10th Five-Year Plan chemization and reclamation will continue to be developed intensively. By 1980 deliveries of chemical fertilizers will reach 115 million tons and chemical fodder supplements will reach 5 million tons. At the same time the quality of the fertilizers will be upgraded and the percentage of phosphorous, concentrated, and mixed fertilizers will be increased considerably. The contribution of the microbiologists to agricultural chemization will be increased as well. Land reclamation projects will continue to be implemented on a broad scale. This five-year plan an additional 5 million hectares of land will be irrigated, including the use of liman irrigation; 4.7 million hectares will be drained; 37.6 million hectares of pastures land will be watered in desert, semidesert, and mountain areas. It is important to note that the building of irrigation and draining systems is now conducted on a high technical level.

Science is having a growing impact on agricultural production intensification. The CPSU considers the acceleration of scientific and technical progress a decisive prerequisite for the further development of agricultural production forces. Practical experience has unequivocally proved that a scientific system of crop growing and animal husbandry must be based on the extensive use of efficient crop rotation, highly intensive plant strains, use of more productive cattle breeds, progressive organization of the upkeep and care of the livestock, proper soil cultivation, and strict implementation of agro-technical rules. The contemporary stage in the development of agriculture

is characterized by the ever-broader use of scientific and technical achievements. This is actively contributing to qualitative changes at all farming levels.

As a complex and comprehensive social production sector agriculture needs a steady influx of basic knowledge on the nature of plants and animals, and new ideas capable of revolutionizing agricultural output. Therefore, the use of highly intensive crop strains and highly productive livestock breeds and their extensive dissemination are an inseparable part of the entire process of the qualitative reorganization of agricultural output.

Establishing the ways for further agricultural upsurge, the 25th CPSU Congress paid particular attention to the development of selection and seed growing and to improving breeding as the most important factors for increasing production output and reducing labor and material outlays.

Extensive work is being done in the Soviet Union in these important agricultural production sectors. The successes achieved by our selection workers are well known. They created excellent strains of winter wheat, sunflower, cotton, and some other crops, whose use made a considerable increase in their yields possible. Between 1966 and 1976 average annual grain crop yields rose nearly 50 percent compared with the preceding decade. In 1976 over 9,000 kolkhozes and sovkhoses, or one-fifth of their overall number, averaged over 30 quintals of grain per hectare while the best among them averaged 50 or more quintals. A great deal is being done in animal husbandry as well in which, under the Soviet system, over 60 new highly productive cattle breeds were introduced. This made it possible to considerably renovate the structure of the herds and increase animal husbandry output.

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decrees "On Measures to Improve Further Selection and Seed Growing of Grain and Oleaginous Crops and Grasses" and "On Measures to Upgrade Further the Effectiveness of Agricultural Science and Strengthen its Ties With Production," passed in accordance with the congress stipulations, earmark specific ways for the solution of such problems. Along with the results achieved these documents also note the essential shortcomings. In particular, they point out the lagging in the introduction of new strains of farm crops, winter grain crops in particular, and of strains for sowing on irrigated lands, consistent with the requirements of intensive and highly mechanized output, and the major shortcomings in organizing the use of the achievements of science and progressive practical experience in agricultural output. Directing the agricultural organs and scientific institutions toward the elimination of such shortcomings, the party and the government have particularly relied on the accelerated application of scientific developments and on insuring that the results of research projects, whose production and economic effectiveness has been confirmed, be used more rapidly in production.

III

The conclusion of the increased role of economic factors in the qualitative reorganization of agricultural output has been given a profound theoretical substantiation in contemporary CPSU agrarian policy. Today industrial methods cannot be effectively applied in agriculture without improved economic relations and forms of production organization. Important measures are being implemented in this connection aimed at upgrading the scientific level of agricultural production planning, increasing the material and moral incentive of the working people, applying a scientific organization of labor and the achievements of progressive practical experience, perfecting cost accounting relations in sovkhozes and kolkhozes, improving the structure of capital investments and of capital production assets, and insuring agriculture with trained skilled cadres. The main aspect of improvements in economic relations is to contribute to the growth of labor productivity and production effectiveness and, consequently, to achieve higher indicators in increasing agricultural output.

Developing further Lenin's agrarian policy, the 25th CPSU Congress substantiated above all and comprehensively the role and significance of upgrading the effectiveness of agricultural output and of improving all quality indicators. Such a direction in the development of agriculture is fully consistent with the overall strategic party line aimed at achieving basic economic and social objectives. Under contemporary conditions, when the scale of the national economy has expanded greatly and when major production capacities have been created, the efficient and more productive utilization of existing material values assumes prime importance as the most important factor in accelerating the growth of production forces.

Increased production effectiveness presumes the steady improvement in the level of utilization of the land, equipment, fertilizer, and reclamation systems in agriculture. It is very important for the increased output of agricultural commodities to be accompanied by a reduction in outlays per unit of output, reduced production costs, and accelerated pace in the growth of labor productivity. Suffice it to say that a 1-kopek increase per ruble of capital investments for production purposes would enable us to obtain additional agricultural commodities worth over 1 billion rubles, while increasing the output of the tractor fleet by 1 percent would equal the use of nearly 20,000 tractors.

It was pointed out at the October 1976 CPSU Central Committee Plenum that the problem of the further development of agriculture at the present stage is, above all, a problem of upgrading its effectiveness in the broadest possible term. The task is to utilize rationally and productively the tremendous resources allocated by the state for the development of agriculture, adopt a thrifty attitude toward the land, and strive to reach maximal returns per hectare, invested ruble, and ton of fertilizer. The party, soviet, and economic organs and all our cadres are actively struggling for the full utilization of existing reserves and possibilities for the growth of labor productivity, and for upgrading production output and improving its quality.

A characteristic example in this respect is the new patriotic movement for reaching the highest possible yields of farm crops developed, under the guidance of the party organizations, by the grain growers of Krasnodarskiy Kray. Many teams, brigades, sections, and farms in the Kuban' have pledged to harvest in 1977 over 50 quintals of wheat, 100 quintals of rice, 75-100 quintals of corn grain, 500 quintals of sugar beets, and 400-500 quintals of vegetables per hectare. The movement initiated by the Kuban' people is spreading extensively in many oblasts, krays, and republics in the country. It marks, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted in his greeting to the rural workers of Krasnodarskiy Kray, a qualitatively new stage in the struggle waged by the farmers for the fulfillment of the main task of the 10th Five-Year Plan: upgrading production effectiveness. The livestock farm workers are actively joining the crop growers in the socialist competition for a further upsurge in animal husbandry. Thus, the kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and interfarm enterprises of Leningrad Oblast plan to outstrip in 1980 the assignments for the final year of the five-year plan by 17.6 percent for meat production, by 11 percent for milk production, and by 36 percent for egg production through the implementation of their counterplans.

The struggle for upgrading the quality of all work is a key problem in the development of agriculture as well as in other social production sectors. This broad concept covers all aspects of economic activities: the quality of plans and management, the strengthening of labor discipline and the saving of working time, the growth of labor productivity, and the quality of output. Specifically in terms of agriculture it means upgrading the standard of crop growing and animal husbandry and of the scientific organization of labor, the timely and thorough implementation of all technological processes and operations in fields and livestock farms, improvements in the quality parameters of output, and obtaining highest possible returns for each ruble of production outlays. The extensive use of the achievements of biology, genetics, and other basic sciences is having an ever-greater influence on upgrading the quality of the grain, sugar beets, potatoes, vegetables, meat, milk, and other products.

As was noted at the October 1976 Central Committee Plenum, it is important to approach the problem of agricultural effectiveness from yet another side. The task of safeguarding the produce is becoming evermore urgent. The results of the efforts of field and livestock farm workers will be the highest when the products they have grown are fully protected and brought to the consumer.

Production specialization and concentration on the basis of interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration assume tremendous significance in resolving the problem of the qualitative reorganization of agricultural output and its conversion to an industrial base. This, as Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 25th CPSU Congress, contains great possibilities for the rapid growth of output and for substantially upgrading labor productivity and reducing production costs.

The CPSU Central Committee decree "On the Further Development of Specialization and Concentration of Agricultural Production on the Basis of Interfarm Cooperation and Agroindustrial Integration," published in June 1976, emphasizes that the implementation of major measures for specialization and concentration, and for improving the organizational forms of agricultural management, approved by the congress, has become a ripe necessity and will assume tremendous political, economic, and social significance. The party considers this work as the most important governmental and national task. "The CPSU Central Committee believes," states the decree, "that the specialization and concentration of agricultural output on the basis of extensive cooperation, and its conversion to a contemporary industrial base is the main direction for the further development of socialist agriculture and a new stage in the practical implementation of the ideas of Lenin's cooperative plan under the conditions of developed socialism." The basic line formulated by the party rests on a strictly scientific foundation and on the all-round consideration of acquired practical experience. It is a major contribution to the theory and practice of the building of communism in our country.

The establishment and extensive development of big specialized enterprises and associations represents a further intensification of socialist labor socialization and division in the countryside. The social division of labor, K. Marx wrote, creates a "qualitative division and quantitative proportionality of social production processes. In other words, it creates a specific organization of social labor and develops a new social labor productive force" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 23, p 377). With the intensification of this process in agriculture a qualitatively higher material and technical base will develop consistent with the requirements of contemporary technology and industrial production technology and with increased effectiveness.

At the same time, interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration, largely determining the future of our agriculture, are directed toward the successful solution of social problems related to the reorganization of the nature of the work and the further improvement of production relations in the villages, the rapprochement between the two forms of socialist ownership, and their future merger within a single nationwide ownership, and the elimination of the major disparities between town and country. Such profound social changes are a historically legitimate process determined by the entire course of development of the country's production forces and the building of the material and technical foundations for communism.

The CPSU Central Committee directs all our cadres toward developing the planned nature of the process of specialization and concentration based on interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration in order to provide a creative solution to the practical problems and, making skillful use of gained experience, block unnecessary haste or unjustified slowness or any interruption whatever. Achieving a maximal growth of output, reducing outlays, and increasing the overall volume of output must be the main indicators of the development of specialization and interfarm cooperation.

One of the basic economic factors which play an important role in the qualitative reorganization of agricultural output is improving its organization and management. In this connection the development of production and economic cooperation between agriculture and the other national economic sectors supplying it with equipment, fertilizers, and mixed fodder, engaged in construction and in the procurement, reception, storage, and processing of agricultural commodities, the proper establishment of the most efficient relations among the sectors of the entire agroindustrial complex, and the establishment of the organizational methods which create favorable conditions for the successful functioning of this complex acquire great significance. The party has given the assignment of organizing properly all links within the mechanism tying agriculture to the consumers. It has called for raising the production forces of the agroindustrial complex to a new higher stage.

The qualitative reorganization in agricultural output, taking place in the course of its all-round intensification, predetermines the profound changes within the main productive force--the production-technical standard of the workers--and the nature and content of their work. The all-round strengthening of the material and technical base of agriculture, the increased capital- and power-labor ratios of kolkhoz members and sovkhoz workers, and the development of comprehensive production mechanization and automation accelerate the process of converting agricultural labor into a variety of industrial labor. Already now many kolkhozes and sovkhozes base their production process on the comprehensive mechanization of all production processes and make extensive use of the achievements of science and technology. This upgrades the production skills of the rural workers, changes the content of the work, intensifies the division of labor, and leads to the appearance of industrial-type skills. This helps to develop agricultural production on an industrial basis. The work of the peasant acquires evermore features similar to the work of the modern industrial worker.

In recent years a great deal has been done to train agricultural specialists and mass skill workers for the countryside and to upgrade the skills of farm managers. However, extensive work remains to be done to strengthen with cadres the middle and primary levels of kolkhozes and sovkhozes. This calls for upgrading the level of training of managers of sections, brigades, livestock farms, and so on. It is very important for all integrated enterprises and associations and production subdivisions of kolkhozes and sovkhozes to be headed by specialists well-familiar with the latest methods of production and management organization.

The decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress reflect the entire set of problems related to improving social relations in the countryside, training a worker of a new type, and upgrading the material and cultural standards of rural workers. The task was set to insure a further rapprochement among living standards and conditions of the rural and urban populations and the systematic elimination of the socioeconomic and cultural-living disparities between town and country on the basis of the accelerated industrialization of agricultural output and improved consumer services in the villages. The

solution of this important problem is being legislatively codified in the draft of the new USSR Constitution which stipulates that a program for the conversion of agricultural work into a variety of industrial labor, of expanding in rural areas the network of public education, culture, health, services, trade, and communal economy enterprises, and the conversion of villages and hamlets into comfortable settlements is being systematically implemented in our country.

The all-round development of agricultural production forces and increased agricultural intensification call for determining their overall prospects not only for the 5-year period but on a longer-range basis so that the planned results for the future may be achieved by taking into consideration the growth of the population, the changes occurring in society, and the achievements of scientific and technical progress.

Currently a plan for the development of the national economy through 1990 is being formulated. Its main directions are based on the sociopolitical and economic tasks set at the 25th party congress. The long-term plan will reflect many major problems related to the creation of the material and technical base of communism and the entire socioeconomic progress achieved in the country. It is a question of the all-round development of production forces, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, and the qualitative upgrading of the living standard of the people. This is also a starting point in formulating the leading indicators for long-term agricultural development.

The increasing intensification of agriculture is a decisive factor in the qualitative reorganization of agricultural output and in upgrading its effectiveness. It also plays a major role in the economic and social progress of the entire Soviet society. The intensive development of crop growing and animal husbandry, conversion of agriculture to an industrial base, and acceleration of scientific and technical progress characterize in their indivisible unity also the process of the creation of a highly developed industrial base within this sector as the most important component of the material and technical foundations for communism.

5003

CSO: 1802

WATCHFUL WATCH

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 63-72

[Article by Maj Gen V. Gaponenko, chief of the KGB Political Administration of Border Troops of the USSR Council of Ministers]

[Text] The Soviet state is advancing toward the great anniversary--the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. Preparations for the anniversary are taking place under the sign of new outstanding accomplishments of our people in the building of communism. The results of the 6 decades covered by the Soviet people along Lenin's path are reflected in a concentrated form in the draft of the new USSR Constitution. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasizes, "The adoption of the new USSR Constitution, the constitution of developed socialism, the constitution of communism under construction, will be not merely a historical event for our country but an event of tremendous international significance."

Like the entire Soviet people, the border troops welcomed with warm approval and enthusiasm the decisions of the May CPSU Central Committee Plenum. They unanimously support the domestic and foreign policy and fruitful creative work of its Central Committee, and Central Committee Politburo, headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and are rallying even more closely around the Leninist party--the organizer and inspirer of all our victories.

Profound and basic changes have taken place in the Soviet state in the 4 decades following the adoption of the current constitution. They affected all aspects of social life. A developed socialist society has been built in the USSR. At this stage, when socialism is already developing on its own basis, the constructive forces of the new system and the advantages of the socialist way of life are becoming evermore apparent, the working people are benefiting from the results of their great revolutionary gains evermore extensively.

Great changes have taken place in the international position of the Soviet Union. The sociopolitical aspect of the world has changed. An end has been put to the capitalist encirclement of the USSR. Socialism has become a world system and a powerful socialist comity has developed.

Implementing Lenin's legacy the CPSU is doing everything necessary to create favorable conditions insuring the successful building of communism. It is adamantly implementing the program for the further struggle for peace and international cooperation and for the freedom and independence of the peoples adopted at the 25th CPSU Congress. Together with the other fraternal socialist countries and all peace-loving forces the Soviet Union is promoting the intensification of detente.

However, operating under the false pretext of the "Soviet military threat," the aggressive imperialist circles are adamantly opposing the course of normalizing the international atmosphere. They are increasing the arms race and energizing subversive activities against the USSR and the other socialist states.

Within the overall system of subversive activities conducted by imperialist intelligence and anti-Soviet foreign centers, a considerable role is allocated to hostile actions along the state borders of the USSR. Under such circumstances the CPSU and the Soviet government are showing constant concern for maintaining on the necessary level the defense capability and security of our country and for reliably protecting its sacred borders.

Answering the party's concern, the Soviet forces and the personnel of the border troops are on watch in protecting the borders of our homeland with dignity and honor and are displaying high vigilance. "...The Soviet people," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 25th CPSU Congress, "may rest assured that the results of their constructive toil are reliably protected."

1

The CPSU is promoting a policy of active defense of the peace and is firmly countering the forces of aggression. Currently these forces are forced to retreat and to abandon some of their positions. Yet, as was emphasized at the 25th CPSU Congress, even though today the possibilities for imperialist aggressive actions have been considerably curtailed, the nature of imperialism remains unchanged. The enemies of detente and international security are continuing to increase the tension acting in various directions and using a variety of methods.

"The reactionary circles," states the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution," "are organizing ideological subversions against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and slanderous anti-Soviet and anticommunist campaigns. They are trying to interfere in the domestic affairs of socialist and other countries."

One of the many manifestations of the ideological struggle waged against the USSR, particularly following the Helsinki Conference, is the restoration of the infamous myth of the so-called "closed society." One does not have to be a seer to unravel the true lining of this type of ideological imperialist attack. In the final account, their purpose is to see to it that the borders of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries become open to the unhindered access of an ideology alien to us, to hostile publications, and to the travel and freedom of action of the emissaries of foreign intelligence and anti-Soviet organizations. In this connection our border troops as well, one of whose tasks is to struggle against ideological subversions launched by our class enemies along the state borders, are the subject of refined slanderous attacks.

The imperialist circles have made similar attempts in the past as well. Their reactionary nature was disclosed by V. I. Lenin who warned the party and the Soviet people that even "partially open borders...involve most serious threats in the sense that petite bourgeoisie and all kinds of agents could enter Russia without offering us the slightest possibility to exercise control..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 45, p 337).

The bourgeois ideologues have invented tens of pseudoscientific "theories" including, in particular, those of "natural borders," "natural linguistic borders," and "social borders." Speaking of the nature of such "theories" let us emphasize that their authors are trying, above all, to justify aggressive conquests. For example, the supporters of "natural borders" claim that the countries must be divided by all kinds of natural lines: mountain ridges, rivers, or seas. If such do not exist, it is claimed that they have the right to conquer foreign territories. The nature of the "social borders" concept is that a state intending to engage in territorial conquests has the right, allegedly, to refer to economic and other relations between its border areas and the adjacent areas of the neighboring country and, on this basis, launch a war with a view to their annexation by force. It is no accident that such "theories" were adopted by the fascist aggressors. In their modernized aspect they are described as "international boundaries," "flexible boundaries," "stretching security boundaries," "defense boundaries," and others. Imperialism resorts to such tricks whenever the need arises to conceal or justify its aggressive aspirations and give them a certain "scientific" foundation.

The imperialist concepts of state borders and their reactionary and anti-people's nature are far from being new. F. Engels himself wrote that they justify military seizures of territories and the enslavement of peoples (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 13, p 276).

In the contemporary historical epoch Lenin gave a proper rebuff to such fabrications of bourgeois ideologues and revisionists. Developing the theory of the state and formulating the party's program on the national question he emphasized that the task of the real liberation of the nations should not be considered separately from the question of establishing the borders of the liberated people and that the true liberation of nations is possible only under socialism.

The socialist world system appeared after World War II in which the universal-historical victory of the Soviet people over German fascism played a decisive role. For the first time in the history of international law boundaries were set between socialist countries fully consistent with the Leninist principles of sovereignty, mutual respect, friendship, and peace. The peoples of the fraternal countries are united by the common objectives of building socialism and communism, by Marxist-Leninist ideology, the most progressive in the world, and by the desire to insure the most favorable conditions for the successful building of socialism and communism and to protect reliably their comity against the encroachments of imperialism and safeguard the peace throughout the world. That is why the inviolability of the borders between such countries is insured by the strict implementation of reciprocal treaty obligations and joint protection.

The desire of the imperialist circles to broaden the scale of ideological subversion against the USSR and the members of the socialist comity is nothing but a coarse attempt to interfere in the domestic affairs of these countries with a view to undermining socialism from within, i.e., in direct violation of the Helsinki Final Act. The Soviet people can give only one answer to such attempts. "...We shall not tolerate anyone's interference in our internal affairs for any reason whatever," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 16th Congress of USSR Trade Unions, expressing the will of the people. "Naturally, any normal development of relations would be inconceivable on such a basis. The Soviet Union has always firmly defended and will defend its sovereign rights, dignity, and interests."

2

The Great October Revolution inaugurated a new epoch marked by the birth of the first socialist state in the world. The protection of its borders became an objective law stemming from the Leninist doctrine of the defense of the socialist fatherland. Lenin substantiated the need for the creation of border troops as a structural component of the army of a new type.

By virtue of their specific nature the border troops assumed a special position in the system of the socialist state. Their role was determined by the objective process of the socialist revolution which required the safeguarding of its political, economic, and ideological interests. This stemmed from the fact that after the October Revolution the protection of the borders acquired a qualitatively new content. With the victory of the socialist revolution they became the line where, above all, the political interests of socialism and capitalism clashed while foreign economic problems assumed a clearly manifested political nature. Under such circumstances the interests of the proletarian state and the socialist revolution at the border could be defended only by forces based on the class principle and expressing the interests of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Communist Party considered the creation of border troops and the organization of the protection of the borders a structural part of the struggle for strengthening the Soviet state and for the further development of the socialist revolution. As early as 28 May 1918 Lenin signed the decree establishing the border guard and formulating its basic assignments and legal status at the state borders.

The party organizations and local soviets, which assigned to the border troops their best representatives, those who were ready to serve the revolution and the interests of the working people honestly and selflessly, with no coercion whatever, actively participated in staffing the border troops.

Simultaneously, the struggle against enemy agents and the counterrevolution at the border was waged by the border extraordinary commissions; as Cheka organs, they worked in close contact with the border troops. Practical experience proved that this type of joint action insures the reliable screening of the border, helps to improve further border troop service and enables commanders and political workers to master the Chekist border protection methods.

After the civil war the party and Lenin did not weaken their attention to the border troops. Despite the difficulties experienced by the countries, border troop units and subunits were steadily strengthened with command and political cadres and party and Komsomol members, and supplied with arms and equipment.

On 7 September 1923 the USSR Central Executive Committee approved a Regulation on the Protection of the Borders of the USSR. This completed the organization of the border troops. In 1927 the USSR Central Executive Committee and Sovnarkom approved a new regulation which codified all changes in border protection. These documents were a manifestation of the scientific Leninist program for the structure of the border troops and their role in the political system of the socialist society.

"The question of the protection of the borders," said F. E. Dzerzhinskiy in April 1923, "is a particularly acute one at present. The borders of the USSR must be closed to counterrevolutionaries and smugglers at all costs. The border guards are protecting the economic independence of the Soviets and protecting the Soviet soil from the penetration of bandits and spies."

A most expedient structure was developed in the course of the advancement and development of the border troops. This was a dynamic process related to surmounting difficulties and a search for the most acceptable organization of the protection of the borders.

With the full victory of socialism, when the social base for espionage-diversionist and subversive activities was eliminated, the border troops focused their main efforts on protecting the state borders from outside encroachments and attempts to violate them by intelligence agents of the imperialist countries.

The experience which the border troops acquired in the prewar five-year plans in the course of their service-combat activities made it possible to use them for combat and special assignments during the Great Patriotic War. Together with Red Army units located near the border, the posts and ships were the first to be exposed to the strikes of the German-fascist troops which treacherously invaded our territory. No single border post or subunit wavered. They did their duty to the homeland to the end. This is a vivid indicator of the fact that in the year of severe trials the Soviet border troops displayed once again their boundless loyalty to the party and the people and their military and service skill and ideological and professional training.

The Communist Party valued highly the combat operations of border troops and their heroism, courage, and dedication in fulfilling their military duty. In the Great Patriotic War 150 border troops were awarded the high title of Hero of the Soviet Union, and about 13,000 were awarded orders and medals.

Following the defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism and the establishment of the world socialist system imperialism did not cease its subversive activities against the Soviet Union and the other socialist states.

Under the conditions of a sharp confrontation between socialism and the forces of imperialism, particularly in the field of ideology, the front of this struggle passes through the border as well. Like a barometer it reacts to changes in relations between our state and the capitalist world. The role and place of the border troops under the conditions of mature socialism have been clearly formulated on the basis of the CPSU program and the decisions of party congresses and Central Committee plenums.

The border troops fulfill their combat assignments as part of the Committee for State Security of the USSR Council of Ministers and in close interaction with its local organs. The important problems of tirelessly improving the operative-service activities of the troops are always kept inside by the KGB collegium.

Thanks to the daily attention paid by the party and the government the border troops have today everything necessary to insure the inviolability of the borders of our homeland and to defend reliably its interests at the state border. The complexity and responsibility of their assignments call for the further upgrading of the quality and effectiveness of the service, combat and political training, and perfection of specialized knowledge.

Party-political work is of decisive significance in achieving such objectives as the main means for shaping the high moral-political and combat qualities of the troops, and for upgrading their responsibility for the reliable protection of the border and for waging an energetic and uncompromising struggle against imperialist ideological subversion.

3

Implementing Lenin's behests on the organization of the vigilant protection of the borders of the USSR, the Communist Party and Soviet state have not weakened even for a minute their attention to the border troops. Thanks to this the troops have the most expedient structure and are supplied with everything necessary for the successful solution of their official assignments. The party is always concerned with improving their party and political apparatus and with strengthening their party organizations. A Political Administration of Border Troops, responsible to the party's Central Committee was established.

Using the acquired experience, the party systematically developed and enriched the theory and practice of the structure of border troops and their party-political apparatus.

Upgrading further the leading role of the CPSU in the organization of the reliable protection of the borders is an objective law. This is determined by the tremendous socioeconomic changes which have taken place in the country, the complexity of insuring the state security of the Soviet Union, and the impact of scientific and technical progress on all aspects of life and activities of border troops.

Scientific and technical progress and its manifestation in the military and technical revolution led to qualitative changes--to the equipment of the troops with modern weapons and combat and specialized equipment. The overall literacy and political conscientiousness of the border troops were upgraded and their technical and vocational training improved.

Under present-day conditions, taking into consideration that the reliable protection of the border is one of the important factors for insuring the security of the state, the party's Central Committee pays great attention to strengthening the party's leadership of all aspects of life and service-combat activities of units and subunits. The decision to set up a Military Council of Border Troops and Military Councils of Border Okrugs was of major importance. This made it possible to increase the political influence on the choice and placement of officers cadres, the operative-service activities of the troops, and the education of the personnel. The political organs and party organizations of the troops strengthened qualitatively. They are actively influencing the maintaining of high combat readiness at border posts, ships, and control-admission points. They raise the party members and all border troops in the spirit of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism,

Soviet patriotism, proletarian internationalism, inviolable unity and fraternal friendship among the peoples of the USSR, and combat comity with the border troops and working people of the socialist countries. The party organizations develop in the troops class hatred for imperialism and for all enemies of communism.

The activeness and militancy of the party organizations of border troops rose particularly in the course of the implementation of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress. Their organizational and ideological activities are aimed at insuring the security of the state borders and educating the personnel in a spirit of infinite loyalty to the Communist Party, high vigilance, and constant readiness to defend the gains of socialism.

The party's Central Committee and the Soviet government implemented other measures as well to strengthen the protection of the borders, to upgrade the combat capability of border troops, and to improve their staffing and training of officers cadres.

The party's social policy is having a beneficial impact on upgrading the moral-political and combat qualities of the border troops.

The growth of the social homogeneity of the Soviet society, the strengthening of the unbreakable alliance among the working class, kolkhoz peasantry, and people's intelligentsia, the gradual elimination of disparities among basic social groups, and the ever-greater rapprochement among all nations and nationalities in our country are the most important sources for the shaping of a healthy moral climate in military collectives and the growth of political conscientiousness and increased responsibility of border troops, manifested in their active view on life and vigilant and reliable protection and defense of the state borders.

The Communist Party considers the protection of the borders a specific field of military-political activity the demands for which are rising steadily. This stems from the complexity of the international circumstances and the energizing of imperialist intelligence. "As before, the border remains the channel through which our enemies are trying to move their agents and to engage in provocatory and other subversive activities," said Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and KGB chairman, in his report "Fifty Years of Watching Over the Security of the Soviet Homeland."

The reactionary forces and the enemies of detente are energizing their subversive activities against our country and are trying to find "weak" spots in our society and to promote national discord. Under such circumstances the role of the border troops becomes immeasurably greater. On the basis of Lenin's theoretical concepts and its own practical experience, the Communist Party is creatively resolving the problem of improving the protection of the state borders of the Soviet Union. In his speech at the Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of Europe, Comrade

L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that the members of the socialist comity are ready comprehensively to increase their contacts with those who aspire for peace and friendship among peoples. However, our doors will always be closed to those who promote war and racism, and to the agents of foreign intelligence services and anti-Soviet organizations. "We are not suffering from 'spy-mania,'" he stated. "However, nor shall we allow freedom of action for subversive activities directed against our system and our society."

Our border troops are reliably defending the sacred boundaries of the powerful Soviet state. All successes in their activities are the result of the wise leadership of the Leninist party. The border troops personnel feel the warmest gratitude to the party's Central Committee, CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and, personally, Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, Central Committee general secretary, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, chairman of the Defense Council, and marshal of the Soviet Union, for his constant concern for improving further the protection of the state boundaries of the USSR and for the border troops. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and other members of the Central Committee Politburo visit border posts and ships and display all-round interest in the life and service of the border troops. Such fatherly concern triggers in the troops personnel a feeling of legitimate pride and inspires them to new patriotic deeds.

The Communist Party rates highly the selfless military work of the border troops. The greeting of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers addressed to the Soviet border troops on the occasion of their 50th anniversary, stated the following: "Created on V. I. Lenin's initiative and raised by the Communist Party and tempered in numerous clashes with the enemy, the Soviet border troops are successfully fulfilling responsible tasks in protecting the state borders of our homeland. Together with the Soviet army and navy they are watching over the peaceful toil of the Soviet people building communism. Loyal and selfless service to the homeland has earned the border troops the profound respect and universal love of the Soviet people."

4

Organizing the protection of the state borders, the Communist Party and Soviet state have always been guided by the view that the strength of the border troops and the guarantee for their successful actions are found in their inseparable links with the people. Lenin believed that the Soviet armed forces are the embodiment of unity of the broadest toiling masses and that this was one of the radical differences between them and the bourgeois armies.

On the basis of Lenin's concepts the CPSU has been tirelessly concerned with strengthening the ties and friendship between border troops and the local population in the border area. Particular attention was paid to establishing proper relations with the native people in the national areas of the country,

to the strict observance of legality, tolerance and respect for local customs, and extensive organization of mass-political work. The political organs and party organizations played a particular role in the solution of these problems, explaining the nature of the national policy of the party aimed at improving the life of the working people. They closely cooperated with the local party organizations, focusing their attention on increasing political work and agitation and propaganda among the rural population. In hamlets and villages, with the active assistance and participation of the border troops reading huts were set up. It was here that the political organs directed traveling brigades of lecturers, speakers, agitators, and organizers.

F. E. Dzerzhinskiy frequently pointed out that ties with the people and relying on the masses are the prerequisites for success in the work of the Cheka organs and the service carried out by the border troops. Thus, in 1925 he wrote that "...gaining the sympathy of the population you will gain the best assistance in the protection of the border..."

Today the role of the local population in the protection of the border has become even greater. Thanks to the great organizational and political work done by the party and soviet organs with the local population, hundreds of thousands of members of people's units are participating in the protection of the borders. This is a vivid manifestation of the inseparable unity between army and people, a manifestation of the lofty patriotic feelings of the Soviet people and of their constant concern for the safety of the socialist homeland.

Under contemporary conditions as a result of the active implementation of the party's social policy the sociopolitical and ideological unity of all working people has been achieved and their activeness in the defense of socialism has increased. Unity between army and people has strengthened even further. The implementation of the Leninist national policy and the fraternal friendship among all nations and nationalities of the USSR, whose material base is the single national economic organism developed in our country, are having a favorable impact on strengthening practical relations between the population and the border troops.

The development of socialist democracy contributes to upgrading the civic responsibility of every Soviet person. In the border areas this responsibility is manifested in the active participation of the population in the protection of the state borders and in the vigilant maintenance of the border system. The working people of town and country consider the protection of the border their personal matter, an inseparable part of their constructive toil.

One of the factors which contributes to strengthening the friendship between border troops and the local population is reciprocal sponsorship in the course of which problems of military and patriotic education, increased vigilance and responsibility for the protection of the border, and

implementation of production assignments are resolved. On the initiative of republic party, soviet, and public organizations, in recent years military sponsorship work has developed particularly extensively.

The border troops enjoy great prestige among the population and its trust. They are elected members of party and soviet organs and many of them are deputies to local soviets. The troops participate in cultural-educational measures and help the population to resolve national economic problems.

Born of the Soviet social and state system, the friendship between the border troops and the local population has gained tremendous strength. It has become one of the outstanding traditions which have become even stronger in recent years.

The unity between the people and the army is based on the inviolable foundations of Marxism-Leninism which is materialized in the activities of the Communist Party aimed at improving developed socialism and upgrading further the material and cultural standards of the Soviet people, including the considerable upsurge of the economy and standards of border areas.

5

The establishment of the world socialist system changed the nature of the borders as well. Borders with the members of the socialist comity became borders of peace and friendship, lines which divide juridically yet unite politically countries of the same type, marking their territories and interests within the framework of the historically developed countries in accordance with the will of the peoples.

"In recent years," states the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution," "the world comity of fraternal peoples of the socialist countries--an international alliance of a new type--has become even stronger...Today the comity of socialist countries has become the most dynamic economic force in the world and a leading factor in world politics."

With the organization and strengthening of cooperation between the USSR and the other fraternal socialist countries the links between the Soviet border troops and the border troops of neighboring socialist states were established and consolidated. Under contemporary conditions the Soviet border troops, together with the border troops of the fraternal countries, are reliably protecting the borders of the entire socialist comity. The protection of the borders, as the defense of the socialist fatherland, has exceeded the framework of a single country and assumed an international nature.

The fraternal communist and workers parties and governments of the members of the socialist comity proceed from the fact that the reliable protection of state borders is their important joint task. They follow the behests of the great Lenin who taught that the peoples taking the path of socialist

development "mandatorily require a close military and economic alliance, for otherwise the capitalists...would suppress and strangle us separately" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 40, p 46).

Guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian and socialist internationalism, and promoting an active policy of peace, the CPSU Central Committee and Soviet government continue to take all necessary measures to strengthen in the future as well the military and political alliance among the members of the socialist comity and insure the reliable protection of its borders.

The CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th party congress provided an impressive picture of the development of all-round cooperation between the USSR and the other socialist countries. Under present-day conditions the members of the socialist comity have strengthened their power considerably. Tremendous successes have been achieved in the development of their economies and cultures, and the moral and political factor has increased immeasurably. All this contributes to the further strengthening of the defense capability of each of the fraternal countries and to the more successful solution of the problems of border protection. "...our outstanding comity of socialist states," emphasized Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the October 1976 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "lives a rich and a full life. This is a factor of tremendous significance and our Leninist party will dedicate all efforts to continue it in the future as well!"

Under present-day conditions relations between USSR border troops and the border troops of the members of the socialist comity and, above all, the exchange of experience in combat training and upbringing of the personnel, and service skill have assumed even greater significance. The forms of fraternal cooperation have become more varied.

Shoulder to shoulder with the border troops of the other socialist countries, the Soviet border troops are vigilantly protecting the borders of peace and friendship and are fully resolved to defending their inviolability from the aggressive aspirations of imperialism and the reaction.

Together with the entire Soviet people the border troops are preparing to welcome properly the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. Their service-combat activities have become more purposeful, meaningful, and initiative-minded. This is helped by the high patriotic upsurge of the personnel triggered by the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and the May party Central Committee Plenum. The draft of the new USSR Constitution is being discussed with unparalleled political activeness in units and subunits. Socialist competition has developed extensively for reaching high indicators in combat and political training. This is having a positive influence on the effectiveness of the struggle against ideological subversions and enemy agents, and on the quality of protecting the sacred borders of the homeland.

POST NUMBER ONE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 73-77

[Article by Rasul Gamzatov]

[Text] As we read and reread the draft of the constitution we see a new light illuminating the life of the people and the history of the country. The term era is a historical concept. It is a chronological system recording the life of mankind since deep antiquity. Yet, ask today a fellow Dagestani, Uzbek, Kazakh, or Kalmyk when did our era begin? He would answer: October 1917. This era determined the fate of all nationalities and all generations.

Prior to the October era my people were defined in terms of geographic location and rituals. Today they are defined in terms of Lenin's ideas. My people have existed for thousands of years but the republic appeared after the revolution. October gave us the possibility both to see farther and to feel deeper. As a youngster I lived the life of the village. Growing up, I lived the life of the peoples of my republic. Now, in my mature years, I live the life not only of the entire country but of the entire earth. Wherever I find myself I always consider myself the legitimate representative of Dagestan and come home as an envoy representing human culture. A member of a small nation is not small himself, for he has become part of the great historical community--the Soviet people.

Occasionally I am asked whether or not my voice is suppressed by the powerful Russian literature? Our era is the epoch of the renaissance of the cultures of all peoples. The power of Soviet literature lies precisely in its many languages, many sounds, and many colors. This enriches it exceptionally, making it varied and fuller. Imagine if there was only one star in the sky. How uncomfortable and lonely it would feel. There are many stars in our sky.

It is said that there is no need to philosophize,
That since there are many stars in the sky
Such stars must be removed
And blended in a single moon.

Let the moon alone give us light,
Since our people are small and our land is narrow.
Let the neighbor oblige us with his language
For the sake of my children, and for books and songs.

However, the greatness and beauty of Soviet literature are found in its variety. From the very first years of the Soviet system, and from the very steps of our literature and art, a spirit of international fraternity among people was established in Dagestan. Actually, this is a phenomenon inherent in the creative work of all the peoples of the country. The experience of the great Russian and Soviet literatures prove that only progressive, profoundly international, and high idea-minded literature is viable. The stars of poetry in our country shine each one for its own sake and all of them together.

As both of first or second magnitude
The stars shine in the skies, and I know
That my own star shines down
On the snow of my native peaks...

There is a place for it like for all the others
In the skies, as there is on earth for the poets.
Oh my star, shine with your
Weak yet unique light.

When mountain rivers run into the sea their waters merge and it would be difficult to distinguish among them. In literature the colors and voices of poetry do not lose their individuality but, on the contrary, enrich each other. Everything that is national and imbued with the progressive ideas of the time necessarily acquires an international sounding. Today a feeling of national worthiness is impossible without a high spirit of internationalism. This spirit ennobles it. I speak and write in the language of a small people. When I write I would like for everyone to know that this is being written by an Avar, a Dagestani and, therefore, naturally, that it is I--Rasul Gamzatov--who is writing this. However, never for a minute do I forget that I am a Soviet poet, a representative of the multi-national Soviet people.

No two similar poets could be found in the world. No two identical poems can be written by a single poet. All of them are different. Nevertheless, there is a unity within this variety. It lies in the poetic credo. In my personal case this means not to be in the shadow of time but in its light. We must feed the light and the fire of the revolution and illuminate time with its ideas. Time means people and time means the cause of our native people. The artist acquires his creative individuality by blending with the people. The poet accomplishes this not by his skill to think in images and speak in rhythm but by his ability to feel the sadness and joys of his contemporaries. His heart must feel a great attachment to the people. It must burn with the desire to help man. True talent is distinguished by selflessness, by the ability to forget about oneself and sympathize with others.

A person can never become a poet unless touched by sadness and joy. He may write poems and publish books. However, if the author thinks of himself alone, considering himself the center of the universe, his poems may for a minute block for the people the light and the world. Poetry must be the bright river of the people's life rather than a muddy stream of doubts expressed by an egotistic self-lover, for the responsibility of the literary worker to the times is tremendous. Remember the line by Aleksandr Mezhirov, "Communists, Forward!" To this day it leads the people to exploits.

The relationship between the poet and the people and the way his works reflect the life of the people is a yardstick of creativity. Not far from our village there is a road crossing all of Dagestan. In my childhood we raced one another to that road and back. No one even conceived of going beyond that road. Our world was limited by it. In the 60 years which separate us from the day when the shot of the Avrora was heard the Avars have covered a long way. The broad horizons of the world were opened to a people previously locked in the narrow gorges of the Caucasus. Before the revolution the name of my father, the poet Gamzat Tsadasy was known only in the mountains. Today his poems are known not only in our country but abroad as well. A motorship built in Yugoslavia was named after him. It sails today on many seas and oceans on earth.

Before the Great October Revolution Dagestan had neither theaters nor actors. Today our Lezginka dance ensemble has traveled around the world. Our rope-walkers perform in Japan, America, and France. Dagestani theaters perform in many fraternal republics. Such were the areas of world culture reached by Dagestani art as a result of the Great October Revolution which revealed the originality of the people! That is why the poems must be so inspired as to reflect such epoch-making changes in the life of the people! The life of the people is the source of the artist's creativity. It is like a rock under our feet, as the foundations of a building. If an artist is alienated from the people his creative work has nothing to rely on. It would be dead and unnecessary to the people.

Yet, while living the life of the people the poet is not lost in the crowd. His voice is not extinguished. He himself builds his own poetic dwelling and cultivates his own poetic field. He cannot entrust this to anyone else. The word expressed by the poet is his word alone rather than a repetition of someone else's word. Yet, when this word is heard it must be the word of the people, for what is a poet worth if the word he says is not accepted by others? It is bad if the village understands but the country does not. It is half bad if the country understands but the village does not. It is trouble, however, if the children do not understand, if mothers and fathers do not understand. If Dagestan does not understand the country will not. The artist must create in such a way as to be understood by all, so that his word is an appeal.

In the draft of the new constitution there is a line on the right to use the achievements of culture. This means poetry as well. This imposes on the poet tremendous responsibility! The time is long past when poetry could be valued by experts only. Today many millions of people read poetry and are able to evaluate it. Some verses trigger the curiosity and no more. Others are controversial but unexciting. Yet, there are poets about whom few people argue. They are read. The people think about them and their poems live in the hearts of the people. This is truly popular poetry. Its strength lies in the honesty and courage of the poet, in his humaneness and his affiliation with the destinies of the people. The fate of a true poet is indivisible from the fate of the people.

Aleksandr Tvardovskiy, whom I consider a truly people's poet, once said that a person becomes a poet only when people previously uninterested in poetry begin to read him or if his work is not a reflection of reality but a part of reality itself.

An awareness of the high civic importance of poetry cannot be suggested by someone else. It is a conscious service to the ideas of justice determined, as a rule, by the life, destiny, and biography of the poet. I was asked once whether social work hinders my literary work. I answered that even though the great Russian poet Nekrasov had once written that the struggle prevented him from being a poet and poetry prevented him from being a fighter, nevertheless, had he not been a fighter he would not have become a great poet.

The poetic profession of a true people's poet is a human, a civic duty. I find it strange to hear that the main realm of interests of the poet is the area of intimate feelings. I believe that the poet is a poet precisely because of the sorrows and joys of the people. Pushkin compared the poet with an echo. Lermontov called him the slave of honor. Anna Akhmatova asked the muse: "Was it you who dictated to Dante pages from his *Inferno*?" Tvardovskiy's heart was open to all the hurts and joys of the world. To me he is the ideal of the contemporary poet.

The poet is, above all, a citizen. One could write refined verses but their merit will be understood only by literary experts. Such verses would remind one of a spring high in the mountains which not every man could reach to drink his fill. The spring must be close to the villages so that the purity of the spring water may become available to all people.

Drops fell on the poet's cheeks.
They fell on his right cheek and on his left.
A drop of joy, and a drop of sadness,
A tear of love and a tear of anger.

Two small drops, pure and quiet,
Two helpless drops until they blend,
Yet, blending, they turn into poems,
And lightning will flash and a downpour will follow.

Literary work is a serious many-faceted matter. One cannot read books and write poetry by drawing on them. Life alone creates true poetry.

A tradition has developed now to celebrate days of Soviet literature in big oblasts and republics. Groups of writers go there, meet with town and country working people, read poems, and speak of their books. Naturally, this is good and contributes to the dissemination of Soviet literature. However, I do not understand why such measures are occasionally described and referred to as a creative assignment? I believe that a poet cannot have a creative assignment by going to the people. His entire life must be inseparable from the biography of the people. His entire life, from his very first to his last day, is a creative assignment.

We are versifiers and not managers,
Success or failure awaits us,
However, tears cannot be planned,
Nor could laughter.

To rate a single day after centuries
Would be difficult in advance.
What could I tell about a man
From a simple handshake?

I have written many books in my lifetime and all of them have dealt with the topics I consider the most important: homeland and love. I did not initiate them. They began long before I appeared in this world. The biggest philosophers of the world have thought of the homeland and fought for it. I would like to add to their great work a single line perhaps.

Books on love and women have also been written before me. It is believed that only sailors discover new lands. Poets also discover their own islands and continents. Sometimes such discoveries are unexpected to themselves as well. I recently visited Mexico. Life convinced me yet once again that lyricism is impossible without civic-mindedness, the way civic-mindedness is impossible without lyricism. In Mexico I was told of an island known as women's island. I flew there. On the way I thought of great women and, so in my imagination, Aphrodite, and the fate of Juliet. I heard the crying of Yaroslavna and thought of the courage of Joan of Arc and of Valentina Tereshkova. They were flying to the island with me. I felt like Columbus, as Magellan, discovering a new land. I thought that every poet should have his own island he has discovered and that the island I would discover would be the island of love.

Yet, everything turned out to be different. Yes, this was truly an island of women, for all the men who had lived there had perished in stormy seas and the women had remained alone. Then I did not think of islands but of women's mining towns in France, where the men had died in the mines, and of Belorussian settlements where the war had deprived all the women of their fathers, husbands, and sons...How could one separate poetry from civic-mindedness and love from struggle?!

There have been many islands of death on our planet and unless we take over the cause of peace our entire earth may become an island of women.

Borders divide the earth
But should a hail or storm break out
They do not ask whose is this field
And do not look at the boundary line.

The people are becoming evermore aware of the importance of peace to our planet. Poetry is also a weapon in the struggle for peace. That is why the poet's responsibility for every word is great. In my childhood I fought with the boys for my dwelling. My brothers died in the Patriotic War, defending the homeland. Today I see my duty as a poet to defend the peace, to defend the lines of goodness, love, and tenderness from the forces of evil and hatred.

It is said that before the world was created
The word was heard for the first time
What was it: an oath or a prayer?
What was it: a request or an order?

To save the world from destruction
Is possible, we need now a word,
Let it be an oath and a prayer,
Let it be a request and an order.

The poet is always in the ranks--in peace or wartime. He does not have a commander to give him a precise order. His commander is his conscience, his ideological conviction, his feeling of responsibility to the people. The poet makes his own road. He discovers his own islands and continents but his compass--the communist outlook--does not allow him to depart from the true way and forces him always to speak the truth. Our people have lofty objectives. We are holding out a wide-open hand but this hand could become a strong and powerful fist when it becomes necessary to defend our ideals.

Once I was invited to visit students at the Kremlin. Some among them were guards at Post No 1 of Lenin's Mausoleum. Addressing them, I thought that our Soviet poetry is also Post No 1. It protects the fire of Lenin's ideas. However, in order to guard this post it takes more than the ability to write poems and be familiar with rhythms and images. One must be a poet by virtue of his nature--love infinitely one's people. The draft of the new constitution states that the defense of the socialist fatherland is the sacred duty of every citizen. The sacred duty of the poet is to defend the spiritual, the moral borders of the Soviet homeland through his entire life and work.

5003
CSO: 1802

LABOR--CREATIVITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 78-80

[Letter to the editor by S. Trofimchuk, fitter-electrician at the Construction-Assembly Train No 286, Angarstroy, Lena Station]

[Text] The draft of the new USSR Constitution was discussed by the collective of our construction-installations train. We, the workers, approve the draft of the new fundamental law of the first state of mature socialism in history entirely and fully. It reflects the major changes which have taken place in the country since the adoption of the 1936 USSR Constitution.

I and my fellow construction workers are particularly pleased that the draft of the new fundamental law juridically codifies the freedom of scientific, technical, and artistic creativity. Article 47 reads as follows: "In accordance with the objectives of the building of communism, the citizens of the USSR are guaranteed freedom of scientific, technical, and artistic creativity. It is insured through the broad development of scientific research, invention and rationalization activities, and the development of the arts. The state provides the necessary material conditions to this effect, and supports voluntary societies and creative unions. The rights of authors, inventors, and rationalizers are protected by the law." This is a recognition of the tremendous social and economic significance of the technical creativity of the working people. The contribution of rationalizers and inventors to upgrading production effectiveness and improving the quality of the work is given a high rating.

Let us take as an example our Construction-Installation Train No 286 of the Angarstroy Administration. In 1975, at the construction of the third section of the Osetrovskiy river port alone some 30,000 rubles were saved as a result of the use of the rationalization suggestions submitted by train workers N. K. Starovoytov and B. P. Belashov. In the first year of the 10th Five-Year Plan the workers of Construction-Assembly Train No 286 submitted and applied 7 big rationalization suggestions. All this enabled the collective to complete the mooring of the eastern freight area of the port ahead of schedule.

A trend toward specialization in rationalization activities has developed in our work. For example, Son Din-su, a bulldozer operator at the mechanized sector, is engaged in modernizing the assemblies of the jib used for the removal of frozen soil. S. S. Ivchenko, senior engineer at the production department, is applying mechanization and progressive technological facilities at finishing operations. Most of the suggestions submitted by work superintendent L. M. Myrtsev deal with sanitary engineering operations.

Such specialization was developed for objective reasons, and because of the need to make each assembly and unit in the technological chain perfect. It enables us to accelerate the development of rationalization suggestions and to apply them faster.

We, rationalizers, are well familiar with bottlenecks in construction output. They could be eliminated, above all, by improving the organization of production. By virtue of my job as a fitter-electrician, I install and service equipment in the entire production sector. Frequently we quickly complete the frame of the building but then take quite some time to finish it. One of the reasons is the shortage of minor mechanization facilities. Our train is still short of machine saws, flexible vibrators, spraying guns, and others. Furthermore, the available equipment is frequently poorly taken care of. Addressing a conference on "Ways to Upgrade the Effectiveness and Quality of Construction Work," I suggested that all workers using minor mechanization facilities be so trained that the workers themselves could deal with minor breakdowns and eliminate them rather than wait for the tuners. In order to insure the fullest possible utilization of minor mechanization facilities it would also be expedient to concentrate them on the machine section of the train. In this case repairs would be made on a high level and skillfully, and there would be no idling of mechanisms.

Construction workers in the Extreme North work under complex and difficult conditions. Frosts are a great obstacle. According to safety rules all assembly operations in the open must cease at temperatures below 45°C (which, in our area, last almost throughout the winter). Furthermore, metals cannot always withstand such temperatures.

How to fight the frosts? How to "outsmart" the severe Siberian winter? This is yet another direction in the work of our rationalizers.

Not so long ago an interesting suggestion was made by senior work organizer L. D. Yakovlev and foreman V. I. Budylin: to use asbestos cement sheets to cover the metal instead of plaster at the construction of warehouse No 11 of the river port. The suggestion was cleared with the design institute and the customer. It resulted in considerable savings in materials and labor outlays. Above all, however, it became possible to warm up the warehouse in the winter. A great deal of thought was given and experiments conducted by the rationalizers on the subject of the electric heating of the concrete. Through joint efforts we developed and refined a reliable and effective system. Now concrete laying work does not stop at -30°C temperatures.

Another important direction in our work is to improve working conditions at each workplace. The train's rationalizations and inventions bureau has recorded a number of suggestions which, even though not yielding major economic results, considerably facilitate the work and make it pleasant. Everyone knows how important a good working mood is.

Creativity--scientific, technical, and artistic--has become a vital need of the Soviet person. This is a sign of the times. The nature of the work and its content are changing. The broad toiling masses are becoming involved in technical creativity. The western sector of the Baykal-Amur main railway was begun at the Lena Station which our train's collective must build. We are pleased to note that it is precisely here, at the western Baykal-Amur main railway, that the patriotic movement of the young people entitled "I am the master of the construction project" was born. It combines a struggle for the thrifty use of labor resources and materials with the extensive dissemination of the creative initiative of young construction workers--rationalizers.

The country has given us highly productive equipment. Our train, one of the many tens of construction subdivisions of the Siberian Extreme North, received in recent years powerful domestic and foreign bulldozers, automotive cranes, cranes on tracks, and excavators. Last five-year plan an automated concrete-making center began its operations with our train. This enabled us to complete the third section of the construction of the Osetrovskiy river port in 2 years by laying over 20,000 cubic meters of monolithic concrete slabs and reduce by 500 percent specific labor outlays for concrete making. An asphalt-concrete plant with a 200-ton-per-shift productivity was installed. It enabled us to mechanize the laying of asphalt-concrete to the 98 percent level and within a single year cover at the port alone 70,000 square meters.

The rationalizers deserve a great deal of credit for the fact that both the concrete-mixing center and the asphalt plant are highly productive. Many hours of concern and thought were spent before the mechanism could be made to work under northern conditions. My work played a role in this as well.

I already said that creativity is a new quality of labor under socialism as well as a vital human need. A no less essential aspect of labor is to encourage creativity and create conditions for creative work. The USSR provides such conditions to the workers to the fullest extent. Rationalization work is one of the most important parts of socialist pledges. The party organs--the party gorkom and the plant party committee--pay great attention to the work of rationalizers. We feel this attention on a daily basis.

5003

CSO: 1802

PROTECTING THE LAND WHICH FEEDS THE PEOPLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 80-82

[Letter to the editor by L. Sidorov, fitter at the kolkhoz imeni S. M. Kirov, Vitebskaya Oblast, Belorussian SSR]

[Text] When the nationwide discussion of the draft of the new USSR Constitution was being launched, our kolkhoz mechanizers took to the cultivated pasture land their machinery for fodder mowing and procurement. The farm had undertaken to create conditions for the reliable and bountiful wintering of the big public herd: the cattle alone is 3,500 head. Yet, in the past...

I remember: Thirty years ago our kolkhoz had a single log cowshed built with funds collected by the kolkhoz members literally kopek by kopek. A decision had been made at a general meeting to withhold per working day 20 or 30 (I do not recall precisely) kopeks, naturally, of the old currency. To the kolkhoz members this represented a considerable amount, for the labor day was paid no more than 2.5 old rubles. So, we built a cowbarn. The cattle wintered in it while in the spring we literally had to carry the cattle to the pastures, for the cows themselves could not reach the area.

Now, in 1976 alone, the kolkhoz's capital assets were increased by 140,000 rubles. Generally speaking, that is not much. However, allow me to say that the kolkhoz's overall capital assets are worth nearly 5 million rubles. In 1973 alone, following the completion of the heifers-growing complex, the amount of capital assets rose 2.5 times. Today the kolkhoz spends funds on more advanced and more productive equipment and for improving the living conditions of kolkhoz members or, in a word, on things which we could not even dream of 30 years ago.

The first kolkhoz tractors appeared in 1957: a DT-54 caterpillar tractor, and two Belarus' tractors. Today we have 31 tractors. In 1957 the kolkhoz had 323 head of cattle while now, as I mentioned, 3,500 or, 25 and 151 head of cattle respectively per 100 hectares of farmland. In 1957 yields averaged 7.6 quintals per hectare for grain and 38.6 quintals per hectare

for potatoes. Last year we harvested 42 quintals of grain per hectare and 221 quintals of potatoes. Let me point out that this was not our highest yield. Average milk production rose from 1,822 kg to 4,465 kg per cow.

These figures clearly show the great improvements achieved in the quality of the utilization of the land and the extent to which kolkhoz labor has become effective.

One of the reasons for the considerable strengthening of the economy and the increased output of crop and animal husbandry products is the adamant and persistent and, I would say, selfless work of all kolkhoz members--party and nonparty members, veterans and people with relatively short practical experience. A total of 205 people work at the kolkhoz averaging over 10 hectares of farmland each. However, all of us work jointly, trying not to lose a single day or hour. The importance of sowing the grain or mowing the grass for fodder at the best possible time is self-evident. A slight delay will reduce the amount of vitamins in the haylage, as a result of which its quality will drop.

Our state, industry, and working class are doing a great deal to raise agriculture to the most modern level. At the beginning of the 10th Five-Year Plan the country had over 25 million hectares in irrigated and drained land. Considerable areas have been reclaimed in our republic as well which, as we know, could not boast of good soils. The state is doing the work on improving the land; the ever-larger volume of chemical fertilizers we use are manufactured at state plants; the state is uninterruptedly supplying the kolkhozes with electric power and equipment. Today this seems self-evident and simple, and the seeming simplicity with which most complex and most important problems of kolkhoz development are resolved leads some people to adopt an irresponsible attitude toward the work. For example, some of the young kolkhoz members call us, the veterans, misers or greedy. Why? Because, for example, we are not in a hurry to throw away as scrap metal a broken-down tractor assembly but try to rebuild it in the workshop where I have worked for many years. It is very unpleasant when the land which feeds the people is wasted. Some kolkhozes use it irresponsibly and inefficiently, unconcerned with preserving and increasing its fertility.

The draft of the USSR Constitution states that "The land held by the kolkhozes is assigned to them free of charge for permanent use." We, kolkhoz members, must be grateful to the state for this. We must be grateful to the homeland and the party for their constant concern for strengthening the kolkhoz economy, for the increased prosperity of kolkhoz members, and for facilitating the working conditions of crop growers and livestock breeders.

However, I believe that the best gratitude will be a universal concern displayed by kolkhoz members for increasing the fertility of the state land and insuring its best utilization. Naturally, this is mentioned in resolutions passed at general kolkhoz meetings and in other documents. However, it may be useful to codify this stipulation in the country's fundamental law.

Therefore, I submit that paragraph 1 of article 11 of the draft of the USSR Constitution be supplemented by the following words: "The kolkhozes must make rational use of the land and work for increasing returns per each hectare of farmland."

I would like to mention something else as well. I am aware of many cases in which tens and hundreds of thousands of state or public rubles have been wasted aimlessly and inefficiently without proper substantiations and computations. Incidentally, this has been frequently mentioned by the press. Article 61 of the draft of the USSR Constitution states that the citizen of the USSR must protect and strengthen socialist property and that it is his duty to struggle against theft and waste of state and public property. I suggest that the following be added to paragraph 1 of that article: "Arbitrary actions committed by officials resulting in losses of state or public funds shall be considered an encroachment on socialist property."

A particular feeling arose in me as I read and reread the draft of the USSR Constitution. What a great right it is to be a citizen of a truly democratic state whose main objective is the good of everyone! It is for the sake of reaching this goal that we work in our kolkhoz, and that all Soviet people are at work. Could a person living in a capitalist country say that his personal objectives and the objectives of his state coincide? No, naturally. The draft of the new USSR Constitution emphasizes even further this unity of objectives of the Soviet person and the Soviet state.

5003

CSO: 1802

WE SHALL GAIN MORE STRENGTH

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 82-83

[Letter to the editor by N. Artemenko, actress at the Zhitomir Ukrainian Music and Drama Theater, party bureau secretary, Ukrainian SSR]

[Text] I am writing this letter immediately after the closing of an open party meeting held at our Zhitomir Ukrainian Music-Drama Theater. It was attended by all actors, stage workers, makeup people, and costumers. The collective discussed the draft of the new USSR Constitution and it was worth seeing the enhanced celebrating mood of those attending the meeting. Every member of our collective, like every Soviet citizen, feels these days profound satisfaction and is legitimately proud of the successes of his homeland and of its socioeconomic progress reflected in the draft of the USSR Constitution.

The participants in our party meeting said that every line of the draft expresses the great and transforming work of the people and the purposeful activities and Leninist concern of the Communist Party for the Soviet people. This concern has been the main meaning of all party work over the 6 decades of life of the Soviet state. We could say with full justification that there are no other forces on this planet which have done so much for the good of the working people and for peace on earth as the CPSU and the Soviet state.

Whereas man is the object of attention of the state and party, our state is the object of attention and concern of the Soviet person. This is the common aspect which unites people of different professions who are involved in resolving a great variety of private problems. Everyone must feel his responsibility to society and fulfill conscientiously his duty to the country and the people, defend the interests of the Soviet state, and protect the gains of the Great October Revolution codified in the draft of the new USSR Constitution. Every one of us is responsible to the memory of those who gave their lives defending the honor and independence of the homeland for the sake of peace, freedom, and happiness. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev mentioned at the May CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "Every Soviet person must clearly realize that the main guarantee of his rights is, in the final account, the power and blossoming of the homeland."

The party and the Soviet system have granted the citizens of the USSR the happy opportunity to develop their creative initiative and enjoy all the benefits of the socialist system. The draft of the new USSR Constitution codifies the right of the Soviet person to choose his profession and type of employment and work in accordance with his vocation, capabilities, professional training, education, and the needs of society.

The profession of theater worker is not one of the most widespread. However, it was with even greater pride and happiness that we discussed at our meeting the articles and stipulations of the draft of the constitution dealing with the spiritual life of society. The draft confirms the great concern of our state and Leninist party for the development of the arts. Therefore, our task of serving through art the common cause of the building of a communist society and molding new communist features in the human character becomes even more serious.

This was stated by all the speakers at the meeting with great enthusiasm. They also said that we must upgrade further the ideological and artistic standard of the performances, and strengthen relations with workers at enterprises and construction projects, and with workers in agriculture. Such relations could be strong only when we present plays dealing with problems which excite our contemporaries and bring to light the greatness of the accomplishments of the party and the people. Today the entire collective is focusing its attention on one such play. On the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution we shall stage the show "Kremlin Bells," based on the play by N. Pogodin. This is a known fact which, however, makes our responsibility even greater. We shall try to introduce something of our own in the play, and find some new aspects of the infinite and inexhaustible Leninist topic in the theater.

We frequently travel to give performances. We have performed in Moldavia and Belorussia. We have performed in Moscow. Once we visited Zvezdnyy Gorodok where those who have been entrusted with the conquest of space welcomed us warmly. When we tour we play not only at the main stages offered at our disposal but in clubs and culture houses of rayon centers and villages. The "deep province" audience is quite interested, for which reason we always return from such performances in an enhanced mood.

However, occasionally I could see that not only when we travel but in Zhitomir itself some actresses look worried. I inquire and it turns out that their child may be sick in the nursery or kindergarten or that they have trouble at home...The draft of the USSR Constitution contains a special article on women's equal rights. This equality is backed by serious state measures. However, I believe that another one should be added to them: concern of the state to facilitate household chores which are essentially performed by women. I do not know how to formulate this item accurately but, probably, it should be included in article 35. The following should be added to article 53 which deals with the family: "...adoption, as the public wealth grows, of other measures aimed at improving the conditions for raising children." By such "other measures" I mean, for example, giving a young mother partially paid leave until the child has reached the age of three.

...After the meeting an actress came to me and said, "You know, Nadya, we have not had such an exciting meeting for a long time."

Yes, all of us were excited by the draft of the new USSR Constitution. We are convinced that its nationwide discussion will add to our strength in the anniversary year.

5003

CSO: 1802

BOURGEOIS DICTATORSHIP AND STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 84-94

[Article by V. Shekhonin]

[Text] The contemporary circumstances in the world are decisively different from the situation 60 or even 30 years ago. The Soviet people live and work in a developed socialist society which is also being built in a number of fraternal socialist countries. The alliance among workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia, and fraternal cooperation among nations and nationalities are the social foundations of our state of the whole people confidently laying a path to the communist future.

The draft of the new USSR Constitution, issued for nationwide discussion, is the concentrated expression of the achievements of socialism.

"Our new constitution," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said, "will clearly show to the entire world the way the socialist state is developing, establishing socialist democracy evermore firmly and deeply. It will clearly show what is socialist democracy and its essence. Our constitution will show the variety of ways and tremendous scope of the steadily growing real participation of the broad popular masses in the administration of governmental and social affairs, something unknown in the bourgeois countries which are ruled in fact by a small capitalist class."

The ideas of scientific communism illuminate the road to the future for other peoples on earth. However, the militant forces of imperialism and reaction are unwilling to abandon their aspirations to turn history back. They are continuing the arms race on a tremendous scale, engaging in ever-new ideological subversions against the socialist states, and trying to bring a division in the actions of anti-imperialist forces. Never before have slogans of popular and revolutionary movements such as, for example, democracy, freedom, and equality been used by bourgeois propagandists and politicians for such shameless manipulations of the minds of the masses in the capitalist countries as is the case now. Organizing the ideological attacks against the new society, including attacks under the banner of the

"defense of human rights," and ignoring the facts of the blossoming of socialist democracy, the supporters of the private ownership system are hoping, among others, to benefit from the fact that the younger generations in the USSR and the other fraternal countries are unfamiliar with the exploiting system through personal experience, while the population of the capitalist countries is still insufficiently informed of the real benefits of socialism.

The unpardonable slander of existing socialism by the propagandists of the exploiting society, which was needed to draw the attention of the peoples away from the unseemly situation in the contemporary bourgeois world, particularly in the circumstances of its deepening crisis, are refuted by life itself. In this connection it would be pertinent to go back to the question of the basic features of the social system in the developed capitalist countries and to the struggle for democracy waged there.

I

Let us begin with the fact that, as all historical experience proves, the Marxist-Leninist formulation of the question of democracy alone offers a key to understanding the factual situation in this field of social life. For the first time in history Marxism-Leninism formulated the problem of the essence of democracy on specific historical grounds and proved its direct link with the class conditions governing the life of the people. Marxism-Leninism pointed out the prime role of the socioeconomic aspect of democracy and the secondary role played by its juridical forms. It proved the impossibility to speak of democracy while ignoring its socio-class content.

The domination of big capitalist ownership of capital goods is the basis of the socioeconomic system in capitalist countries. The protection of this ownership is the main purpose of the bourgeois state.

Here the factual power levers are focused above all within the apparatus of the big monopolies and the banks, and in the state machinery which manages the affairs of the entire bourgeois class. That which under socialism is the content of daily life--the freedom of labor from any oppression and exploitation--is rejected by all the living norms of the bourgeois society. There democracy was, and remains, in the final account, democracy for the rich. "The forms of bourgeois states are exceptionally varied. In the final account, however, they consist mandatorily of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 33, p 35).

What are the mechanism and basic functions of this dictatorship?

Its shock forces are concentrated in the suppression organs--the army, police, courts, jails, and internal affairs and intelligence institutions which support by force the interests of the ruling exploiting minority. The bourgeoisie zealously sees to it that the suppression organs and their command cadres are staffed by loyal servants and promoters of its class interests.

In principle, at the imperialist stage of capitalism, the bourgeoisie prefers not democratic but authoritarian forms of rule. Imperialism shamelessly violates elementary human rights, depriving the people of even the hope that their lives may be improved. It originates and encourages racism, neo-colonialism, and fascism. It attacks any party or organization which favors the liberation of man from the "right" to be exploited.

The myth of freedom and democracy, allegedly inherent in the capitalist society, is the invention of literary bourgeois fable-makers. As a whole, the history of capitalism is a true martyrology, a long list of the way entire peoples and classes have been deprived of basic rights, the way tens and hundreds of thousands of supporters of progress have died, and the way in the course of colonial wars and under colonial systems the people were turned into cattle sent to the slaughter or to reservations. Still today the list of such crimes would cover more than one volume. Suffice it to recall the situation of national minorities in the United States, the war in Vietnam, Algeria, the tragedy of Chile, South Africa, and the innumerable victims of fascist and other tyrannical systems.

When the foundations of the private ownership system began to weaken in the West with the intensification of the general crisis of capitalism and the 1929-1933 worldwide economic crisis, the big bourgeoisie began to turn to openly terroristic and fascist systems. The victory of the anti-Hitlerite coalition in World War II, with the decisive contribution of the Soviet Union, confused the designs of the reaction and contributed to achieving certain successes in the struggle waged by the working people under capitalism for democracy.

The democratic rights and freedoms existing today in Western countries were gained by the working class and the broad democratic circles in battle. However, the bourgeoisie tried to ascribe these rights and freedoms the most formal, limited, and curtailed nature possible. Discussing this aspect of bourgeois activities, V. I. Lenin noted that "For centuries or decades the bourgeois and most reactionary jurists in the capitalist countries formulated the most detailed rules and wrote tens and hundreds of volumes of laws and interpretations of laws restricting the worker, binding the hands and the feet of the poor, erecting thousands of obstacles for any simple working person from the people..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 37, pp 285-288).

Still today the capitalist state is, essentially, the bourgeoisie organized as a ruling class. To use Lenin's words, bourgeois democracy is even a form of state government most suitable to the needs of the bourgeoisie. Changes in the assumption of power by some parties or individuals do not weaken in the least the domination of the big capitalists and landlords who are doing everything possible to remove the masses from the administration of the state. "...as long as private ownership exists, your country, even though it may be a democratic republic, is nothing but a machine for the suppression of the workers in the hands of the capitalists..." (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 39, p 83).

As a whole, this state loyally serves the interests of precisely capitalism and, above all, big capitalism. This is confirmed, in particular, by data on the social structure of parliaments. In the U.S. Senate 13 percent of its members are industrialists and financiers; 65 percent are lawyers linked, as a rule, with the monopolies. No single senator is a worker or low-level employee. Most of the members of the British House of Commons are either capitalists themselves or big bourgeois officials; very few of the Labor Party representatives are workers. Cabinets consist almost exclusively of representatives of the rich classes.

All most important domestic and foreign governmental affairs in the West are managed by an apparatus whose main structure that it remains unchanged regardless of electoral results.

The class bourgeois selection and training of leading cadres for the state machinery and for enterprises belonging mainly to big owners are consistent with the self-seeking features of the educational system. School curricula and property and other requirements erect a barrier which a member of the lower classes finds difficult to surmount. After graduating from higher educational institutions, the offspring of the rich families constitute a kind of caste association enjoying different privileges inaccessible to the representatives of the poorer strata.

The leading cadres of the monopolies, the state machinery, and the military-industrial complex are trained, as a rule, in schools whose tuition is very high. Thus, in the United States it reaches \$2,600 or more, excluding room and board.

The big bourgeoisie protects by all possible means all accesses to power and tries to keep in its hands command positions. To this purpose it restricts the prerogatives of electoral authorities should they include representatives of the broad population strata.

There is no single bourgeois state whose constitution has no loopholes or stipulations insuring the monopolies the possibility to raise an army against the workers, proclaim a state of emergency, or adopt other repressive measures. Let us recall that it was precisely such an article, article 48 of the Weimar Constitution in Germany that was used in 1933 to make Hitler the head of the government and, subsequently, to proclaim a state of siege, suppress the workers movement, and abolish democratic institutions. This should not be forgotten today as well, for all types of neo-Nazi and revanchist organizations are continuing to operate with the connivance of the authorities; attempts to whitewash the Hitlerites and their crimes are being undertaken under the guise of the "freedom of the press."

It is characteristic that it is precisely in times of crises that capitalism proves, more shamelessly than ever before, what an unceremonious attitude it could adopt toward democratic norms. Millions of people, above all women, young people, immigrant workers, and unskilled workers are thrown out of the enterprises, deprived of housing and medical services, and so on. Their civil rights are violated and suppressed.

The recent exposures of the activities of American intelligence which organized a total surveillance of the country's population and acts of terrorism both in the United States and abroad, created a big scandal. A truly draconian measure in the FRG is the so-called "profession bans" which block for "people thinking differently" access to governmental service--administrative organs, schools, institutes, and medical and other establishments, both central and local. The "reliability" of 800,000 people has already been checked; many thousands of people with left-wing convictions have been deprived of working in their fields. "Thought control has reached an unimaginable scope," wrote the West German newspaper DIE ZEIT. "The loss of mutual trust has become a reality. The desire to engage in political debates is dying in our institutions. Frank ideological debates are being replaced by fear for one's professional life."

The intensification of the general crisis of capitalism is leading, among others, to the fact that the reaction is resorting evermore extensively to the political banditry of fascist or gangster groups. The number of murders of people favoring democratic rights and freedoms is rising.

The bribing of representatives, corruption, and the breakdown of entire links of the state apparatus and in the upper levels of influential bourgeois parties have become common practice. The entire world learned of the machinations of American military-industrial companies such as Lockheed which gave bribes to high foreign officials to purchase its output. Such bribe-takers included members of governments of a number of capitalist countries.

Corruption has developed in their governmental apparatus as well. This is confirmed, in particular, by the characteristic system of mutual guarantees existing between the personnel of military departments who handle huge budget allocations and the weapons manufacturers. Owners of banks and corporations and heads of law firms or research centers of the monopolies assume governmental positions while the administrators abandoning such positions go to work for the private corporations which, as a rule, pay them higher salaries for services previously rendered. Others set up various types of consulting organizations which advise "on a voluntary basis" presidents, governments, or individual departments.

II

The class which dominates the bourgeois society economically and politically holds in its hands the means for spiritual enslavement. Using the possibilities of its dictatorship, the bourgeoisie is imposing upon the population views, behavior norms, and a way of life consistent with its class interests. The private capitalist ownership of capital goods and the universality of commodity-monetary relations give the bourgeois way of life and outlook a particularly rigid mercantile nature. The main purpose of reactionary ideology is to substantiate the need for the preservation and strengthening of capitalism and imperialism. This means a justification of

exploitation, oppression of the peoples, militarism, the arms race, neo-colonialist practices, and preparations for war. These are the objectives of the widespread bourgeois propaganda apparatus, and of the mass information and education media, and of the entire organization of political life.

As a result of the social heterogeneity of the population in the capitalist countries, and the antagonistic interests of its different classes and strata, bourgeois and petit bourgeois ideology has a many-faceted nature. As a whole, the political direction here is determined above all by the interests of the big monopolies who rely, as their foundation, on the entire system of private ownership of capital goods.

The crisis which broke out in the capitalist countries covered all aspects of life--economic, political, cultural, ideological, and moral. The problems of energy, environmental pollution, and others rose sharply. Output declined, wages dropped, and prices rose. However, the profits and dividends of big companies, particularly the military-industrial ones, are rising. As acknowledged by bourgeois commentators, a tremendous number of working people in the capitalist countries live in poverty and the appearance of prosperity frequently conceals poverty. All this convincingly proves that capitalism is a system with no future.

The growth of the attractiveness of socialism and the intensification of the class struggle waged by the proletariat and its allies against the background of the general crisis of capitalism as a system motivates the bourgeoisie to increase its campaign of slanders against communist and workers parties and socialist countries. All possible methods are used to corrupt the awareness of the people's masses and to misinform them. As Lenin said, "One means used by the bourgeois press has always and in all countries been considered the most popular and 'impeccably' effective. Lie, make noise, shout, and repeat lies and 'something will remain'" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 31, p 217).

The division within the workers movement, the promotion of the concept of "social peace" between the oppressed and the oppressors, the dissemination of mistrust of the great constructive forces of the working class and the working people in the administration of society and the reorganization of social relations, and the implantation and support of anti-Sovietism and of all forms of revisionism and right-wing and left-wing opportunism are consistent with the class interests of the bourgeoisie. Those are precisely the purposes of the selected materials published daily and hourly by the mass information media who try, under the screen of "objectivity" to retain control over the outlook of the consumers and their assessments of the main trends in the development of the world or the foreign and domestic policy of one or another capitalist country. "All the news that is fit to print" boasts the American NEW YORK TIMES on its masthead, in fact giving its editors alone the right to decide what news is "fit" and what is not.

The private ownership of most mass information media and their material dependence on big advertisers representing the interests of the leading monopolies, and the bourgeois outlook of the managers of newspaper concerns and radio and television corporations insure the class oriented nature of their activities. Following are several examples taken from Western sources clearly proving the dependence of the information organs on monopoly capitalism. No more than 50 of the biggest corporations directly control the content of international news agencies and the programs of nearly all television and most radio companies in the nonsocialist world. In the United States radio and television are entirely in private hands. The governmental coalition in the FRG is headed by the Social Democratic Party. It has almost no newspapers and journals. Yet, 40 percent of the daily and up to 90 percent of the Sunday editions disseminated throughout the country are owned by the allegedly "above-party" extreme reactionary personality Axel Springer who has made a huge fortune through all kinds of speculations. The conservative journalist Paul (Zete) made the noteworthy admission that "Freedom of the press in the federal republic means freedom for 200 rich people to spread their views...He who is rich is free. This was said not by K. Marx but by me, Paul (Zete)."

The big capitalists see in the ownership of information and education media one of the most important weapons for their spiritual domination. That is why, for example, there was a tremendous upheaval in the Western press caused by the fact that some newspapers and radio stations were taken over in Portugal by democratic authorities in 1974. In the West the press of the big corporations is considered to be the "free" press, while the influence of the press on the part of society and even of the bourgeois-democratic parties is proclaimed as a "violation of freedom."

"The most disgusting slander, forgery, and gross lies and refined efforts to confuse the reader," Lenin noted, "are all means that the yellow and, in general, bourgeois press uses with inordinate zeal" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 32, p 424). Most of the books, motion pictures, television, and newspapers in the world of private ownership are so structured that the characters operate primarily within a rather narrow circle of people and interests which either have no or almost no major social problems. In the final account, the underlying reason for all this is to draw the people away from the acute problems, and to lock them in the shell of egotism and the petite bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie bases morality on the basest instincts and the imaginary defectiveness of human nature, the will of God, and the idealistic dogmas. Education as a whole is reduced to promoting the mentality and habits of petty owners who say that "I am looking out for myself and everything else is subordinated to this." Faced with the tremendous concentration of private ownership in the hands of the monopolies, in fact, it is a question of stupifying the people by promoting the myth of the inviolability of private ownership and its all-embracing nature which, allegedly, offers everyone the possibility to become rich.

The ideological and all spiritual life of the capitalist countries has become, in our time, a field for a fierce battle among classes. The hysterical and unrestrained campaigns launched against socialism and the proletariat show not the strength but the weakness of the bourgeoisie. The conscious understanding by the proletariat of creative Marxism-Leninism and of existing socialism makes it even more active in the struggle against capitalism. Naturally, the reaction is raving seeing the correctness of the predictions made by the Marxists in the past to the effect that this awareness will turn out to be stronger and more powerful than the capital stacked in the bank safes of the bourgeoisie. Hence its attempts to slander in every possible way the theory and practice of scientific communism.

III

Of late a slanderous campaign "in defense of human rights" in the Soviet Union and the socialist world was launched in the United States and, after it, in other capitalist countries. Far fetched and invented by imperialist propagandists, this campaign is being waged with the obvious purpose of an attempt to defame in the eyes of the broad popular masses of the capitalist countries the factual achievements of the socialist states which, after eliminating exploitation and all types of oppression of man by man, have factually insured the working people freedoms and true democratic rights impossible in any capitalist country. The freedom of the individual of the citizen of a socialist country represents the freedom of creative labor and participation in all realms of social activities, and the freedom to organize his own life. In a word, it is the freedom of the harmonious and comprehensive development of every person in which the basic criteria for his behavior are the social interests which, in turn, have as their supreme objective the development of the individual.

What is the situation in the bourgeois society with its antagonistic classes? Here we see the right of a minority to exploit the majority, to oppress for the sake of maximal profits, to engage in terrorism and other crimes against the working people, to promote the moral corruption of society, falsify public opinion, and so on. There is also the right, far from always allowed by the bourgeois laws, to struggle against all such ills through parliamentary and nonparliamentary means, defending the vital interests of the bulk of the population, humaneness and justice, and peace and cooperation among nations. The mechanism of bourgeois dictatorship is directed, essentially, toward supporting the rights of the first type. However, the working class and the working people are evermore adamantly opposing this order.

At the very dawn of capitalism its democracy was doubly limited. First, it was conceived and implemented only in the political field and had nothing to do with the basic socioeconomic aspects of human life. Secondly, surrounded by numerous property and other restrictions, it satisfied only a privileged segment of the bourgeoisie, leaving the majority of the population factually rightless.

At the present time the circumstances are developing differently in the various capitalist countries. World socialism is influencing the growing struggle for democratic rights by the masses of those countries. The increasing pressure on imperialism on the part of countries which have rejected the colonial and semicolonial yoke is also of great importance. The struggle for true constitutional rights and freedoms in the capitalist countries is becoming evermore acute.

In the final quarter of the 20th century the democratic requirements of the masses of those countries go farther than in the past. This is natural, for more favorable historical conditions have developed. There has been a radical change in the deployment and ratio of class forces in the world arena in favor of socialism and its supporters.

The various forms of struggle for democracy within the framework of the bourgeois society are expressed today in factual battles among classes, parties, and political currents, taking place under the influence of the urgent requirements and needs of the majority of the population. The historical achievements of the peoples of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries are considered by the working class in the West as bright beacons in the struggle waged by the working people for social progress and against the omnipotence of capitalism. The nationalization of key industrial and transportation branches, equal wages for equal labor, just taxation, giving the land to those who cultivate it, extensive pension security, including pensions to peasants, artisans, and members of the liberal professions, reduced rental payments and prices of communal services, free education and medical services, closing down of private privileged schools and hospitals, insuring leisure time, banning the propaganda war and racial and national discrimination, and elimination of organized crime are a far from complete list of democratic demands.

Ever-stronger demands are being made to put an end to monopoly ownership of newspapers, television, radio, and publishing houses; to abolish the privileges of officials and eliminate the bribing of parliamentary representatives; banning the use of advertising with a view to falsifications using information media; giving rights to public committees to control the way elected authorities and officials fulfill their electoral campaign promises; and democratization of the police and the army. Many of these demands have been included in the programs of parties close to the people and have become the battle slogans of the striking movement.

Today the struggle waged by the progressive forces in the capitalist countries against militarism on the economic, political, and ideological levels, is becoming particularly important. This is understandable, for after World War II militarism assumed a historically unparalleled scale, threatening to absorb in the unrestricted arms race the rich results of the work of the nations and the benefits of the scientific and technical revolution.

The mountains of armaments which have been accumulated have become a threat to the very existence of civilization, under the sponsorship of militarism. Armies and armed forces are being set up not only for purposes of external conflicts but also for suppressing all kinds of domestic people's democratic movements. Events in a number of bourgeois countries have indicated the ever-greater contradiction between parliamentary forms of political life and militarism. Unquestionably, demilitarization would contribute to improving the economic and domestic situation in the capitalist countries, and to their democratization.

Twentieth century history has given an object lesson to the peoples. Two world wars have buried tens of millions of people. The danger appearing on the horizon is immeasurably greater than such losses. The document entitled "Foundations for Reciprocal Relations Between the USSR and the United States" (May 1972) and the Final Act of the European conference in Helsinki (August 1975) expressed the entirely realistic thought that in a nuclear century there is no basis for relations among countries with conflicting social systems other than peaceful coexistence. Yet, the militarists are resorting to ever-new refinements with a view to urging on the arms race. The policy of militarism has turned into chains blocking the development of entire countries and continents; these chains could and should be broken and cast away from the path of progress and democracy, even though this is no easy task.

Militarism could and should be eliminated the way the people were able to do so with the colonial system. The struggle for a lasting peace and international security is a factual manifestation of a democratic outlook, a dominant feature in the struggle between the forces of progress and reaction waged on an international scale. It rallies the broadest possible social forces, including various bourgeois strata.

The requirements of the people's masses are merely the elements of a general democratic program which does not exceed the framework of the bourgeois society. They are directed toward insuring the rights of the people's masses in accordance with the factual possibilities of the present epoch. Assessing these requirements from the dialectical-materialistic viewpoint, the communists stem from the fact that the struggle for democracy calls for the participation of the working class in all of today's battles, and for a unity of the proletariat in this struggle which will inevitably draw a mass of allies from the peasantry, the employees, and the petite and even some of the middle bourgeoisie. The battle for democracy is not limited to the arena of parliamentary or other elections. It includes all forms of struggle, not only defensive but offensive. Showing to the masses the halfway nature and limitations of bourgeois democracy, the progressive forces are directing themselves toward the fastest and most profound launching of the struggle of the masses for a further democratization of society with an antimonopoly trend. Here sharp changes, the creation of new forms of democracy and new institutions embodying the changing conditions for its application and, something very important, for its protection, are possible and inevitable.

Historical experience has entirely confirmed the correctness of Lenin's words to the effect that "Capitalism in general and imperialism in particular turn democracy into an illusion, while capitalism also triggers the democratic aspiration of the masses and creates democratic institutions and aggravates the antagonism between imperialism which rejects democracy and the masses aspiring toward democracy" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 30, p 71).

Relating democratic demands, most firmly expressed, with each step of its struggle, the revolutionary working class has socialism in mind as its final objective.

We know that the transition to socialism is possible both through peaceful and nonpeaceful means. Lenin wrote the following about the socialist coup d'etat: "Neither Marx nor the future leaders of the socialist revolution tied their hands as to the ways, forms, and means of a coup d'etat, perfectly realizing the mass of new problems which would arise and the way the entire circumstances would change in the course of the coup d'etat, and how frequently and violently they will change in the course of the coup d'etat" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 304). Yet, a transition to socialism is possible not at any moment, not by capitalism "growing" into a new system through parliamentary votes, but in the presence of a revolutionary situation, through a revolution.

Historically, bourgeois democracy itself was the product of the struggle waged, above all, and primarily by the working class. Lenin's assessment of bourgeois democracy retains its full validity: "One hundred and fifty to 250 years ago the progressive leaders of this revolution (or these revolutions, speaking of each national kind of a single general type) promised the peoples to free mankind from medieval privileges, women's inequality, state advantages enjoyed by one or another religion (or 'idea of religion,' or 'religious faith' in general), and from inequality of nationalities. They promised and did not fulfill their promise. They could not fulfill it, for they were prevented by 'respect'...for 'sacred private property'" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, pp 146-147).

Despite jabbering on human rights in the United States, it was precisely in recent months that the legislations of a number of states rejected the equal rights amendment. In the FRG chauvinistic and revanchist circles, rallied around the CDU/CSU, are opposing the strengthening of all democratic institutions and proclaiming the menace of the "Jacobins." All this only emphasizes the need for vigilance and for even closer unity among democratic and progressive forces.

The "nonclass" or "above class" approach to democracy is a deception or self-deception, and conceals the fact that as long as the capitalist power is retained, as long as the capitalists retain their ownership of capital goods, bourgeois dictatorship will remain. The "pluralism" (multiplicity) of parties in bourgeois society reflects the heterogeneity of this society--the existence of various factions and groups of the bourgeoisie and petite bourgeoisie, fighting among each other and against the proletariat. Yet,

in the more developed capitalist countries, this "pluralism" is reduced to a system of two or three bourgeois parties alternating in the political arena, leaving totally untouched the rule of monopoly capitalism.

The programs of these parties are frequently hardly different from each other. They are aimed at the struggle against the communist and workers movements. Wherever those movements are strong, the bourgeoisie tries to cope with the situation by organizing new parties in order to divide the forces of the class enemy and gain electoral votes, weaken the positions of the working class, and draw it away from the path of the struggle against capitalism and imperialism, and into the swamp of revisionism, opportunism, and nationalism.

Proclaiming democratic demands within the framework of the bourgeois society, the communist and workers parties are defending the interests of the working people and their rights and uniting the struggle against capitalism and for improvements in the economic and social position of the masses. The class determination and consistency in the positions of the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist parties on matters of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the struggle for democracy do not prevent and, conversely, contribute to the implementation of the historical mission of the working class as the leader, guide, and organizer of the struggle of the working people for peace, democracy, and socialism.

The general crisis of capitalism at the present stage and the broad scope of the class struggle of the proletariat and the working people for their social, political, and economic demands, and for democracy, as well as the increased influence of world socialism lead the ruling circles in the capitalist countries to an ever-greater "tightening of the screws," and to the violation of basic norms of bourgeois democracy of which they themselves boasted. At the same time, the propaganda waged by the capitalist countries is intensively promoting a campaign whose purpose is to cast aspersions on the social order in the countries where real socialism exists, and trying to undermine sympathies for such countries among the broad popular masses of the West.

All this proves the bankruptcy of bourgeois ideology. The more time passes the more apparent become the faults of capitalism as a system incapable of providing a practical solution to the most acute social, economic, and political problems. The more time passes, the more noticeable becomes in the capitalist countries the desire of the peoples to find an answer to such questions through radical social change.

5003

CSO: 1802

ALONG WORN-OUT TRACKS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 95-103

[Article by O. Borisov]

[Text] Analyzing reports received from China, it would be difficult not to reach the conclusion that the situation in that country remains extremely contradictory and unstable. The sharp political crisis which has long excited the country is triggering the growing discontent of various population strata.

The new leadership which has assumed power is trying to stabilize the situation somehow. However, this clearly hinders the continuity of Maoist dogmas. The foreign great-power course with its expansionistic aspirations, concealed by anti-Sovietism, and hostility to the process of detente is retained on the foreign political level.

As we know, after the death of Mao Tse-tung the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries took constructive steps proving their sincere desire to improve relations with the People's Republic of China. However, Peking did not respond and did not undertake to remove the obstructions along this path.

Life and Chinese reality themselves prove the correctness of the basic assessments of Maoism as a current hostile to Marxism-Leninism, found in the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and the documents of the fraternal communist parties.

Since a general picture would remain incomplete without certain essential details, let us turn directly to events and facts.

Today as Yesterday

The funeral ceremonies were still underway in Peking when the latent clash for inheriting the power became obvious. Wang Hung-wen, Communist Party of China Central Committee deputy chairman, Chang Ch'un-ch'iao, State

Council vice premier, and Central Committee Politburo members Chiang ch'ing and Yao Wen-Yuan (Mao's widow and son-in-law) were arrested and repressive measures were adopted against other relatives of the deceased.

This was another characteristic "explosion" within the ruling crust of the country, observed for more than 1 decade, directly reflecting the faultiness of the Maoist regime. It was a repetition using the same type of labels applied at different times to describe Wang Ming, Kao Kang, P'eng Te-huai, Liu Shao-ch'i, Lin Piao, Ho Lung, Ch'en I, and, to a certain extent, even Chou En-lai as well as Teng Hsiao-p'ing. Not all of these leaders stood on the positions of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Not all of them had opposed the cult of Mao's personality. However, one way or another, each one of them had been labeled "head of black gangs," "counter-revolutionary" and "revisionist," unless he disappeared totally without a trace.

The same is being repeated today. Only the names have changed. Peking's propaganda claims that it was precisely the arrested foursome that was responsible for the entire confusion and the troubles. To make this more convincing they are being accused of total immorality, wasting huge amounts of money for personal use, and other sins. Such a washing of dirty linen in view of the entire world, strangely combined with the praise of Maoism, creates an entirely understandable puzzlement. Ends do not meet. It was no accident that, addressing the Cuban national assembly, Fidel Castro noted the following on this subject: "Incredible information is being received on the way a group of adventurers factually usurped the power in the party. However, official Chinese explanations do not as yet enable us to understand how this group was able to control China's policy over many years and how Mao Tse-tung's widow was able to commit in his lifetime such crimes in the People's Republic of China, in a socialist country.

The gravity of the current situation is largely determined by Mao's heritage. The "great leap" and other campaigns of which Peking's propaganda tirelessly and solemnly reminds us, and which took place and developed under his direct guidance and personal participation, dealt a most severe blow at socialism in China. The "cultural revolution" undermined the foundations of democracy and became, according to Lin Piao, Mao's former "closest associate and successor," a "true meat grinder of cadres," disturbing the alliance between the working class and the toiling peasantry, and bringing about the establishment of a military-bureaucratic dictatorship. The working class became split and was essentially deprived of the possibility to play a leading role in the country's life. Millions of party and non-party people became victims of the "cultural revolution." The internationalist forces of the Communist Party of China were bled white.

Mao and his group suborned the republic's national economy to their hegemonistic aspirations and to the objectives of an unrestrained growth of the military potential and war preparations. China's development was turned away from scientific socialism. This fatal course has still not been subjected to any change, as can be seen.

Let us recall that Peking proclaimed 1976 as the first year of the Fifth Five-Year Plan. Naturally, one should have expected the publication of data on the fulfillment of the Fourth Five-Year Plan and on the assignments for the fifth or, at least, on the 1977 plan. However, no such information was published. Apparently, here it is less a matter of the efficiency of the respective organs than of the critical condition of the national economy. Hardly anyone could be misled by official references to disasters caused by the elements. Naturally, one could not ignore the great harm caused by the earthquakes. Obviously, however, they are not the prime reason for economic complications.

In one of his talks Ku Mu, State Council vice premier, said that the country's economy is indeed "in a state of disintegration." In turn, the newspaper JEN-MIN JIH-PAO recently reported that last year production in industry and agriculture declined. Here again the four mentioned leaders are used as a scapegoat, whereas, in fact, it was precisely Mao Tse-tung's "experiments" that led China to a dead end and hindered the development of its economy for at least 10 years.

The material condition of the Chinese population not only failed to improve but, conversely, worsened even compared with 1958. A rationing system for basic foodstuffs and consumer goods has long been operative. Now, however, it has become even more rigid. Every month ration cards are issued at places of work for a maximum of 14 to 20 kg of grain products (this includes potatoes computed in terms of grain on a 4:1 ratio), and 250 grams of vegetable oil. Cotton fabrics are allocated similarly, on the basis of no more than 7 meters per capita per year. There are coupons for various industrial goods. Housing conditions are exceptionally difficult. For the past 20 years there has been virtually no state housing and cultural construction in the country. The funds allocated were only for the building of community houses at war plants and for barracks.

The current leadership faces urgent problems not only of an economic or political nature. Important organizational problems must be resolved. The Communist Party of China Central Committee Politburo, established at the 10th congress (1973) numbered 25 members, including 4 candidate members. Today 16 remain (only 9 of them in Peking). Only one of the five positions of party Central Committee deputy chairman is occupied. So far no one has been appointed chairman of the Permanent Committee of the All-China National People's Congress (VSNP): vacancies for an entire number of positions in the party, state, and military apparatus remain.

Characteristically, Hua Kuo-feng, who assumed the position of State Council premier following the death of Chou En-lai, and that of chairman of the Central Committee military council, was not given an official mandate either by the party's Central Committee plenum or the parliament. (His appointment was made at a restricted Politburo session when the foursome were arrested.) The CPC Central Committee has not held a plenum for over 2 years. Many of its members are suspected of open or secret solidarity with the removed leaders. The state apparatus is disturbed by all kinds of reorganizations and repressions of many ministers.

Disturbances are not abating in Shanghai, Loyang, Shenyang, Wuhan, and other big cities. Workers go on strike demanding better living and working conditions. There is ceaseless discontent caused by the political purge. Phenomena of a different order are also occurring--separatism and parochialism--the more so since in a number of provinces the full power is concentrated in the hands of influential members of the military.

In April and May the Peking leadership took a number of measures to strengthen its own position. They include, above all, the publication of Mao Tse-tung's "Selected Works," in five volumes, an article by Hua Kuo-feng in defense of the Maoist "doctrine" ("Let us complete the continuation of the revolution with the dictatorship of the proletariat"), and an all-China conference on industry.

Particularly noteworthy among these measures is the five-volume edition. As the Chinese press emphasizes, from the very beginning a fierce struggle was waged on the matter of its publication by the Peking leadership. The newspaper JEN-MIN JIH-PAO claims that the subsequently arrested foursome, now described as "sworn enemies of the ideas" of Mao Tse-tung, created all possible obstacles and undermined the efforts to edit and publish this book. Its publication--planned in up to 200 million copies--is presented as a "great victory," as an event of "far-reaching historical significance." A special CPC Central Committee decree directed "the entire party, the entire army, and all the peoples of the country" to launch a "mass movement" for the study of the materials in the work "in connection with the practice of the class struggle," and the "streamlining of party ranks and of style" (i.e., in connection with the continuing purge).

It is noteworthy that this volume has practically no materials by Mao published in the past and which spoke of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and the need to pursue a policy of peace among nations. This has been replaced by speeches delivered by Mao at closed meetings, imbued with hatred for the homeland of the Great October Revolution.

The tendentious choice of materials, the "editing" done by a commission headed by Hua Kuo-feng, and the subsequent comments leave no doubt that the present Peking leadership has decided to follow Mao's views on ideological, political, organizational, and economic problems. The content of volume 5 speaks for itself. Among others, it promotes basic Maoist postulates, conflicting with the principles of scientific socialism, such as the essentially neo-Trotskyite "theory of the permanent revolution," "class struggle under socialism," and others. Problems of socioeconomic development are interpreted in direct contradiction to the experience of the members of the socialist comity.

On 1 May the central Chinese press published a sui generis program article by Hua Kuo-feng. Devoted, as reported the New China News Agency, to problems related to the study of the new volume of the "Selected Works," it praises

the deceased as "the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our epoch." Hua Kuo-feng calls for maintaining the loyalty to the "banner of Chairman Mao Tse-tung," as a guarantee for all victories.

In the socialist society after Mao, Hua claims, contradictions continued to exist among different classes. The socialist society "is full of contradictions" which "as before have the nature of the class struggle." The article promotes the idea that whereas until the people's system was established this struggle was essentially waged outside the party, following the seizure of governmental power it "assumes a particularly serious nature," and is focused above all within the party. The main danger of capitalist restoration stems from intraparty "kapputists" (i.e., individuals following the capitalist path--a name given by Peking to anyone who opposes the Maoist dogmas one way or another). Hence that same conclusion of the alleged need for a "cultural revolution," and for the use of Mao's methods in dealing with differently-minded people.

Hua Kuo-feng praises the Maoist theses in the field of economic construction and emphasizes the link between "economic power" and military construction. He casually mentions that the purpose of the development of output is "gradually to satisfy the steadily growing needs of the people and to create an ever-stronger material base for the socialist system." However, he fails to formulate any kind of positive socioeconomic program on this account.

The speeches delivered at the April-May All-China Conference on Industry were in the same spirit. The speeches delivered at the conference by Hua Kuo-feng, Yeh Chien-ying, CPC Central Committee deputy chairman and minister of national defense, Li Hsien-nien, State Council vice premier, and others confirmed that, as before, China's socioeconomic development is being based on adventurist concepts such as the notorious "great leap" and the "people's communes." Yeh Chien-ying referred to Mao's statements on military control over various aspects of the country's political and economic life under the sign of "training the entire people by the people's liberation army."

Increasing China's military power was considered particularly important at the conference. Hua Kuo-feng once again linked the development of the national economy with preparations for war. In this connection he referred to the alleged threat originating from the Soviet Union. The statement by Yeh Chien-ying was in the same spirit. "Currently," he stated, "the struggle between the Soviet Union and the United States for hegemony is becoming evermore aggravated. Sooner or later it will lead to war. We must not...forget about the war. We must be prepared for it and proceed from the fact that a large-scale war will soon break out."

The inability of the present Chinese leadership to elaborate more or less realistic positions in terms of stabilizing the political situation and organizing the country's economy was manifested clearly at the conference. It ended in the same way as a similar conference on agriculture held in December of 1976: no program document whatever was adopted.

Peking's "new" platform shows that Maoism remains and that no essential signs of "de-Maoization" can be noted as yet in the People's Republic of China. Everything shows that the main content of the current process is the efforts of the so-called pragmatic Maoist wing to save, preserve, and strengthen the regime created as a result of the "cultural revolution" merely by amending somewhat the most odious Maoist concepts. It is a question of surmounting the deep crisis in Maoist theory and practice which has clearly brought to life all the ills of the existing regime, above all the crisis in domestic policy, intensified by the outbreak of a struggle between rivaling groups of Mao's heirs.

Everything leads one to believe that this process is merging into a spontaneous anti-Maoist current aimed, in the final account, not at correcting but totally rejecting Maoism. Such a current has existed for a long time, manifesting itself in a variety of forms, including popular disturbances and mass population actions. Mao's heirs are now trying to turn the discontent of the working people to secondary factors and blame the misfortunes created by Maoism on fabricated renegades and imaginary distorters.

The campaign of criticism of the "four" is merely a valve through which the pressure in the boiler of mass discontent is released not without a certain success so far. Blaming the arrested leaders for economic failures, breakdown in the field of public education and culture, and for the victims of the "cultural revolution," the present leadership is trying to save the real culprit of all this--Maoism and its order. The result is that not Maoism per se is bad, or that it is the trouble, but that it was misinterpreted.

The Maoist ideas are consistent to the greatest extent with the objectives of turning China into a powerful militaristic state. On this all factions within Peking's leadership agree. Great power concepts impress greatly the Chinese nationalists guided by Mao's words expressed as early as the 1950's: "We must become the first country in the world" (1956); "We must conquer the globe" (1959). Naturally, this is not to say that such delirious thoughts are a conviction shared by the Chinese people. However, we must not fail to take into consideration that such ideas have been implanted in the minds of the people for decades. To this day Peking has not abandoned their promotion.

Contrary to the Expectations of the Peoples

Maneuvering in the field of domestic policy, the present leadership meanwhile retains a fully intact foreign policy. Furthermore, it is persistently promoting its support of "Chairman Mao's revolutionary foreign political line." Everyone knows that this is a line of open hostility to the cause of peace, democracy, and socialism, a line of alliance with the most aggressive imperialist circles, and of a struggle against detente.

Characteristic manifestations along this line include the Maoist energizing of subversive activities against the USSR and other socialist countries, and the socialist comity as a whole, a demonstration of solidarity with NATO and other imperialist alliances, and support of fascist and other reactionary forces.

Addressing the October 1976 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that the foreign political line followed by the Peking leadership for the past 15 years has been thoroughly discredited throughout the world. Whereas at the beginning of the 1960's the Maoists presented themselves as "the most decisive" fighters against imperialism, today the fig leaves have blown away. The protection of Pinochet, the encouragement of such ardent opponents of detente as Strauss, Jackson, and (Tetcher), and the open support of aggressive blocs revealed to international public opinion the real nature of Maoist policy.

This nature may be clearly traced in the present directions followed by Peking's foreign political activities, namely:

A course of total ideological and political confrontation with the USSR and the other members of the socialist comity;

The aspiration to form alliances with imperialism on the common platform of the struggle against detente and other positive trends in international life, and against world socialism;

Continuation of the line of converting the zone of national liberation into its own special sphere of influence, pitting the developing countries against the socialist comity, and increasing cooperation with the local reaction with a view to subverting the progressive forces in these countries and emasculating the anti-imperialist trend of the nonalignment movement;

Energizing attempts to aggravate the international situation and to use conflict situations for increasing the tension and provoking war, while preaching the inevitability of a new worldwide military conflict;

Intensifying devisive subversive activities against the international communist movement.

Volume 5 of Mao Tse-tung's "Selected Works," and the article by Hua Kuo-feng on the publication of this book are a direct attempt to substantiate ideologically the hegemonistic anti-Soviet foreign political course aimed against peace and socialism, and to prove the "correctness and usefulness" of Peking's current diplomacy.

The CPC Central Committee decree on the study of said volume particularly emphasizes that its publication is of "tremendous topical significance... to the international communist movement," and to the struggle against "contemporary revisionism" in the world arena, a label which the Maoists are trying to attach to the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties.

Hua Kuo-feng describes the struggle against "contemporary revisionism" and, above all, against the Leninist party as Mao Tse-tung's "great contribution." He subscribes to the Maoist concept that the Soviet Union has allegedly "degenerated into social imperialism, and that the socialist camp no longer exists," and that following Mao "the struggle must be fought to the end" against the USSR and its allies.

Noteworthy is not only the so-called theoretical but the practical approach taken by Peking on a number of most important problems.

Attempts continue to be made to turn back the process of detente through coordinated actions between China and the West. Particular efforts are being made, as in the past, to undermine the process of improvement of American-Soviet relations. The Chinese leaders openly support the increased Pentagon budget, and U.S. military presence in various parts of the world. Peking approves of NATO's appeal for a further arms race under the pretext of straightening the "imbalance" of forces between that bloc and the Warsaw Pact organization. The new Chinese leadership welcomed with satisfaction NATO's refusal of the suggestion addressed by the socialist comity to all participants to the Helsinki European conference to conclude a treaty on not being the first to use nuclear weapons against the other. Completely supporting the Common Market, and developing official relations with it, Peking also actively supports forces which favor the even greater militarization of Western Europe.

The position taken by the People's Republic of China on the establishment of a new international economic order is demagogic. The Maoists present themselves as the only defenders of the interests of developing countries. In fact, here again Peking is pursuing its self-seeking aims and is trying to direct the struggle of these countries not against the real exploiters but against the members of the socialist comity.

In the United Nations the delegation of the People's Republic of China is waging a fierce struggle against the socialist countries. Here the Maoists have become so unrestrained in their hostility to the policy of peace and detente that in taking votes their representative frequently remains alone or in the company of Pinochet and South African diplomats.

Peking ascribes great importance to Sino-American relations in its geopolitical estimates. Despite the complex domestic political circumstances and the changes in the Chinese leadership, it is constantly signaling to Washington that rapprochement with the United States has been and remains its unchanged objective. This was confirmed at meetings both with former President Nixon, in 1976, as well as with Schlesinger, Mansfield, Curtis, and other senators. The Chinese leaders are indicating that anti-Sovietism and subversive activities against the socialist comity should be the base for Sino-American relations, and that the alliance between the People's Republic of China and the United States in the international arena, against the USSR and the other socialist countries, is more important than settling

the question of Taiwan. A reciprocal search is continuing for the establishment of channels for military-technical cooperation between the People's Republic of China and the militaristic circles of the United States, Japan, and other imperialist countries.

Naturally, the imperialist countries are interested in using Peking's anti-Sovietism for their own purposes. However, they cannot fail to take into consideration the ratio of forces in the world arena and the role and significance of the Soviet Union. The most far-sighted Western politicians note in this connection that at the present time China is still relatively weak from the military-economic viewpoint. They cannot fail to realize also that whereas as yet China is no direct threat to the United States, Japan, and other countries on a global scale, the situation will change in time. As the economic and military potential of the People's Republic of China continues to grow, Peking's great power and chauvinistic ambitions will unquestionably conflict with their interests to an ever-greater extent.

Practical experience proves that Peking is continuing the Mao Tse-tung line of countering detente and of a factual rapprochement with imperialism on an antisocialist great power basis and that, as in the past, is calling for a military-political unification of Western European countries against the socialist countries and is countering the initiatives of the Soviet Union aimed at strengthening the peace and security.

It might have seemed that after Mao Tse-tung Soviet-Chinese relations should have improved, for it is universally known that it was precisely he who initiated their worsening and who bears tremendous personal responsibility for their aggravation. In the past as well, while Mao was alive, the Soviet Union invariably tried to improve them. We have not only proclaimed this but taken specific steps and translated our goodwill into the language of practical constructive suggestions.

Unfortunately, the well-wishing actions of the Soviet Union remained without positive answer. The Chinese leadership itself did not make the slightest movement to normalize governmental relations with our country. Peking's representatives rejected even proposals of cooperation among seismologists, the establishment of contacts between friendship societies, and so on.

The campaign hostile to the Soviet Union conducted in China not only by the propaganda organs but by highly placed officials, is acquiring an ever-broader scale. The press and the other mass information media are disseminating day after day unpardonable fabrications and slanders. They are continuing to launch the coarsest possible attacks on the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet Union. These sallies are being intensified in connection with the approaching 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution and the nationwide discussion of the draft of the USSR Constitution in our country. After Mao's death three central press organs alone (the newspapers JEN-MIN JIH-PAO, and KUANG-MIN JIH-PAO, and the

journal HUNG-CH'I) have been publishing monthly some 300 anti-Soviet items, articles, and comments (a total of 3,000 in 1976, i.e., more than in 1974 and 1975 together). All Chinese radio stations engage in frantic anti-Soviet propaganda.

Peking is unceremoniously trying to interfere in the affairs of our country and to teach the Soviet people what it should and should not do. The inspirers of the anti-Soviet campaign defame the great results of the heroic struggle and labor of the Soviet working class, kolkhoz peasantry, and people's intelligentsia, the combat revolutionary traditions, and the socialist way of life of the Soviet people and their communist ideals and Leninist policy of peace and friendship among the peoples.

The Chinese authorities are promoting a provocative racket concerning some kind of "aggressive intentions" of the Soviet Union toward China, aimed at poisoning the minds of the working people in the People's Republic of China with hatred for the Soviet state, and promoting a quarrel between the Chinese and the Soviet people. At the same, the truth of the policy of the USSR and of the measures taken by our country to improve Soviet-Chinese relations are being concealed from the Chinese people. All our steps aimed at creating a normal atmosphere and favorable prerequisites for improving intergovernmental relations and organizing mutually profitable cooperation are being misrepresented.

Uninterrupted attempts are being made in China to defame the fraternal ties among the members of the socialist comity and their struggle against the forces of imperialist reaction and aggression and for peace and cooperation among the peoples. The thesis not only of the inevitability but the desirability of a new world war is being insistently preached. The idea of detente is being anathematized and everything possible is being done to hinder the assertion of the principle of nonuse of force in intergovernmental relations and to set some countries against others.

This anti-Soviet campaign is hypocritically depicted as a sort of "principled argument." The question is what common grounds could exist between an ideological argument and malicious slander, abuse, and provocations? What is the purpose of those who are promoting an anti-Soviet psychosis? Who benefits from such a falling-out?

All this benefits only the forces interested in a constant enmity between China and the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The present anti-Soviet propaganda in China, aimed at aggravating Soviet-Chinese relations and the entire international circumstances, conceals dangerous complications and, naturally, is not consistent in the least with the interests of the Chinese people themselves.

Only those who are unconcerned with the destinies of the peoples, including their own, those who ignore the tragic consequences which a policy aimed at increasing international tension, fraught with a threat to all mankind,

could act. Yet, this is precisely the target of the reactionary circles in the imperialist countries, together with the organizers of the anti-Soviet campaign in China.

As to our party, its course in such a complex international problem as that of China has been, and remains, clear and principled. It is expressed in the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and the statements by Soviet leaders. "We," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said recently, "would like to have normal good neighborly relations with that country. We have mentioned this previously and are repeating it now. However, relations between any two countries must be bilateral...Furthermore, we would like for Peking to understand that acting against the expectations of the peoples and opposing anything that is good and healthy in international relations is a thankless and unpromising matter."

The Soviet Union has not and will not spare efforts in the struggle for bringing China back into the common ranks of the fighters against imperialism.

5003

CSO: 1802

HIGHER POLITICAL EDUCATION WITHIN THE PARTY EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 104-105

[Article by A. Aver'yanov]

[Text] Readers Comrades A. I. Smirnov (Gor'kiy), A. Krasnozhan (Nal'chik), and V. A. Barkovets (Saratov) asked the following: does graduating from a Marxism-Leninism university sponsored by the party committee give the right to consider that its graduates have acquired higher political education and are they presented with a badge?

Following is the answer to these questions.

The steady improvement of one's ideological and theoretical level, and the evermore profound mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory and the skill to apply it in practice are obligations of every party member and an inner need of the Soviet person. Today, as was noted in the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th party congress, the mass study of Marxism-Leninism is the most important characteristic of the development of social consciousness in our country.

Exposure to Marxism-Leninism occurs, essentially, in all schools. However, a particularly important role here is assigned to the party education system whose structure is such as to enable practically anyone so desirous, regardless of profession, age, and so on, to master Marxist-Leninist theory at a corresponding level.

Thus, political schools are attended by comrades who have not completed their secondary education; schools of the foundations of Marxism-Leninism are attended by people with secondary educations; as a rule, people with higher educations attend theoretical seminars, schools for the party and economic aktiv, and Marxism-Leninism universities; methodological seminars are attended by scientists and highly skilled specialists.

The students within the party training system could change the topics they study within the same unit such as, for example, the political course, or else, as they upgrade their general educational and political levels, move to a new level such as, for example, from a course on the foundations of Marxism-Leninism to a theory seminar, and so on.

The mastering of Marxism-Leninism is a continuing process. Naturally, the completion of a specific course of training within the party educational system does not mean that the student has obtained a definitive level of knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory. His duty is to continue to intensify such knowledge. Attending the party training system has its characteristics which distinguish it from attending a VUZ, a technical school, a general school, and others. The students within the party training system, auditing one or another course, do not acquire professional training which enables them to work for a salary. This stipulation applies also to the superior forms of party training such as the Marxism-Leninism universities.

Yes, in the Marxism-Leninism university the students acquire higher political education. This education, certified with a diploma, gives them the rights to become propagandists, lecturers, reporters, or political informants, as required by the party organization. In other words, one of the most important social professions is acquired at the Marxism-Leninism university. Its graduation proves that the student has mastered the type of knowledge of Marxism-Leninism and the method for its dissemination which enables him to share skillfully such knowledge with others but only on a voluntary basis.

The party education system, of which the Marxism-Leninism university is a structural part, is not a governmental but a social method for the study of revolutionary theory. That is why the higher political education obtained with its help cannot be considered higher professional education with all its corresponding rights.

After graduation the students of Marxism-Leninism universities are not given badges. We emphasize once again that the Marxism-Leninism university is one of the superior forms of the party's educational system and that its objective and task is to contribute to the ideological and political growth of the party members and the non-party aktiv. Naturally, the primary party organizations must carefully watch over the ideological and political growth of the communists and take this growth into consideration in the solution of cadre problems.

5003

CSO: 1802

BOURGEOIS AND SOCIALIST CONSTITUTIONS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 106-111

[Article by A. Mishin, doctor of juridical sciences]

[Text] Dear Editors! Please tell us when and in what country was the first constitution adopted, and what were the historical conditions of its appearance? How did constitutional legislation develop subsequently and what is the basic distinction between our Soviet constitution and a bourgeois constitution? It would be very good for the editors to answer these questions in connection with the discussion of the USSR draft constitution.

V. Lomtev, bearer of the Order of Lenin, welder at the Moscow Elektrosvet Plant imeni P. N. Yablochkov.

The constitution is a state law which codifies the foundations of the social system and establishes the principles governing the organization and activities of the superior state organs (form of rule), national-territorial organization of the state (state system), and the legal position of the individual. The legal norms contained in the constitution have supreme juridical power. This means that all other legal norms (laws, ukases, decrees, and others) must be passed strictly in accordance with constitutional prescriptions.

The modern concept of the constitution appeared and developed in the epoch of the bourgeois revolutions. The first bourgeois constitutions were the American, of 1787, and the French, of 1791. It was precisely then that the epoch of bourgeois constitutionalism began. According to the theoretical views prevailing at that time the constitution not only established a boundary between the area of the execution of the supreme state power and the rights of the citizen-owner, but formulated the procedures through which power functions could be exercised. Thus, having become the politically ruling class, the bourgeoisie officially made its power constitutional, restricted by a law, unlike the totally unrestricted power of a feudal absolute monarch.

It is noteworthy that the constitutional texts thoroughly concealed the class nature of the governmental power. The constitution was interpreted as a manifestation of the will of the people and as an expression of the agreement among all classes in the bourgeois society. The American constitution, for example, contains the following solemn formula: "We, the people of the United States, ...ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." For the next two centuries this formula was repeated innumerable times in other bourgeois constitutions. Even the most reactionary 1969 Brazilian constitution states that the entire power originates from the people and is exercised on their behalf.

V. I. Lenin clearly defined the class nature of the bourgeois constitutions. Analyzing them critically, he reached the following basic conclusion: "The essence of the constitution is that the main laws of the state in general and the laws applicable to electoral rights for representative institutions, their range of competence, and so on, express the factual ratio of forces in the class struggle" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 17, p 345).

In the capitalist society the norms of the constitution express the will of the bourgeoisie. They codify and establish its dictatorship and proclaim the rights to private ownership of social production capital. This practically substantiates the "legality" of the capitalist system with its inevitable exploitation of man by man.

Unlike the daily law-making of parliaments and governments, the constitutions appear at critical historical moments. As a rule, a constitution has been adopted whenever an essentially new ratio of class forces has been established. "In the past," K. Marx noted, "constitutions were drafted and adopted when a balance was reached in the process of social change, when new class relations became stable and when the struggling factions of the ruling class resorted to a compromise which would enable us to continue the struggle among them and, at the same time, remove from the struggle the weakened people's mass" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 7, p 40).

This idea could be most clearly illustrated by taking France as an example. The 1791 constitution, having established a constitutional monarchy, codified the gains of the bourgeoisie in the first stage of the revolution. The 1793 Jacobin Constitution ratified the republican system and expressed the new ratio of class forces characterized by the temporary predominance of a radical petite bourgeoisie. Two years later the new constitution codified the results of the 9 Thermidor coup d'etat which brought the big bourgeoisie to power. In December 1799 another addition of the constitution was adopted as the result of a plebiscite, legalizing the results of the 18 Brumaire coup and established the personal dictatorship of the First Council Napoleon Bonaparte. Five years later the omnipotent ruler drafted a new constitution which restored the monarchy: "French Republic, with Napoleon the Emperor." Following the defeat of the Napoleonic armies and the occupation of Paris by the allied forces, the French people were "granted" the 1814 Constitution which restored

to the throne the Bourbon Monarchy. After the power of the king was restricted to a certain extent as a result of the 1830 revolution, the fact was codified by the adoption of a constitution which gave the practical power to the financial bourgeoisie. The July monarchy was overthrown in the course of the 1848 revolution and the bourgeoisie secured its dictatorship with a constitution passed by the constituent assembly in November 1848. The Second Republic did not exist long. Louis Napoleon Bonaparte introduced a new constitution in January 1852, approved at a plebiscite. Soon after that, in November of that year, a senatus consultum was passed restoring imperial power in France. The 1875 Constitution was adopted following the defeat of the Paris Commune and the stabilization of the power of the big bourgeoisie. Thus, in 84 years, France had 10 different constitutions.

In the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism the political situation is substantially different. The contemporary bourgeois constitutions expressed, above all, the correlation between the forces of the main classes--the bourgeoisie and the proletariat--and only after that the intraclass factional contradictions among the capitalists. Such a situation could arise only after the proletariat had developed as an autonomous political force.

The Marxist science of the state distinguishes between two types of constitutions: juridical and factual. The first consists of the text of the fundamental law expressing the factual ratio of class forces at the time of its adoption. Actually, the constitution means the factual procedure through which governmental power is exercised. Lenin noted that "a constitution is fictitious when law and reality are different; it is not fictitious when they agree" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", Vol 17, p 345). The practical-political conclusion based on this situation is that a fictitious juridical constitution should be replaced, in the final account, with a new one or substantially amended and supplemented.

Unlike conventional parliamentary laws, constitutions are adopted in accordance with a more complex procedure. This proves the particular importance and expected stability of the fundamental law. Contemporary practice has developed several basic means for the adoption of a constitution.

The right to adopt a constitution may be exercised by a representative institution--a parliament or a constituent assembly especially created for this purpose. Thus, the first bourgeois constitutions--the American and the French--were adopted by constituent assemblies.

A constitution may be adopted directly by the voting electorate. This method is known as a referendum. The practice of submitting a draft constitution to a referendum is traced to the epoch of the French Revolution. Under the conditions of a bourgeois dictatorship, despite its externally democratic nature, a referendum is frequently a means to secure the approval of the most reactionary draft constitutions. That is why fascist regimes have repeatedly resorted to such a procedure. Contemporary political experience proves that under capitalism a constituent assembly, particularly if representatives of

communist and workers parties participate in its work, is a more democratic method for the drafting and final passage of a constitution. A constituent assembly created on the basis of democratic principles could express and codify in the constitutional norms, the factual ratio of class forces. For example, in 1947 the Italian constituent assembly adopted a constitution which was an outstanding gain for the Italian people.

The particular status of the constitution as a fundamental law is secured by the more complex procedure for amending and supplementing it. While parliamentary laws are passed by simple majority (50 percent of the votes plus one of the quorum), special procedures govern the introduction of constitutional amendments. A universally accepted stipulation is one according to which the constitution must be amended and supplemented on the basis of the same procedure governing its adoption.

The nature of the stipulations contained in the constitution could radically change through the passing of conventional and other laws and the issuance of governmental and presidential decrees. In countries following an Anglo-Saxon legal system the constitutional stipulations are supplemented substantially by customs and frequently constitutional norms are given a different significance as a result of interpretations by the courts. It is self-evident that the daily practice of the exercise of state power in the bourgeois countries is far from always strictly consistent with constitutional prescriptions.

With the exception of Great Britain and New Zealand modern constitutions are written documents. This means that they have been drafted as a single (rarely more than one) document based on a specific system. As a rule, the constitution consists of a preamble (introduction to the basic text of the constitution), a basic text, and provisional and related stipulations. In some countries, as in the United States, for example, amendments to the constitution are not included in the basic text but are presented separately and each amendment has its own number.

All bourgeois constitutions without exception conceal the class nature of bourgeois state power. They say nothing of the real foundation of the bourgeois society--the exploitation of man by man. Such constitutions are of a formal-juridical nature. They have been written in a casuistic language which the common man is frequently unable to understand. Many of the most important aspects regulating the procedure for the exercising of state power are not included within the constitutional text thus making governmental and administrative interpretations possible.

The epoch of socialist constitutionalism began with the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The first socialist constitutional acts were passed by the historical Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets. The congress's appeal "to the workers, soldiers, and peasants!" proclaimed the following: "On the basis of the will of the tremendous majority of workers, soldiers, and peasants, and on the basis of the victorious uprising of the

workers and the garrison in Petrograd, the congress assumes the power...The congress decrees the following: All local power will be assumed by the soviets of workers, soldiers, and peasant deputies which must insure factual revolutionary order." The most important constitutional acts of international significance passed at the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets were the Decree on Peace and Decree on Land, and the Decree on the Establishment of a Government of Workers and Peasants. In the subsequent period the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Sovnarkom passed a number of other constitutional acts which were summed up in the decisions of the Third All-Russian Congress of Soviets, held in January 1918. The congress adopted a Declaration of the Rights of the Toiling and Exploited People, and a resolution on the federal institutions of the Russian Republic.

These and many other acts were the foundations of the RSFSR Constitution, passed at the Fifth All-Russian Congress of Soviets, on 10 July 1918. It codified the results of the first eight months of the revolution. Addressing the delegates to the Fifth All-Russian Congress of Soviets, Lenin emphasized that "whereas now a Soviet Constitution could be submitted by us to this congress, it is only because soviets have been established in all parts of the country and have been tried, because you created the constitution and tried it in all parts of the country; it was only 6 months after the October Revolution and nearly 1 year after the First All-Russian Congress of Soviets that we were able to put down in writing that which already existed in practice" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", Vol 36, p 499).

The 1918 Constitution established and juridically codified the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat created through the revolutionary creativity of the masses under the leadership of the Communist Party. However, it had nothing in common with preceding or contemporary bourgeois constitutions either in terms of content or of form. For the first time in the history of mankind the fundamental law proclaimed the following: "The Russian Republic is a free socialist society of all working people in Russia. The entire power within the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic belongs to the entire working population of the country united in city and rural soviets." The international significance of the 1918 RSFSR Constitution was manifested, in particular, in the fact that the constitutions of other independent Soviet Socialist Republics were adopted on the basis of its model: in Belorussia, the Ukraine, Azerbaydzhan, Armenia, and Georgia. The RSFSR Constitution was a model to the Soviet Republics which appeared in other European countries.

The adoption of the 1924 USSR Constitution was an important landmark in the constitutional development of our country. It codified the voluntary union of Soviet Socialist Republics within a single union state. A new type of Soviet Socialist Federation was established founded on a contractual basis. In the time during which this constitution was effective our country resolved in its main aspects the national problem and carried out tremendous socioeconomic changes of a socialist nature which brought about the total elimination of the exploiting classes and the undivided rule of socialist production relations in all realms of the national economy.

The final victory of socialism in our country led to the development of essentially new social, economic, and political conditions which were not reflected in the 1924 Constitution whose main task was the building of the Soviet multinational state. For this reason it codified, above all, the principles of reciprocal relations within the union as well as the structure, organizational procedure, and range of competence of the superior organs of the state power and the administration of the USSR and its constituent union republics. Yet, it paid lesser attention to problems of the social structure and to the legal status of the citizens, since such problems were regulated mainly by the constitutions of the union republics themselves. All this determined the need for the adoption of a new fundamental law.

The Communist Party Central Committee passed a decision on the need to revise the constitution and submitted it for consideration by the Seventh Congress of Soviets of the USSR, held in February 1935. The congress noted that a number of stipulations of the first union constitution have become obsolete and failed to reflect the changes which had taken place in the social, economic, and political development of the USSR. By decision of the congress the Central Executive Committee of the USSR elected a constitutional commission which prepared a draft for a new USSR fundamental law. In June 1936 the draft was approved in its main aspects by the party's Central Committee plenum and the Presidium of the USSR Central Executive Committee, and published for nationwide discussion. The notes and suggestions expressed by the working people were taken into consideration in drafting the final text of the new union constitution.

The delegates to the Extraordinary Eighth Congress of Soviets of the USSR discussed the report "On the Draft of the New USSR Constitution" and approved its text. On 5 December 1936 the Extraordinary Eighth Congress of Soviets of the USSR passed the decree "On Ratifying the Constitution (fundamental law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

The 1936 USSR Constitution summed-up the achievements of the Soviet people in the economic, social, and political areas and legislatively codified the victory of socialism in our country. The USSR Fundamental Law also codified the political foundations of the USSR as represented by the soviets of worker deputies, as well as the economic foundation of the USSR which consists of the socialist economic system and the socialist ownership of fixed assets and tools. The necessary amendments were made to the national-territorial organization of the USSR. The system of superior state organs was improved and so was the administration of the union and of union republics. The social, economic, political, and other rights and freedoms of the Soviet citizens were broadened considerably. The restrictions of political rights found in the 1918 and 1924 constitutions applicable to exploiting elements were deleted in full as the result of the elimination of the exploiting classes themselves. The inequality in the representative norms of workers and peasants was eliminated and the electoral system was improved. Equality among all the citizens of the USSR, regardless of their nationality and race, in all realms of economic, state, cultural, and sociopolitical life became the basic principle of the country of victorious socialism.

The Soviet social and governmental system, codified and molded with the 1936 constitution, withstood the most severe trials of the Great Patriotic War. On the basis of this system the Soviet people restored the national economy destroyed by the war and accomplished tremendous social, economic, political, cultural, and scientific changes. A mature socialist society was built in the Soviet Union, developing toward growing social homogeneity. The previously existing disparities among basic social groups--the working class, kolkhoz peasantry, and people's intelligentsia--were being gradually eliminated. A new historical community--the Soviet people--developed.

Our country's economy changed radically. Characteristic of its present condition is the total domination of socialist forms of ownership. A single powerful national economic organism is successfully operating in the country, developing on the basis of the combination of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist system.

The most important event of our time in the political sphere was the fact that, after implementing its historical mission, gradually the state of dictatorship of the proletariat developed into a state of the whole people.

Within that time the international position of the Soviet Union changed substantially. The disappearance of the capitalist encirclement, the conversion of socialism into a world system, the formation of a socialist comity, the appearance on the political map of the world of tens of young countries liberated from colonialism, and the weakening of the positions of world capitalism created real possibilities for the prevention of a new world war.

The changes which have taken place determined the need for the adoption of a new constitution a draft for which has now been submitted to nationwide discussion.

The draft of the new constitution is the natural result of 60 years of experience in the building of socialism and Soviet statehood. It is based on the Leninist principles of the development of socialist democracy, the state structure, the solution of the national problem, and the correlation among the interests of the individual, society, and the state.

The draft of the new constitution retains and develops the basic characteristic features of the preceding Soviet constitutions of the period of socialist construction--the 1918 RSFSR Constitution, and the first USSR Constitution. The draft of the new constitution contains and develops many of the basic stipulations of the 1936 USSR Constitution which have withstood the trial of time and have retained their validity. They include the constitutional codification of the basic foundations of socialism in the economic and political areas, and a guarantee of the real rights and freedoms of the citizens.

The draft of the new constitution takes fully into consideration the rich constitutional experience of the fraternal socialist countries which, in turn, have carefully studied and used the achievements of Soviet constitutional theory and practice.

The new USSR Constitution will represent the further development and improvement of Soviet constitutionalism. It will preserve the continuity of the ideas of the previous constitutional structure in our country and throughout the socialist comity. Unquestionably the new constitution of the Soviet Union will become in the future a model for the drafting of the fundamental laws of other socialist states.

"...The adoption of the new USSR Constitution," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the May CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "will become an important landmark in the political history of the country. It will remain as yet another historical contribution made by our Leninist party and the entire Soviet people to the great cause of the building of communism and to the international cause of the struggle waged by the working people the world over for freedom, human progress, and lasting peace on earth."

5003

CSO: 1802

LENINIST STYLE--A PRICELESS PARTY PROPERTY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 112-116

[Review by N. Lyaporov of the book "Nekotoryye Voprosy Tvorcheskogo Razvitiya Stilya Partiynoy i Gosudarstvennoy Raboty" [Some Problems of the Creative Development of the Style of Party and Governmental Work] by K. U. Chernenko. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 96 pp]

[Text] The 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution is coming. The entire heroic history of the Soviet people and their combat and labor victories are inseparably linked with Lenin's party--the party which headed the revolution, the acknowledged vanguard and the leading force of our society.

Today as well, when the efforts of millions of people are focused on new accomplishments and on the systematic implementation of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress, this vanguard role is manifested with particular clarity. The tasks set by the congress are distinguished by their unparalleled scale and comprehensiveness. The successful implementation of the plans calls for the mobilization of all forces and resources at the disposal of our state. Stricter demands also face the level of management and the style and methods of party activities.

"An important prerequisite for successful party leadership," emphasized Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, at the 25th congress, "is the Leninist style of work. The Leninist style is a creative style, alien to subjectivism, imbued with a scientific approach toward all social processes. It presumes high exactingness toward oneself and others. It excludes complacency and opposes all manifestations of bureaucracy and formalism."

The Leninist work style is the priceless and most important gain of our party. The practice of the building of socialism and communism brilliantly proves its outstanding viability and exceptional fruitfulness. How was it created and how did it develop? What are its basic features and content? How is this style improving and developing today in accordance with the

growing tasks? This is the topic of the book "Nekotoryye Voprosy Tvorcheskogo Razvitiya Stilya Partiyonoy i Gosudarstvennoy Raboty", by K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee secretary, recently published by Politizdat.

Speaking of the origins of the Leninist style, the author notes, above all, that "it was formed and developed on the basis of the unity between Marxist-Leninist theory and practice, and a profound knowledge of the laws of social development" (p 4). Lenin's brilliant instruction that "the role of the leading fighter could be performed only by a party guided by a leading theory" remains the guiding star of the party members (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 6, p 25), a theory which makes possible not only the successful solution of current problems but a proper prediction of the future and which lays the true path to it. Combining revolutionary scope with communist efficiency, the Leninist style encompasses the powerful enthusiasm and optimism of the working class and the many years of experience, wisdom, and energy of its party which guided the greatest social changes.

The author convincingly proves the tremendous role which V. I. Lenin, the party's creator, played in developing the style of all party activities. His outstanding personal qualities--infinite loyalty to the cause of the working class, respect for the working man, responsiveness, and justice--became the party's law of life and the norm of social behavior of the Soviet people. This style embodied the principles of the humanism of the communists to whom there is nothing higher than serving the working people and the noble communist ideals.

The basic features of the Leninist style are described by the author through his thorough analysis of the practical activities of the CPSU. The main aspect of such activities is the elaboration of a general plan for the development of society and a proper political line, and organizing the masses for its implementation. All this requires, above all, a scientific approach which, as the author notes, is "one of the most important and most characteristic features of the Leninist style in party and state work...It is a profoundly meaningful concept with a variety of facets and manifestations" (p 16).

It is a question, above all, of the ability to apply theory creatively in the study of specific reality, to see the trends and laws of social processes, and to find the main link in the work. Particularly important is the requirement to approach the solution of any problem comprehensively, and to consider the many aspects of one or another phenomenon in their unity. It was precisely such an approach that was used, for example, by the Altayskiy Kray Party Committee in resolving problems of the education of the rural youth. Here measures to increase ideological influence and strengthen the discipline were combined with the creation of the most favorable possibilities for work and recreation, and improvements in housing and cultural-living conditions.

A scientific approach is inconceivable without well-organized information. Noting its most important qualities--reliability, operativeness, and veracity--

the author discusses in detail the necessary measures for the broadening and improvement of party information. He analyzes the various ways and means of work with it, including the use of contemporary technical facilities. Specific examples are given to describe the fruitfulness of long-term planning which is becoming evermore widespread in the practice of party committees and primary party organizations. Valuable experience in the field of such planning has been acquired in Moscow, Leningrad, the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Uzbekistan, and by the party organizations of other union republics.

Reality has tested the effectiveness of the scientific approach organically inherent in the Leninist style of work. It "creates reliable obstacles on the path to the manifestations of subjectivism...It restrains all types of voluntaristic thrusts, and prevents the errors they inevitably create...The confidence of the Soviet party members in the future and the implementation of congress plans is also inseparably linked with the awareness of the party's guidance of the building of communism as organized on a solid scientific base" (p. 20).

The realistic nature of our great plans is guaranteed also by high level organization and efficiency, defined by Lenin as "the ability to do the work" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", Vol 54, p 88). Revolutionary tasks may remain a utopia, and a pious wish, unless supported by efficient organizational work. Therefore, the author states, the problems of organization and efficiency should not be considered either particular or secondary. They must always be within the sight of the party committees.

Naturally, communist effectiveness has nothing in common with narrow practicalism or uninspired plodding which make it impossible to look beyond the present. What is needed is Lenin's purposefulness, the ability to concentrate along the main directions and to oppose yielding to current affairs, insuring for oneself, as Lenin advised, "the possibility to calmly consider the work in its entirety" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", Vol 44, p 366).

The author considers these and other problems of improving the Leninist style of work by invariably looking at the practice of the party organizations aimed at implementing the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress. Many committees have begun to deal more profoundly with economic matters and to undertake the solution of key economic-political problems. In recent years they have formulated more specific suggestions of national importance than in the past. As a rule, success is achieved wherever practical considerations are combined with a broad political outlook, and where performance and discipline are combined with initiative and creative enthusiasm.

The following fact is characteristic: implementing the stipulations of the 25th congress, the Sverdlovskaya Oblast Party Committee organized and sponsored a practical science conference on the utilization of scientific and technical achievements in production. Over 1,600 scientific and technical measures were elaborated. Essentially, a comprehensive plan for scientific and technical progress of the oblast for the 5-year period was elaborated at the conference.

The crux of all organizational work and its reliable instrument is control of execution. The content of party, state, and public control has been enriched and acquired new features in recent years. It is particularly important to note that to an ever-greater extent the center of gravity is shifting to practical aid, to organizing implementation on the spot, and to summing up and applying progressive experience. The broad public circles are becoming involved evermore energetically in this work. Information on execution has become more operative. This has had a very beneficial impact on the development of mass initiative.

However, the author cites facts of a different nature as well. They show that if problems of control are neglected this entire work is imperceptibly reduced to meetings and conferences while active work is replaced by talks and unnecessary paperwork. As a result, the apparatus workers lose most of their time in drafting a variety of documents.

The party calls for abandoning decisively such a faulty style. Success can be achieved only through the thorough study of matters, formulation of substantiated suggestions, and availability of precise and systematic information on execution. Considering the various aspects of such activities and measures for developing a control system, the author draws the conclusion that "in our present conditions the social content and political functions of control are clearly revealed in the tangible growth of its effectiveness as an active means for the implementation of the plans for economic progress by the country and as means for the development and improvement of socialist democracy" (p 24).

The CPSU and the Soviet people are legitimately proud of their accomplishments. However, complacency, intoxication with success, and arrogance are deeply alien to the party members. They clearly understand that as the scale and complexity of the tasks increase, a self-critical approach to all matters becomes evermore important. The author draws the attention to the effectiveness and constructive nature of critical remarks directed against bureaucracy, red tape, parochialism, and obsolete work methods.

The Leninist style is vividly manifested in the strict observance of the principle of collective leadership. The author traces the way this principle--one of the basic principles of the party's entire life--is implemented by increasing the role of the elected aktiv, by relying on the primary party organizations, and by broadening relations with the masses. The collectivity concept presumes maximal consideration of views and suggestions which contribute to success. In practical terms this means reliance on the knowledge and experience not only of committee members, for example, but of a broader range of people, specialists, and interested collectives.

The author describes extensively the practice of the party's Central Committee and Politburo. Their entire comprehensive and fruitful work aimed at implementing CPSU domestic and foreign policy is a model of true Leninist style. Inherent in this work are profound realism, a scientific approach to the solution of ripe problems, collectiveness, efficiency, and

close ties with the masses. The Central Committee decisions are invariably made on the basis of a collective discussion. The author describes the outstanding role of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, in insuring the efficient and harmonious work of the party's Central Committee and of party organs at all levels.

It would be difficult to overestimate the significance of the various measures which contribute to the fullest possible consideration of mass initiatives. The author ascribes a great role, in particular, to the study of the work related to letters written by the working people. "Quite frequently," he notes, "the letters provide an incentive and a starting point for the decisions made not only by local party organizations but by the CPSU Central Committee as well" (p 74). He provides interesting data: the Central Committee receives daily up to 2,000 letters while during the period of preparations for the 25th party congress and during the congress over 600,000 letters and telegrams were received. Taking into consideration the suggestions of the working people, in 1975 and 1976 the Central Committee passed a number of documents dealing with organizational-party, ideological, and mass-political work, economic construction, and party foreign political activities.

True collective leadership is inconceivable without relying on the primary party organizations which play a decisive role in the implementation of the party's policy. The author discusses the intensified guidance of the primary party organizations by the party committees and the means for improving this work. He pays particular attention to the party organizations operating within the conditions of production associations. He analyzes the three basic types of structure of such organizations, as they exist at present, and their characteristics and possibilities for intensifying their influence in the collectives.

Recent practical experience, the author states, has indicated that all these three types of the contemporary structure of party organizations in production associations have proved their viability. In proving the work, the party members work for the fuller utilization of the possibilities of the associations as a qualitatively new form of management with a view to upgrading production effectiveness on the basis of accelerated scientific and technical progress.

The party's cadre policy helps to strengthen and develop the Leninist style. Naturally, the author deals extensively with problems related to work with cadres. He notes that one of the aspects of this work, previously somehow ignored, was raised at the 25th party congress: the question of moral education in general and of that of party workers in particular.

"Nothing enhances the individual more," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the Congress, "than an active position in life, a conscientious attitude toward social duty, when unity between word and action becomes a daily norm of behavior."

However, not everyone can observe this moral requirement. Here and there a tolerancy is displayed toward the violation of the norms of socialist community life and rules of behavior. A disparity is allowed between words and actions, and between principles and their practical implementation. The author systematically promotes the thought that "under contemporary conditions we must not only take into consideration the political and business qualities of a worker and the level of his knowledge and competence, but also pay attention to his moral virtues" (p 63).

A Leninist style is being established not only in party work but in the activities of state and public organs. It contributes to upgrading the level of the national economic management. A transition to a two- and three-step management system is taking place on the basis of party and government decisions. Production associations are being established. A number of measures have been taken to simplify the structure of the administrative apparatus and to eliminate duplication within it. Naturally, however, not everything is proceeding smoothly. Some ministries and departments, enterprises, and organizations are slow in resolving problems of improving and reducing the cost of the apparatus. Elements of formalism are allowed to exist. In a number of cases the experience of enterprises which have applied the most efficient organization of the work is neglected. The author directs us to the fastest possible elimination of such shortcomings and promotes new and progressive aspects. In particular, he cites the following fact. During the past five-year plan some 2,000 big industrial enterprises and many new shops were built. They required new administrative personnel totaling over 2 million people. However, measures for improving the administrative-economic mechanism released over 1 million workers in different sectors. The funds thus saved were directed toward financing the national economy and upgrading the living standard of the working people.

The Leninist style is not a sum total of universal prescriptions applicable to all practical cases. Such prescriptions neither exist nor could exist. The Leninist style is a live and creative method which is being steadily developed and improved. This is quite convincingly confirmed by the practical activities of the party and the people in the implementation of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress. These decisions call for upgrading the effectiveness and quality of all work. This stipulation applies, above all, to party work.

This book, summing up the rich party experience gained in recent years, is imbued with concern for the active assertion of the Leninist style in all realms of work. It will be of great help to our cadres in mastering such experience and modern ways and means of organizational and political work among the masses.

5003

CSO: 1802

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL PROGRESS AND SOCIAL PRODUCTION EFFECTIVENESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 117-119

[Review by V. Kamayev, doctor of economic sciences, of the following books: "Nauchno-Tekhnicheskaya Revolyutsiya i Preimushchestva Sotsializma" [The Scientific and Technical Revolution and the Advantages of Socialism]. edited by V. G. Lebedev, and V. I. Kushlin. Mysl', Moscow, 1975, 261 pp; "Nauchno-Tekhnicheskaya Revolyutsiya: Ekonomika i Upravleniye Sotsialisticheskim Proizvodstvom" [The Scientific and Technical Revolution: Socialist Production Economics and Management]. edited by A. A. Amvrosov, V. V. Dorofeyev, G. I. Zinchenko, G. A. Kozlov, A. G. Koryagin, G. Ya. Kuznetsov, and D. I. Pravdin. Mysl', Moscow, 1976, 351 pp; "Ekonomicheskiye Problemy Nauchno-Tekhnicheskoy Revolyutsii pri Sotsializme" [Economic Problems of the Scientific and Technical Revolution Under Socialism]. edited by L. M. Gatovskiy. Ekonomika, Moscow, 1975, 263 pp; and "Effektivnost' Ekonomiki Razvitogo Sotsializma" [Effectiveness of the Developed Socialist Economy]. edited by V. I. Dokukin and L. F. Kondrat'yev. Mysl', Moscow, 1976, 312 pp]

[Text] The number of works written on the topical problems of scientific and technical progress grows with every passing year. Implementing the party's instructions, the Soviet scientists are making a profound and comprehensive study of the ways and means for organically combining the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist economic system.

The books selected for this review cover a variety of aspects of this important problem. The authors are, in fact, resolving a single problem indicating how to make fuller use of the potential of socialist production forces and of the achievements of science and technology in the interest of the working people, and how to upgrade social production effectiveness and the quality of all work. This review shall be limited to the range of questions raised in the books which, in our view, need further elaboration and are being actively discussed in scientific publications.

The monograph "Nauchno-Tekhnicheskaya Revolyutsiya: Ekonomika i Upravleniye Sotsialisticheskim Proizvodstvom" deals mainly with reproduction processes and with improving the management of scientific and technical progress. It deals extensively with the development of the socialist nature of labor under contemporary conditions. Planned production management is analyzed through the lens of the cost accounting mechanism. The discussion of specific methods for determining indicators of development of the socialist economy which could be achieved with the maximal utilization of the possibilities of the scientific and technical revolution and of production reserves is of unquestionable interest.

The work "Effektivnost' Ekonomiki Razvitogo Sotsializma" describes the ways for further utilization of the reserves of the Soviet economy under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution. Its authors have been able to link within a single entity the consideration of economic problems both on the level of the country's entire national economy as well as on the level of the individual sectors and enterprises.

In recent years our economists have been paying great attention to the elaboration of the criteria for economic and socioeconomic production effectiveness. We must note that this is an important problem of economic theory which requires further research and development. We believe that a proper approach here is the one which takes into consideration both the unity and differences of the two types of effectiveness and their interdependence and interaction. This problem is also discussed extensively in the work "Ekonomicheskiye Problemy Nauchno-Tekhnicheskoy Revolyutsii pri Sotsializme." Its authors are correct in stating that social production effectiveness (bearing in mind socioeconomic effectiveness--the reviewer) "is determined by the main objectives of the socialist society and, above all, by the need to satisfy maximally the material and cultural requirements of the members of society" (p 105). On this basis the authors suggest that the growth of the per capita consumption fund be considered as its criterion. However, developing and concretizing this view, obviously, they have ignored the fact that the absolute size of the consumption fund (and, consequently, its per capita growth) substantially depends on a number of factors, including foreign political ones.

Here is yet another consideration on the way this work interprets the correlation between social and economic effectiveness. The authors, justifiably pointing out that the solution of problems related to facilitating the work and changing its content, environmental protection, and others, will demand ever-greater outlays, draw the conclusion of a frequently inevitable lowering of effectiveness (see p 12). In our view, they are confusing social effectiveness with economic effectiveness. Outlays for such objectives are of a social nature and they must be related not to the size of the product obtained or to improvements in its quality but precisely to the solution of one or another social problem. The higher the economic effectiveness of socialist production becomes, the greater will be the material and financial possibilities of society to resolve social problems.

The acceleration of scientific and technical progress leads to changes in the organizational structure of industry. At the same time, big economic units are established--industrial and production associations--which enable us to reach a higher level of production concentration and specialization. These books will provide the readers with a number of interesting and useful thoughts on the work of such associations. However, we cannot agree with the authors that their establishment is essentially no more than an administrative measure as though unrelated to economic relations (see "Nauchno-Tekhnicheskaya Revolyutsiya: Ekonomika i Upravleniye Sotsialisticheskimi Proizvodstvom," ch 4, sec 8). Naturally, the establishment of associations is accomplished through the administrative-economic activities of the state. However, it is also clear that their establishment has led to certain changes in relations among associations themselves and between them and the state. Suffice it to mention, for example, changes in the financial resources of the associations and in their material responsibility to the state and to each other.

One of the most important advantages of socialism is the planned development of the national economy. It is natural, therefore, for the authors of those books to consider problems of improving the systems for planning the progress of science, technology, and production. Thus, in the work "Nauchno-Tekhnicheskaya Revolyutsiya i Preimushchestva Sotsializma" the country's economy is considered as a single system of big scientific and production complexes. The authors focus their attention on a description of their specific characteristics and interactions. In this connection yet another important problem arises which, unfortunately, has not been covered in the books. It is a question of the fact that under contemporary conditions there is a trend of changing the structure of the national economy as an object of management and planning. Considering the structure of the entire national economy we could note that its components are strictly subordinated to each other: the country's economy as a whole, followed by intersectorial and sectorial complexes, and ending with primary structural units. Intersectorial complexes established in the course of the planned practical utilization of the achievements of scientific and technical progress are relatively new units. Consequently, we could assume that one of the most important functions of the central planning organs will be to plan the establishment of intersectorial national economic complexes. This is a new problem which deserves greater attention on the part of our economists.

Summing up the experience acquired in the planning of various long-term scientific and technical programs, the authors point out the importance of balancing capital investments in new capital assets and of backing them with material resources not only as a whole but in terms of their spatial and territorial aspects. In this connection, for example, they claim the following: "The more the direction of capital investments will gradually change, the more favorable conditions will develop for the formulation of new technical decisions and the creation of new construction organizations, construction industry bases, and bases for material and technical supply" ("Nauchno-Tekhnicheskaya Revolyutsiya i Preimushchestva Sotsializma", p 143).

One could hardly agree in full with this idea. The point is that one of the characteristics of the scientific and technical revolution is the occasionally drastic change in investment flows and, consequently, in the sectorial structure of the national economy and the variety of output. An example of this is found in the development of a nuclear power industry or polymer chemistry and of respective machine-building sectors. If we are guided only by the gradual change of investment flows the possibility is not excluded that obstacles will arise in the course of the creation of new sectors. We believe that greater attention should be paid to problems of the further improvement of the system of capital construction and its financing in order to insure a high-level dynamic structure of capital investments and, consequently, the steady dynamism of all material output.

The authors discuss problems of material incentive as directly linked with the planning of scientific and technical progress. The CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th party congress lists prices as one of the most important economic incentives and levers which should be used more skillfully in the 10th Five-Year Plan. The authors consider the problem of price setting for new equipment from different sides. We believe that the readers will be most interested in arguments in favor of increasing the role of ceiling and graduated prices in insuring scientific and technical progress. These views are found in the works "Ekonomicheskiye Problemy Nauchno-Tekhnicheskoy Revolyutsii pri Sotsializme" (chs 1, 17, and 18), and "Nauchno-Tekhnicheskaya Revolyutsiya: Ekonomika i Upravleniye Sotsialisticheskim Proizvodstvom" (ch 1). They provide substantiated recommendations presented as formulas applicable in economic practice. These chapters are of unquestionable interest.

Our scientists pay particular attention to the most important price-setting principle under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution: setting prices not only on the basis of the socially necessary outlays needed for the manufacturing of a specific product but (currently particular attention is being paid to this) of the factual effect which will be obtained in the use of the new equipment in the national economy. In this connection the content of the effect resulting from the use of new equipment should have been considered in greater detail. Here we face the problem of determining the minimal effectiveness which must be provided by the new equipment if it is to be used at all. A variety of viewpoints may be found in our political and economic publications dealing with this matter. A number of economists assume that under socialist conditions effective use could be made of machines and equipment possessing worse economic indicators compared with those utilized in the capitalist society. Some authors are even supporting the thesis of the use of one or another machine under socialism unrestricted by a time limit. However, in order to have resources for upgrading the prosperity of the people and improving labor conditions, we must steadily upgrade labor productivity and production effectiveness. Yet, this is impossible without the use of the latest highly effective equipment. As was emphasized at the 25th CPSU Congress, "The created machines, equipment, instruments, and technological processes must be superior to the best domestic and world achievements in terms of technical and economic indicators

per unit of output and other useful effects." The monograph 'Ekonomicheskiye Problemy Nauchno-Tekhnicheskoy Revolyutsii pri Sotsializme' (ch 8) provides a principled and argued criticism of the viewpoint that as we achieve economic successes we could apply less effective equipment.

Great attention is being paid in scientific literature to problems of upgrading capital returns and reducing production material intensiveness. However, only the book "Nauchno-Tekhnicheskaya Revolyutsiya: Ekonomika i Upravleniye Sotsialisticheskimi Proizvodstvom" considers the dynamics of material intensiveness even though the conclusions drawn by the authors are far from unquestionable. Thus, analyzing the correlation between the gross social product and the national income produced, the authors reach the conclusion that disparity between the size of the gross output and the national income is increasing. This leads to the conclusion that the indicator of national economic material intensiveness should worsen. It was true that in the Ninth Five-Year Plan our country was not able to surmount this trend entirely. However, it does not follow in the least that the higher rates of growth of gross output, compared with the national income, are an economic law. The arguments cited in the book in favor of this fact are not entirely accurate, for the disparity between gross output and produced national income is influenced not only by the growth of the technical-labor ratio, including the increased fund for the restoration of worn-out facilities, but a number of other factors as well. Let us note among them, above all, the reduced cost of machines in terms of their useful effect, their moral obsolescence, imperfect price setting, and others. Obviously, the problem of the dynamics of material intensiveness, as of capital returns needs a more detailed study.

To sum it up, we could say that as a whole these books unquestionably make a specific contribution to the theoretical elaboration of topical economic problems of the scientific and technical revolution under socialist conditions. Whenever the authors limit themselves merely to the formulation of the problems they provide additional impulses for a creative discussion.

5003
CSO: 1802

ART AND PARTY IDEOLOGICAL WORK

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 119-122

[Review by A. Mikhaylova of the book "Iskusstvo i Ideologicheskaya Rabota Partii" [Art and Party Ideological Work]. Edited by Yu. A. Lukin, V. M. Polevoy, and S. I. Freylikh. Mysl', Moscow, 1976, 351 pp]

[Text] The book "Iskusstvo i Ideologicheskaya Rabota Partii" is a collective work.

The significance of this problem hardly needs a comment. With the further development of the socialist society problems of spiritual culture, including artist culture, must assume an evermore important place within the system of the party's ideological work by the very logic of the building of communism.

The book under review provides a study of the principles governing the interaction between art and ideology and the basic methods of CPSU activities in guiding the artistic process and raising the creative intelligentsia cadres at the present stage. A number of chapters, written by specialists from the GDR and Poland, describe the significance of our party's experience in cultural construction of the members of the socialist comity; the universal-historical role of socialist artistic culture has been depicted extensively.

The authors do not simplify in the least the interrelationship between artistic creativity and ideology. "Art has never been nor could be a simple translation of political, social, and other ideas into the language of artistic characters" (p 4). This is the position on the basis of which they consider the ideological potential of art and its participation in party educational work, and analyze the fruitful influence of communist ideas on the creative process. They subject to a critical analysis the destructive influence of bourgeois ideology on culture in the capital society and bring to light the real forces in contemporary world art which oppose reactionary ideology and represent the real values of the world's artistic process. On the basis of historical experience the authors claim that the

communist movement and true art share the same final objectives and the same humanistic ideal coinciding with the interests of the development of all mankind. The all-round development of the personality and the enrichment of the interests of man, the shaping of high spiritual needs, the development of labor and social activeness, and upgrading the creative potential of every member of society are problems in which art plays an important role.

The authors reveal the significance of the main CPSU Central Committee decrees on literature and art and trace the strategic party lines in the field of guiding artistic culture. They justifiably note that inherent in such documents is a combination of accurate ideological assessments, and a profound social analysis combined with aesthetic exactingness and a considerate attitude toward talent and toward fruitful creative research.

The CPSU Central Committee decree "On Work With the Creative Youth" was passed following the publication of this book. It is another vivid confirmation of the party's constructive course and a specific implementation of the line of the 25th congress in the realm of literature and art and of a contemporary approach to artistic culture systematically developed by the party and fully expressed in the documents of its 23rd, 24th, and 25th congresses. This approach is based on the creative development of the Leninist principles of guidance of literature and art and on the party's long experience. It is organically linked with the general political course of the CPSU and the atmosphere of well-wishing, creative activeness, confidence, and efficiency which has developed in recent years in the party and the country. This atmosphere is particularly important precisely to people engaged in artistic work. It is difficult to plan in advance the creation of major works of art. However, the social atmosphere and the social need for such works as well as the proper recognition of the accomplishment and the concerned attitude toward the work of the artist, and faith in and assistance of his creative searches really contribute to their appearance. The overall atmosphere in the country and the attitude toward the artistic intelligentsia largely contributed to the energizing of the creative and social activeness of the masters of literature and art who, as was noted at the 25th CPSU Congress, are making an evermore substantial contribution to the cause of the party and the people in building a communist society.

The creative associations have made a serious contribution to the fruitful development of Soviet art. It is entirely natural that the authors have paid particular attention to their activities. These unions are voluntary democratic associations of the artistic intelligentsia based on collectivism and respect for creative individuality, broad initiative, and autonomy. They are radically different from the professional associations of the artistic intelligentsia in the capitalist world. The main purpose of our creative unions is the organization of the literary-artistic process in the country and assistance to the party and the state in resolving the problems facing the entire society, for the professional interests of the Soviet cultural workers organically coincide with the interests of the people. Whereas in the bourgeois society associations of the creative intelligentsia strengthen

even further the isolation of a thin "stratum" of artists and their alienation from the toiling masses, under socialism the creative unions consider as their main task to strengthen relations with the life of the people and to study this life profoundly, justifiably assuming that modern reality is a vivifying source for a truly great art. Helping the development and reciprocal enrichment of the cultures of the socialist nations and nationalities, and many-sided work aimed at the ideological upbringing of the artist, as well as strengthening the atmosphere of exactingness and strictness toward oneself and one's fellow artists are all aspects in the activities of creative unions quite fully described in the book.

The strengthening of fraternal relations among the creative unions of the socialist countries, the development of their international cooperation, and the joint efforts made by the artistic intelligentsia of the socialist comity in the ideological struggle in the international arena are all described by taking as examples the activities of the creative unions in the USSR and the GDR.

A number of chapters discuss the new developments in Soviet art in recent years. Naturally, the authors have not ignored works of art which created a considerable social response, particularly works classified under so-called "production topic" (which, occasionally, is described as the "workers topic" not entirely accurately in our view). Supporting the thematic variety of Soviet art, they also insist on the importance of the very category of the topic and of the legitimacy of a thematic analysis of art.

"It is usually considered," the authors state, "that the topic by itself means nothing in art. However, this claim is correct only whenever the artist is complimented precisely for the 'topic,' regardless of the way it is treated, and of the artistic level of the work itself. There are times in the development of art when the consideration of one or another theme by itself inevitably brings about essential changes..." (p. 163). Indeed, a consideration of works dealing with production conflicts or motion pictures on the Great Patriotic War lead to the conclusion of the problems of a major topic which contains not only materials but conflicts. Interesting considerations are expressed on the sharp conflicts found in a number of motion pictures and plays written in recent years and the importance of characters such as kolkhoz chairman Yegor Trubnikov or engineer Cheshkov.

The common methodological problems raised in the main chapters of the book are concretized and developed in sections discussing the problems of the individual types of art or studying the contemporary creative process in the members of the socialist comity. The problem of the educational impact of art is considered in detail, for example, by taking as an example the theater. Particular attention is paid to the characteristic nature of contacts between the stage and the audience, and the direct perception and subsequent life of the play in the minds and activities of the audience. One of the important aspects is the study of the new features introduced by the scientific and technical revolution in the development of the socialist

theater, both on the level of problems in the plays, in terms of broadening the influence of the theater through mass information media, and so on. Legitimately, here bourgeois concepts and "sociometric" theories distorting and over-simplifying the question of the educational functions of the theater are criticized. The problem of intensifying the impact of the theater on the audience, including the young audience, is also analyzed by taking Polish plays as an example.

The desire of the authors to describe the specific nature of the various types of art and the characteristics of their application in ideological work is a noteworthy feature of this work. Thus, the discussion of the place of music in the propaganda system is prefaced by a detailed description of its aesthetic and social functions and it is on this basis that its possibilities in the ideological and moral education of the listeners are revealed. The use of contemporary mass information media greatly increases the influence of music, multiplying its capacity not only to express but to trigger and to strengthen an active and positive attitude on the part of the broad masses toward communist ideals, and mold emotional and aesthetic disposition for the adoption of progressive contemporary ideas. It is entirely obvious that music can implement such functions if it is sensibly and purposefully used, not to mention the condition of the quality of the music itself.

Displaying good knowledge of contemporary foreign literature, the authors criticize substantively and sharply the concepts of bourgeois sociologists and art experts, exposing elitist theories and speculative elaborations of supporters of "mass culture," and proving the real class objectives of our ideological opponents.

The assertion of the progressive role of socialist art is one of the important topics in the book. This includes an interpretation of its socioaesthetic function in the international arena and the development of the Leninist traditions of cultural policy under contemporary conditions. Socialist art is a decisive force in the world's artistic process. It is an international phenomenon which draws to itself progressive creative forces and opposes bourgeois culture. Its development is studied in the book both historically as well as in its contemporary life--in the social world and in the capitalist countries.

The authors describe an impressive picture of the extensive use of art in party-propaganda work and of the unification of major artistic forces on the platform of communist ideas (under the conditions of legal activities by communist parties in capitalist and developing countries). They emphasize the great influence of art related to communist activities on the overall artistic process. The study of the activities of masters of culture whose political views gravitate toward the communist and workers movements and of artistic creativity which, by virtue of their democratic and realistic principles contributes to the solution of problems formulated by the communist parties in their political and ideological work is of great interest. Another question which legitimately arises is that of the creative method. The authors prove that the tendency of artistic creativity imbued

by socialist ideology toward the realistic method and realistic art and socialist ideology is an objective historical-artistic trend. It is precisely a trend which in real art practice is far from always obvious or presented in its finished form but frequently assumes a rather complex and contradictory expression (see p 300).

These problems are considered in the book primarily on the basis of graphic art. Unquestionably, however, they are of general methodological significance, for the study is based on the Leninist theory of the party-mindedness of artistic creativity, and the Leninist theory of the two cultures existing within each national culture of the bourgeois society. The authors convincingly show the invariable interest of the communist parties in humanistic and aesthetic values and their support of any true achievement of national culture which, in its totality, becomes part of the system of socialist culture as an international movement. The authors also discuss masters of foreign culture whose creativity reflects (occasionally in most complex points of intersection) both the laws governing the development of bourgeois culture as well as the principles of the establishment of a socialist culture. This enables us to analyze clearly and precisely the creative development of these artists. A no less complex problem arises in analyzing the question of the "second life" of works of presocialist art under socialist conditions, and of changes in their aesthetic, ideological, and cognitive functions under the new conditions.

The intensive development of socialist art and its growing role in the building of communism, as well as the party's practical experience demand constant study and profound summation.

The 25th party congress provided a tremendous incentive for the development of this work.

We believe that the view of the social role of nature seen through the lens of its specific nature, expressed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the congress, calls for the need to pay particular attention to the study of the characteristics of the influence of art on man and society and consider thoughtfully all the various ways leading to the intensification of this influence. The congress materials face the researchers with the question of art as an element of the socialist way of life and as an influential factor in its assertion and development.

The party has elaborated a truly scientific approach to the guidance of literature and art. The shaping and implementation of this approach which were the result of the creative development of the Leninist principles of guidance of artistic culture and a summation of the activities of the Central Committee in this area, as well as the experience acquired by the party committees in the country, insured the intensive and fruitful development of Soviet art. The characteristics of the party approach to art and its specific implementation by the party organizations is an important and promising topic for further research.

TRADITIONS OF COMBAT REVOLUTIONARY FRIENDSHIP

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 122-123

[Review by I. Lippay, candidate of theological sciences, and N. Rakovskaya, member of the USSR Writers' Union, of the book "Vengerskiye Internatsionalisty v Bor'be za Pobedu Oktyabrya" [The Hungarian Internationalists in the Struggle for the Victory of the October Revolution] by (A. Yozha and D. Milei). Progress, Moscow, 1977, 384 pp]

[Text] Hungarian historians (Antal Yozh) and (D'yerd' Milei) have written a book on the participation of Hungarian internationalists in the October Revolution and the Civil War in our country. This work was published in Hungary on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. Now, expanded and reworked, the work was published in our country in Russian. The noble objective of this book is to describe the combat traditions of Hungarian-Soviet friendship which have now become firmly part of the awareness and life of our fraternal peoples.

Amazing coincidences occur in history. Fierce battles were being waged in World War I between the Austro-Hungarian and Russian armies in places crossed today by the friendly Hungarian-Soviet border, where the Friendship and Fraternity pipelines run and where the poles of the joint electric power systems of CEMA-member countries have been erected. After the battles at Peremyshl', and the famous Brusilov reach at Lutsk, hundreds of thousands of Austro-Hungarian soldiers found themselves prisoners of war of the Russians.

In the autumn of 1917 some 500,000 Hungarian prisoners of war were in tsarist Russia. However, the time of tsarist Russia was already coming to an end. On the eve of the great revolutionary accomplishments in the country an unparalleled movement among prisoners of war, including the Hungarians, developed.

V. I. Lenin wrote: "As we know, Hungary is the closest country to Russia not only geographically but in terms of the omnipotence of reactionary landlords who have kept huge amounts of land from the middle ages...Four thousand Hungarian magnates own over 1,000 desyatins each and all of them

together own nearly one-third of the land. As you may see, this is similar to the situation in 'mother Russia'" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 23, p 378).

How was this powerful social factor reflected in the minds of the Hungarian soldiers' masses? Having sobered them up from the heat of war, it brought about fraternizing at the fronts, and desertions and, in captivity, a rapprochement and contacts with the Russian revolutionaries. Together with the Russian workers the prisoners of war struck at mines, plants, and road construction projects. Together they joined the ranks of demonstrators. When the famous Decree on Peace was proclaimed in October, thousands of prisoners of war became fighters for the socialist revolution.

The authors spent nearly 20 years studying documents of Soviet, Hungarian, Czechoslovak, Austrian, and other archives, following the Hungarian internationalists in battlefields and along the roads of the civil war. With the authors the reader meets with Hungarian internationalists in the units of Chapayev's Division, and in the armies commanded by Frunze, Blyukher, Postyshev, Kuybyshev, or Kirov...Hungarian internationalists also fought in the heroic Tamanskaya Army, described by A. Serafimovich in the novel "Zheleznyy Potok" [The Iron Stream]...About 1,000 former prisoners of war, headed by their commander (Karoy Ligeti) fought desperately against Kolchak forces at Omsk, Tyumen', and Ishim...Internationalist fighters fought at Simbirsk and participated in suppressing the White Guard mutiny in Astrakhan.

We are familiar since childhood with and remember the names of Bela Kun, Tibor Szamuely, and Mate Zalka. Our school children know about the Hungarian Soviet Republic. Its fighters included internationalists who attended the school of Bolshevism in Russia. We learn from the book new names of heroes.

Layos Wienerman was the organizer and commander of the first Moscow International Communist Battalion. The Whites flashed him with their sabers at Ural'sk. His remains are buried in Moscow in the Kremlin Wall. The Hungarian miner Layos (Gavro) was awarded two orders of the Red Banner. In the Ukraine, surrounded by White Guards, (Gavro) rallied the internationalists and created a regiment with which he was one of the first to enter Kiev. Cadre Officer (Dula) Varga, who met with Lenin, was nicknamed "The Red General." A participant in the liberation of Simbirsk, (Dula) Varga commanded an international regiment which was part of the famous Iron Division commanded by G. Gay. With him (Dula) Varga covered the battle road from Simbirsk to Orenburg...

The authors note concretely and offer a close look at proletarian internationalism then. They describe the way the spontaneous thrust of the internationalists became an organized movement and joined the stream of the common struggle of the working people in Russia. The All-Russian Prisoners Bureau was located in Smol'nyy. It was created by the Military Department of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, on the initiative of Ya. M. Sverdlov. I. I. Ul'yanov, All-Russian Central Executive Committee member, was bureau chairman.

The Moscow Party Committee, and the editorial premises of the newspapers DEREVENSKAYA PRAVDA and SOTSIAL-DEMOKRAT were housed in the building of the former Moscow Drezden Hotel. In 1918 this hotel was the residence of Bela Kun, and Tibor Szamuely. Meetings and rallies of internationalists were held here.

...April 1918. Former prisoners of war marched in ranks on the streets of Moscow toward Red Square. They had come as delegates from all parts of the country to attend the All-Russian Congress of Prisoners of War. The Congress elected an all-Russian revolutionary internationalist organization which combined 55 local sections. The ring of fire of the fronts was tightening around Soviet Russia and the revolutionary internationalists organization called upon the prisoners of war to defend the Great October Revolution. When the institution of political commissars was set up in the Red Army it was joined by many Hungarian internationalists.

Together with the working people of our country internationalists from many nationalities, totaling no less than 200,000, fought for Soviet power. Between 80,000 and 100,000 of them were Hungarians. The Soviet people remember in their hearts their heroism and loyalty to the cause of the Socialist revolution. "Today the outstanding traditions of proletarian internationalism, and combat revolutionary friendship which have long linked the working people of our countries," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has said, "live in the inviolable friendship between our parties and peoples."

"We shall never forget that tens of thousands of sons of the Hungarian toiling people actively participated in the October Revolution in Russia and helped our people to defend the cause of socialism in battle."

The Soviet readers will be unquestionably interested in this book describing the participation of Hungarian internationalists in the struggle for the victory of the cause of the October Revolution.

5003

CSO: 1802

FACTS OPPOSING FABRICATIONS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 124-125

[Review by S. Golyakov, candidate of historical sciences, of the books "Pravda o Kul'turnom Obmene" [The Truth About Cultural Exchanges], Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 62 pp; and "O Svobodakh Podlinnykh i Mnimyykh" [On True and Imaginary Freedoms], Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 175 pp]

[Text] These books whose authors are noted Soviet political and social leaders and heads of ministries and departments consist of materials published in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. They provide an impressive picture of the steady and systematic implementation by the Soviet Union of the agreements reached in Helsinki and codified in that part of the Final Act which applies to cooperation in the humanitarian areas.

The need to sum-up facts and authoritative proof pertaining to the contribution made by our country to the international exchange of spiritual, cultural, and scientific values is obvious. "The reactionary circles," states the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution," "are organizing ideological subversions against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, as well as slanderous anti-Soviet and anticommunist campaigns. They are trying to interfere in the domestic affairs of socialist and other countries." The materials included in the books provide us with substantial arguments in the debate with our ideological opponents who are trying to belittle, slander, and discredit this contribution. However, the exposure given by these publications does not account for their entire meaning. It is easy to see behind this "event of the day" something more significant and broad, namely the historical achievements of factual socialism in the assertion and systematic practical implementation of the noble ideals of reciprocal understanding and cooperation among all peoples, in the realm of cultural exchanges as well.

Implementation by the Soviet Union of the corresponding stipulations of the Final Act is the organic continuation of a policy proclaimed by the bolsheviks at the dawn of the Soviet system. Both before and after the Helsinki

Conference we were far ahead of the capitalist countries in exposing the Soviet people to the best and the true achievements of world culture. A broad aesthetic outlook is an inseparable feature of the personality of the builder of the new society. The Communist Party promotes this quality within every Soviet person. It is tirelessly seeing to it that the most profound ideas, strict scientific conclusions, and highest achievements in culture and art enrich the citizens of the new world.

A practical solution to this problem is being provided by our secondary and higher schools, the developed network of cultural and educational institutions, and the party's purposeful policy in the field of exchange of cultural values with foreign countries.

The facts cited in the books convincingly prove that the Soviet Union is insuring for the working people a far higher level of spiritual growth than are the highly developed capitalist countries.

Here are a few figures. In the postwar years alone we have published some 7,000 titles by American authors, and 4,500 titles of British and French authors. The overall edition of their books in the USSR has long exceeded the 600 million mark.

Last year alone our country published some 1,500 different works by foreign authors in a total of over 60 million copies. How could the West balance this? Naturally, as anywhere in the world, it publishes books by L. Tolstoy, F. Dostoyevskiy, and A. Chekhov. As to contemporary Soviet literature, as the book "Pravda o Kul'turnom Obmene" shows, with the help of a great variety of propaganda tricks the idea is persistently insinuated to the foreign reader that the most talented writers in our literature are anti-Soviet, the so-called "dissidents," or else our long forgotten authors. The following example is cited: the West German journal AKTZENT published a list of Soviet authors whose books were published in the FRG over the past 10-15 years. The names of many outstanding representatives of Soviet multinational literature, enjoying truly nationwide recognition in our country, were absent.

A similar situation exists in the exchange of movies and television films and plays. The Soviet film "While the Dawns Here Are Quiet..." was awarded an Oscar. However, it was not shown in U.S. movie theaters.

Many such facts are given in the book. Whether it is a question of cooperation in science and technology, international relations with Soviet higher schools, tourism, or working conditions of foreign journalists in our country in all such areas the Soviet Union, displaying good will and readiness to fulfill the assumed Helsinki obligations, is ahead of its Western partners.

The international spiritual, cultural, and scientific relations of our country have developed according to specific conditions at different stages in history. However, as the authors show, they have never been so broad and

varied as today. This is one of the vivid examples of the real embodiment of the policy of international cooperation and detente which the CPSU firmly wants to make irreversible.

The socialist society has unquestionable advantages in the exercise of democratic freedoms as well. Our class enemy has tried for centuries to promote in the people the false idea of the allegedly organic link between freedom and free enterprise, private ownership, and egotistic arbitrariness. The truth, however, is that there neither is nor could be any broader and more basic prerequisite for democracy than nationwide ownership and utilization of all labor tools and results. It is only with the establishment of the public ownership of capital goods that democracy is given for the first time a real material base unknown to any class-antagonistic system.

This is the real prerequisite for true democracy. It is precisely this that determines the nature of the socialist way of life, its social climate, the working and living conditions of man, and his inner moral world.

In his preface to the book "O Svobodakh Podlinnykh i Mnimyykh" A. Chakovskiy, editor-in-chief of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA writes the following: "True democracy not only proclaims the rights of man but guarantees the exercise of these rights. Only a person finding himself in airless space becomes really aware of how precious the possibility to breathe is. Under normal circumstances he does not think about this. The Soviet person has already become accustomed to accept many benefits as his inalienable right, like the possibility to breathe deeply, without thinking of what a benefit this is" (p 7).

In fact, not to mention most important human rights as the right to work, education, and rest, fully guaranteed by our system, the Soviet people have become accustomed to an atmosphere of collectivism, true comradeship, solidarity, and friendship among all nations and nationalities, the moral health of our social relations, and everything pertaining to the most outstanding accomplishments of the Soviet way of life.

Yet, that which has long become the norm for the Soviet person remains a cherished dream for millions of working people in the capitalist countries. We do not have to recall the tragedy of the strong and healthy people deprived of the right to work. Its scale is well known. We do not have to speak of the fact that bourgeois democracy gets along perfectly with racism and fascism: the Chilean junta and the South African pogrom makers operate in the open. The pure facts are taken from a somewhat different area. In the United States, the richest and technically most developed country of the so-called "free world" after 1969 the number of illiterates has remained a stable 2 million people. Only one out of 100 children of under-skilled and unskilled workers attends school to the age of 18. In our country new schools, technical schools, and institutes are being built every year. In the United States, however, from 1971 to 1974 alone some 80 higher educational institutions were closed down because of financial difficulties.

Such is the case in the realm of education whose general accessibility is fully guaranteed to the citizens of the socialist society. Such is precisely the case in the fields of public health, social insurance, and other areas which determine the democratic nature of a social system.

However, it is precisely these among our accomplishments that bourgeois propaganda is trying to circumvent silently, blabbering that there are no democratic freedoms in the socialist society and that if such freedoms are proclaimed they are, allegedly, merely statements. As proof of such fabrications the mass information media, particularly the radio stations of the bourgeois countries broadcasting for the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are systematically and insistently claiming that so-called "differently minded people," who allegedly suffer for their "convictions" are being persecuted. However, the Western propaganda gentlemen cannot possibly ignore the fact that according to our Soviet laws citizens are held neither criminally nor administratively liable for their convictions. It is not a question in the least of "differently minded people" but of certain specific actions committed by people encroaching on the Soviet social system. Such actions cannot remain unpunished.

Such are the facts and unquestionably they are well known by our ideological opponents. Accusing others for "violations of the Helsinki agreements," and of an alleged absence of democratic freedoms in our country, they are trying to compromise the very idea of detente and its beneficial possibilities. This becomes something more than a regular local anti-Soviet attack. It is an attempt on the positive changes which have taken place and are taking place in international relations and on the developing political cooperation among countries with different social systems which replaced the period of confrontation and cold war.

Such attempts could not be ignored. They must be firmly rebuffed. The books under review are a successful example of how to achieve this using the weapon of the passionate party word.

5003
CSO: 1802

BRIEF REVIEW OF BOOKS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 77 pp 126-128

[Review of three books]

[Text] "Illyustrirovannaya Istoriya SSSR" [Illustrated History of the USSR], by V. T. Pashuto et al. Illustrated by Ya. N. Shchapov et al. Mysl', Moscow, 1975, 453 pp. Reviewed by V. Zakharov.

Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev spoke quite accurately on the links between the history of our country and the history of all mankind. "The road which took Russia to socialism," he emphasized, "is the high road of world history of the entire human civilization. Despite the characteristics of Russian conditions, the October Revolution expressed the main, the basic trends of an entire historical epoch--the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism, a transition which had been prepared by the entire course of socioeconomic development in the world."

Reflecting the basic laws governing the social process, the book's structure enabled the reader to master a great deal of factual data showing that our homeland not only went through the historical stages characteristic of most countries in the world but followed the path of social progress farther than other countries. The illustrated history of the USSR opens with a brief essay on ancient Russia and ends with a story on the way, inspired by Lenin's ideas and guided by the Leninist Party, the Soviet people are successfully building a communist society.

A number of additions, ranging from basic works to popular pamphlets, have been written on the past and present of our homeland rich in events. They include many scientific works of a definitive nature with which we could classify the new book in terms of the scope of historical material contained. Naturally, some such works have also been illustrated. Nevertheless, this is a special edition. This is one of the first attempts to create a book in which many color and black and white reproductions of paintings by famous artists, portraits of historical figures and outstanding representatives of culture, and photocopies of documents, photographs, including rarely seen

ones, and various maps, diagrams, and others are not simply supplements to the text. All of these materials have their own significance: as organic parts of the book it is as though they broaden the framework of the extremely concise and systematized description of historical events.

The authors and the compilers of the illustrations have done a good job also because many of the originals of the historical relics, documents, and so on, reproduced in the book, are in collections kept by central archives and other scientific institutions in the country, for which reason they are accessible only to those especially engaged in the study of domestic history of culture.

For example, the book contains reproductions of Stepan Razin's "Excellent Deed" [1670], and a drawing of Berezan' Island made by Lieutenant P. P. Shmidt before his execution (1 March 1906). The reader will see manuscripts of V. I. Lenin's resolution on the armed uprising, passed at the 10 October 1917 session of the RSDWP(b) Central Committee, and a photograph of the "International Conference of Communist and Workers Parties in Moscow" (1969).

Anyone interested in the history of culture will be drawn by reproductions of the birch bark deed of the beginning of the 12th century and pages of the first dated book printed by Ivan Fedorov in Moscow (1564), the only response to the death of A. S. Pushkin in the Russian press, published by the Supplements to the military newspaper RUSSKIY INVALID, the third section trial "On Verses Written by Cornet Lermontov on the Death of Pushkin," and others.

Leafing through the book, we could say that the attempt to create an illustrated history of the USSR has been successful as a whole. The reader has been given the possibility to visualize the historical path covered by the country and the pictures of selfless fighters for the people's happiness. It is a well-presented book which, unquestionably, will meet with a lively response among those interested in the history of our great homeland.

Unfortunately, such editions are not large. This makes it even more important to see to it that they are supplied to libraries and schools, particularly in the rural areas, and to other educational institutions. In such a case the illustrated history of the USSR will fulfill its main purpose by becoming accessible to a broad circle of readers, young ones above all.

P. I. Malakhinov, "O Sverakh Deyatel'nosti i Probleme Proizvoditel'nogo Truda pri Sotsializme" [On the Realms of Activities and the Problem of Labor Productivity Under Socialism]. Buryatskoye Knizhnoye Izdatel'stvo, Ulan-Ude, 1975, 355 pp. Reviewed by M. Il'in.

The Buryat Book publishing house has published a monograph by P. I. Malakhinov on problems of classification of types and realms of human activities and productive labor under socialism insufficiently covered by scientific publications.

In the first section of the book the author considers in detail the content, nature, and characteristic features of human activities in the realm of material production, spiritual life, services and, finally, management. The author systematically describes the characteristics of each of these areas and the interconnections and interactions among them. He provides an extensive socioeconomic analysis to the realm of services. The author brings to light the social direction, the purpose, and functional role of services based on changed social living conditions.

The second part of the book deals with problems of production and non-production labor in the socialist society. A detailed description is provided of the history of views on production labor and methodological and theoretical postulates governing its study. Also interesting are the author's views on the criteria and nature of production labor under capitalism and under socialist conditions.

The final part of the book is a study of problems related to establishing the value and the added product in the realm of services and the compensation of outlays in nonproduction work.

Many of the concepts included in this monograph dealing with such a complex problem must be developed further. The book is of interest for its broad and original approach to the topic.

I. A. Kryvelev. "Istoriya Religiy" [History of Religions]. Essays in two volumes. Mysl', Vol I, Moscow, 1975, 415 pages; Vol II, 1976, 419 pp. Reviewed by M. Andreyev, candidate of philosophical sciences.

The elaboration of the problem of the history of religions is not only of academic and general theoretical but of immediate practical and ideological significance. It provides important data for scientific-atheistic propaganda. Naturally, the history of all religions cannot be covered even in such a relatively voluminous work. This would require a multiple-volume work whose writing, we believe, should be a task for the immediate future. The author's intention has been more modest: to trace the history of three of the so-called universal religions--Christianity, Islam, and Buddhism.

The book provides an overall historically and logically systematic survey of centuries of activities of the Christian Church in all its main branches. Reaching the beginning of the 20th century in his narration, the author analyzes the crisis phenomena which the churches encountered in the course of the appearance and growth of the class struggle of the proletariat. He also describes the political and ideological struggle waged by the Christian churches against Marxism and communism starting with the middle of the 19th century.

The work poses a number of important methodological problems. For example, the author has interesting thoughts on the subject of the monotheistic nature of universal religions.

Judeo-Christian and Moslem theologians consider that the basic difference between their dogmas and the "pagan" dogmas is that the latter are polytheistic, whereas the former are based on the acknowledgment of a single God, creator of everything that exists, and ruler of the destinies of the universe and of mankind. The analysis given in the book makes it clear that no single religion could claim to absolute monotheism, for each of them calls for belief not only in a second god who is the opposite of the first--satan--the embodiment and the prime source of evil--but also in an innumerable number of minor gods--angels, demons, saints, and others. The advantage of "superior" religions over "inferior" religions turns out to be just as imaginary in all other respects. Idol worship, fetishism, magic and rituals, most groundless gullibility and illogical thinking are inherent in virtually all religions. The author firmly refutes the pitting of concepts of religious faith against superstition still found in some publications (not only proreligious ones). Basically any religious faith is a superstition for its basic and determining characteristic is the claim that supernatural forces exist.

The author's clarity of methodological positions is manifested also in his study of the nature and character of Buddhism. We know that a widespread viewpoint exists in the science of religion and in philosophical literature according to which Buddhism should be considered not a religion but a philosophical-ethic doctrine. There is also a concept claiming that oriental religions in general are essentially different from Western religions by virtue of their "nihilistic" nature: allegedly, they do not preach faith in god. In general, they are considered more philosophical and, in the final account, even atheistic. The author thoroughly criticizes such a view with the help of specific facts. In particular, he proves that even though in Buddhism, particularly early Buddhism, philosophical-ethical problems played an important role, the religion developed on its grounds contains an expanded doctrine concerning gods and demons, afterlife, and incredibly fantastic miracles and supernatural phenomena. The very concept of "atheistic religion" is nonsense which can only confuse the people's minds. The author describes in detail the birth and development of Islam and its rituals. He brings to light the essence and characteristics of the basic trends and sects within this faith.

At all times religion has been a false outlook which has hindered the development of science. The work describes the way this took place in individual historical periods. The author describes extensively the skillful maneuvering on the part of the clergy in interpreting religious doctrines in the epoch of great natural scientific discoveries which marked the triumph of a materialistic outlook. A description of this aspect of church activities is very topical today, when the irreconcilable contradiction between religion and science has become particularly obvious, and when under the conditions of the total breakdown of the religious picture of the world theologians must constantly try very hard to find ways to modernize church dogmas which would enable them to "rescue that which can still be rescued."

In conclusion, let us note the lively and precise style of the study. The author does not abuse "scientific" terminology. The book is accessible to a broad range of readers. Regretably, it does not end with a chapter describing the current condition of the religions and their main current trends.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo PRAVDA, KOMMUNIST, 1977

5003

CSO: 1802

- END -