

JPRS 71891

19 September 1978

U S S R

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 10, JULY 1978

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE

20000412 125

178

NOTE

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

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

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 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 semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

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

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

Soviet journal articles displaying a copyright notice and included in this report are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Further reproduction of these copyrighted journal articles is prohibited without permission from the copyright agency of the Soviet Union.

19 September 1978

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 10, July 1978

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
CPSU Resolution Views Persisting Problems in Agriculture.....	1
Brezhnev Report on Agriculture at CPSU Central Committee Plenum (L. I. Brezhnev)	15
On Measures To Improve the Training of Party and Soviet Cadres in Republic and Interoblast Higher Party Schools.....	51
Brezhnev Speech at Minsk Ceremony (Leonid Brezhnev)	55
Loyalty to the Leninist Norms of Party Life and Management Principles (A. Masyagin)	64
Topical Tasks of Economic Science (M. Volkov)	77
Main Trends of the Revolutionary Process (T. Timofeyev)	93
In the Name of National Independence and Socialism (Nguyen Duy Trinh)	103
Vicissitudes of the Capitalist Cycle (E. Pletnev)	112
Loyal Son of the Leninist Party (G. Sharapov)	126
Clandestine Addresses (N. Mor)	135

CONTENTS (Continued)	Page
Life of a Bolshevik-Internationalist (F. Makarov)	146
Leningrad's Valuable Experience (T. Bolesavskiy)	150
Party Gorkom and Raykom: Ways and Means of Work (I. Yudin)	152
From the Bookshelf	156
Following the Article in 'KOMMUNIST'	159

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No 10,
Jul 1978

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : Jul 1978

Signed to press : 5 Jul 78

Copies : 979,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda," "Kommunist."
1978

CPSU RESOLUTION VIEWS PERSISTING PROBLEMS IN AGRICULTURE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 pp 3-13

[Apparent text of CPSU Central Committee Resolution adopted at 4 July plenum session: "On the Further Development of USSR Agriculture"]

[Text] Having heard and discussed the report of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "On the Further Development of USSR Agriculture," the CPSU Central Committee plenum notes that the report gives a comprehensive, deeply scientific analysis of the party's policy and practical activity in the development of socialist agriculture at the present stage and defines the main ways and concrete measures for its further development. The Central Committee plenum fully and completely approves the evaluation of the positive results which have been achieved given in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's report, as well as the criticism of existing shortcomings in the work of party, soviet and agricultural organs, ministries and departments in fulfilling the decisions of the 25th Congress on agriculture.

Since the time of the CPSU Central Committee March (1965) Plenum, which laid the foundations for a new state in the development of the party's Leninist agrarian policy, the country's agriculture has made major steps forward in economic and social respects. Firmly following the planned course the party has been able to resolve a wide range of agrarian problems.

The material and technical base of agriculture has been considerably strengthened. Much has been done in the development of industry supplying agriculture. In essence, such major specialized sectors as water resources and land reclamation, machine-building for stockraising and fodder production, rural construction, and the fodder concentrates and microbiological industry have been organized anew. Together with tractor and agricultural machine-building, the production of mineral fertilizers, and sectors of the processing industry, they make up a growing industrial complex aimed at insuring a steady upsurge in agricultural production.

The technical equipment of kolkhozes and sovkhozes has increased greatly. The farm machine and tractor pool has been almost completely renewed and its qualitative composition has been improved. The energy capacities of agricultural enterprises have more than doubled, while the power available per worker on kolkhozes and sovkhozes has risen by 2.5 times. The process of the electrification of agriculture is actively continuing.

The party has devoted great attention to the development of chemical treatments and land reclamation. In 1977 some 77 million tons of mineral fertilizers were supplied to the countryside. The area of irrigated and drained lands almost doubled and now total 27 million hectares.

The CPSU Central Committee highly evaluated the tremendous economic and social significance of the specialization and concentration of agricultural production on the basis of interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration. The CPSU Central Committee resolution on this question adopted in May 1976 armed party organizations with a clear program for developing the production forces of agriculture on the basis of further socialization of socialist production and labor. Specialization and concentration have assumed a broad scale. More than 8,000 interfarm enterprises and associations are already operating in the country.

Party, soviet and agricultural organs devote constant attention to training and strengthening all levels of agricultural production with cadres, and especially well-trained machine operators and specialists.

Great work has been carried out in the sphere of improving the planning of production and purchases, price fixing, the advancing of loans, and payment for labor. As a result the economic condition of kolkhozes and sovkhozes and the material position of kolkhoz members and sovkhoz workers have notably improved.

The CPSU Central Committee and local party and soviet organs combine the tasks of developing agricultural production with the resolution of rural social problems. The work payment of kolkhoz members and sovkhoz workers had doubled. Great work is taking place on pension security and social insurance for kolkhoz members. Housing, amenities and cultural construction is spreading more and more widely in rural areas. In 1965-1977 capital investments in the social development of rural areas exceeded R40 billion.

In implementing the comprehensive program for the development of agriculture, rural workers, under the leadership of the Communist Party, have achieved an upsurge in labor productivity and on this basis a considerable increase in the output of cropgrowing and stockraising products. In the last 7 years the average volume of agriculture output has increased 1.4 times in comparison with the same period before the Central Committee's March plenum.

Grain production has increased by 61.5 million tons, raw cotton by 3 million tons, sugar beet by 25 million tons, vegetables by 6.8 million tons, and potatoes by 5.5 million tons. The yield and total harvest of all other agricultural crops have also increased.

Positive processes are also taking place in the development of livestock raising. The average annual output of this sector in the same years increased by 45 percent, and the production of meat rose from 9.2 to 14 million tons, milk--from 63.9 to 88.8 million tons, and eggs--to 53.5 billion eggs, that is, by 1.9 times.

On the basis of the upsurge in production the population's consumption of products, as well as of goods manufactured from agricultural raw materials, in particular cotton, wool and linen cloths, is growing steadily.

Noting the great significance of the work which has been carried out since the CPSU Central Committee March (1965) Plenum in developing the country's agriculture, the Central Committee plenum believes at the same time that the general level of development of this vitally important sector is still not meeting society's rapidly increasing requirements and demands energetic efforts in further strengthening the material and technical base of agriculture, improving the organization of production and realizing its efficiency, in order to satisfy much more fully, as soon as possible, the demand for food products and raw materials for industry.

There are still serious shortcomings in the production of grain and other agricultural crops. The yield of grain crops is indeed growing, but not enough, and in several republics, krais and oblasts it is virtually at a standstill. The yield and total harvest of sugar beet, sunflowers, vegetables and potatoes are still low. Despite the good quantitative results achieved in cotton production, the struggle for its quality is being poorly waged. For several reasons, especially resulting from shortcomings in the organization of the cultivation, harvesting, processing and preservation of agricultural products, wastage is still great.

In recent years great planned work has taken place in the intensification of stockraising, but this sector has still not reached the level required in its development, especially regarding meat production. Although possessing considerable reserves for increasing meat resources, kolkhozes and sovkhoses are far from fully implementing them. A significant proportion of stock reaches the meat combines without being fattened, low in weight and poorly fed.

In certain regions many calves are slaughtered. Milk yields are still low, infertility is tolerated, and in essence, the expenditure of labor and fodder is not falling and the cost of produce is rising. Many party organizations, Soviet and agricultural organs and leaders of kolkhozes and sovkh-

hoses are poorly implementing measures in the intensification of stock-raising and transferring it onto an industrial footing, and this is holding back the rise in the sector's efficiency.

As before, fodder production is falling seriously behind. This is one of the main causes of the inadequate rate of development of stockraising. On many kolkhozes and sovkhozes fodder production is carried out primitively, and modern technology and the achievements of scientific and technical progress are introduced slowly. There are not enough good storehouses for fodder--something which leads to much waste and deterioration in quality. As a result of the protein deficit a considerable overexpenditure of fodder takes place. Certain leaders of farms, rayons and individual oblasts do not show the necessary concern for the production of hay, cured hay, silage and root crops, relying on concealing the lack of fodder with concentrates, often at the expense of grain from the state's resources.

One of the factors delaying the growth of agricultural production is the still inadequate provision to kolkhozes and sovkhozes of modern, powerful tractors, trucks and agricultural vehicles, mineral fertilizers and plant protection agents, and also the backwardness of the processing industry.

Machine-building ministries are resolving questions of raising the quality of machines supplied to agriculture slowly and with inadequate persistence. Often the output of obsolete tractors and many types of machinery is continuing, although these do not meet modern demands in terms of productivity, economical running or reliability. The output of the necessary range of machines for the optimum loading of tractors and the introduction of new technological processes into production is lagging seriously behind.

Shortcomings have not been overcome in the exploitation of capital investments, machinery and other material resources allocated to agriculture. The struggle for efficiency and quality has not become the main element everywhere in the work of party, Soviet and agricultural organs and the leaders of kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Care of vehicles is not by any means organized on all farms in the necessary way, nor are the rules for their use and maintenance observed. A large number of vehicles are standing idle owing to low quality repairs and technical servicing. Much machinery wears out and is written off before its time. There is frequently a lack of machine operators, and the shift index of the tractor work is low.

Wastage and even spoiling of fertilizers is often permitted on farms, and the agrotechnical rules for their application are violated, which reduces the effectiveness of chemical treatments. A negative role is also played by the absence of a single agrochemical service in the country. In a number of regions reclaimed lands are used skillfully but their economic assimilation is lagging behind. Yields on irrigated land are frequently hardly distinguishable from those on nonirrigated land.

The Central Committee plenum notes that the plans for the first 2 years of the 10th 5-Year Plan were on the whole underfulfilled both in the total volume of the gross output of agriculture, and in some of its branches. In a number of oblasts of the RSFSR, the Ukraine and Kazakhstan, and in Moldavia, Latvia and Kirgizia the gross output of agricultural produce was lower than the plans envisaged. A particularly low growth in production was maintained, or the level reached even fell, in Tambovskaya, Orlovskaya, Lipetskaya, Chelyabinskaya, Odesskaya, Pavlodarskaya and Turgayskaya oblasts. Plans for the sale of meat to the state were not fulfilled by Rostovskaya, Chitinskaya, Taldy-Kurganskaya and Vostochno-Kazakhstanskaya oblasts and Altayskiy Kray. In those 72 years milk yields practically failed to increase on the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Kemerovskaya, Ulyanovskaya, Zhitomirskaya and Minskaya oblasts. No substantial improvement in stockraising, especially in raising the stock productivity, was achieved by the Transcaucasian and Central Asian republics.

There is backwardness in the fulfillment of 5-year plan targets in the Non-Chernozem Zone of the RSFSR. Plans have not been fulfilled for reclaiming or increasing the fertility of land and creating a base of production, housing and cultural and consumer construction, and little has been done in constructing roads. Work is being carried out slowly in settling families from small communities in well-equipped settlements.

In the set of measures for developing the economy of Siberia and the Far East the problems of agriculture and supplying the requirements of the population of this extensive area with main food products through local production are still not being resolved as necessary.

Further improvement is needed in agriculture planning as well as in economic relations between sectors of the agroindustrial complex. Recently instead of one firm plan for purchases of agricultural produce based on 5 years, a multiplicity of plans has appeared and in some places the habit of frequent and unfounded changes of the plan has arisen. Nor have shortcomings been eliminated in price fixing, including price fixing for industrial produce supplied to agriculture and for the services of organizations serving kolkhozes and sovkhozes. A sharp increase in cost has taken place in rural construction.

There are many shortcomings in carrying out the specialization and concentration of agricultural production on the basis of interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration: Livestock units on kolkhozes and sovkhozes are abolished too soon, extravagance is permitted in creating enterprises and associations, and the necessary concern for high quality work is not displayed. Interfarm cooperation still embraces too small proportion of field cultivation, land reclamation, chemical treatments in agriculture and machinery. In certain republics and oblasts an unjustified delay is

displayed in implementing the specialization and concentration of production on the basis of interfarm cooperation. The USSR Gosplan and the USSR Ministry of Agriculture and their local organs coordinate and direct this important work poorly.

A serious delay in the further development of the production forces of agriculture and in resolving major social tasks in rural areas is caused by backwardness in construction. The production base of rural construction organizations is not developing well, and as a result kolkhozes and sovkhozes are forced to fulfill a significant part of their construction work in an inefficient, expensive way. The necessary order has not been introduced in the material and technical provision of rural construction. Construction workers often break schedules for commissioning projects and permit dispersal of capital investments. Plans for the commissioning of production capacities as well as housing, children's institutions, and projects in consumer, medical and cultural services are often not fulfilled. Construction and design organizations do not always take into account the specific conditions of the countryside and automatically introduce industrial elements and designs in rural construction.

Certain party committees do not always have a deep understanding of the economic and social processes which take place in rural areas and sometimes do not see all the new potentials for a more rapid growth in agricultural production. There are also instances of individual workers assessing the state of affairs without objectivity and exaggerating the results achieved.

Elements of bureaucracy, of ignoring the opinion of the aktiv and of specialists and of violating party and state discipline have not been eradicated everywhere. There are still many shortcomings in cadre work, especially in the selection, distribution and education of leaders and specialists at the middle level. In a number of republics, krays and oblasts the appropriate measures for insuring a full supply of machine operators for farms are not taken. Party organizations are often weak in carrying out mass political work among rural workers, do not show the necessary concern for the high effectiveness of propaganda and agitation means, and permit a formal attitude to the organization of socialist competition.

The CPSU Central Committee plenum resolves:

1. Taking into account the experience of previous years and the results achieved, which convincingly confirm the scientific justification and vital force of the CPSU's Leninist agrarian policy; to consider it necessary to continue, with all persistence, to follow the course elaborated by the Central Committee March (1965) Plenum and subsequent plenums and party congresses.

2. To approve the measures for the further development of agriculture elaborated by the Central Committee Politburo and set out in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's report.

3. To make it incumbent on the Central Committees of the Communist parties of union republics, party kraykoms, obkoms, okrugkoms and raykoms, soviet and agricultural organs, leaders of ministries and departments, industrial enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and primary party organizations to adopt effective measures to eliminate the shortcomings to which attention is directed in the present resolution and in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's report, to strive for a significant growth in cropgrowing and stockraising production, and to insure the unconditional fulfillment and overfulfillment of the targets of the 10th 5-Year Plan by all sectors of the agroindustrial complex.

4. To consider the main task in agriculture to be the all-round, dynamic development and significant increase in efficiency of all its sectors and the reliable supply of foodstuff and agricultural raw materials to the country, in order to insure a further rise in the people's standard of living. To step up efforts in every way to resolve the task of bringing the material, cultural and consumer levels of city and country life closer together.

On this basis, the Central Committee plenum considers it necessary to envisage for the 11th 5-Year Plan (1981-1985) an average annual grain harvest of 238-243 million tons, and by 1990 to produce an average of up to 1 ton of grain per capita countrywide [proizvodit yego do odnoy tonny na cheloveka v srednem po strane]. The production of meat by the end of the 11th 5-Year Plan must reach 19.5 million tons and the production of milk, eggs, wool, vegetables, potatoes, sugar beet, cotton and other products must also increase.

5. With the aim of creating a lasting basis for resolving these tasks, to insure the all-round strengthening and further development of the material and technical base of agriculture, bearing in mind the planned transfer of this sector to an industrial footing:

The USSR Gosplan, in elaborating the 11th 5-Year Plan, must provide for a corresponding increase in capital investments in agriculture. Their proportionate share in the total volume of resources allocated for the development of the country's national economy must be no lower than the level achieved. It is also necessary to insure the appropriation of the necessary resources for the more rapid development, in the 11th 5-Year Plan, of agricultural machine building, of production of mineral fertilizers and plant protection agents, of processing industry and all other sectors of the agroindustrial complex.

6. The Central Committee plenum stressed that the intensification of agricultural production based on all-round mechanization and electrification and the chemical treatment and reclamation of land remains the main direction in the party's agrarian policy at the present stage.

In the next 5-year plan it is necessary to complete the comprehensive mechanization of the cultivation of the most important agricultural crops and to raise the level of mechanization of stockraising to the maximum degree. In this connection it is necessary to provide for a significant increase in the supply to agriculture of modern, powerful tractors with complete sets of mounted and trailer attachments and tools, specialized trucks, high productivity grain combines, fodder harvesting vehicles and other agricultural machinery.

The USSR Gosplan, the USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Fodder Production, the Councils of Ministers of union republics and construction ministries must insure the modernization, in a short time, of the Volgograd, Pavlodar and Lipetsk tractor plants. Measures must be implemented in a very short time to modernize the grain-harvesting combines which are produced, in order to eliminate their design shortcomings and raise productivity. In the next few years the production of more powerful combines of modern design must be organized. The modernization of existing plants must be carried out, mighty new enterprises created, and other sectors of industry involved in increasing the production of fodder harvesting machines and fodder processing machinery.

With the aim of accelerating the resolution of the problem of the transportation of agricultural freight, the production of large-load, specialized agricultural trucks must be organized.

7. It is necessary to increase supplies of mineral fertilizers to agriculture in the next 5-year plan to 135-140 million tons, and of fodder supplement to 7 million tons. Special attention must be directed to raising the quality of the products produced. Growth in the production of mineral fertilizers must be obtained primarily by means of phosphate, concentrated and complex fertilizers. It is necessary to resolve the question of the production of sufficient lime, especially for the needs of the Non-Chernozem Zone, as quickly as possible.

The USSR Ministry of Chemical Industry and the USSR Academy of Sciences must insure the wide development of scientific research in the creation of herbicides and preparations to combat weeds and pests which damage sugar beet, sunflowers, cotton plants, rice, soybeans, vegetables, potatoes and other agricultural crops, organize the industrial production of new preparations and significantly improve the supply of them to kolkhozes and sovkhoses.

It must be considered expedient to concentrate agrochemical services both centrally and locally within the system of agricultural organs, transferring to them the entire production base intended for this purpose.

8. Major new steps remain to be taken in the development of agricultural land reclamation. The central task is to radically improve the use and raise the fertility of reclaimed land and to eliminate backwardness in their economic exploitation. The comprehensive exploitation of reclaimed areas which have been brought into use must be insured everywhere; where possible, they must be concentrated in specialized farms and interfarm associations for the organization of high-efficiency cropgrowing.

9. The Central Committee plenum stresses that the task of the more rapid development of stockraising is now moving into the foreground.

It is necessary to focus the attention of the whole party, ministries and departments, leaders of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and rural workers on resolving this task and to do everything to insure that, with increasing numbers of livestock, the productivity of livestock and poultry is raised everywhere and as quickly as possible, that stockraising is transferred consistently onto an industrial footing, and that it is transformed into a modern, highly efficient sector. In this sector it is necessary to be more active in implementing specialization and concentration on the basis of interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration more actively.

The priority task is to increase meat production. It is necessary to make full use of potentials and reserves for the growth of production of beef, pork, lamb, poultry and rabbits. Special attention must be directed to increasing the weight of animals sold for slaughter and to reduce the time needed for fattening. All young cattle must only be given over for meat after fattening to 400-450 kg in weight. Measures must be implemented to create a specialized meat stockraising sector in the country.

The intensive development of pigraising must be insured. As well as expanding the capacities of pigraising enterprises of the industrial types, broad use must be made of potentials for increasing pigmeat production in livestock units on nonspecialized farms. Sheepraising and goatraising must be developed more widely, major mechanized livestock units and fattening areas created, and the production of mutton, wool, karakul and other products increased. It is necessary to more actively create new capacities and modernize existing ones for raising broilers and other types of poultry for meat.

It is necessary to strive for a considerable increase in the productivity of dairying and a reduction in the expenditure of fodder, labor and resources for produce production. In the 11th 5-Year Plan the country's average milk yield per cow must be raised to 3,000 kg on kolkhozes and sovkhozes and, in regions of developed dairying, up to the level of 4,000-5,000 kg.

Fuller use must be made of the potentials for stepping up production of meat and other stockraising products on the subsidiary farms of enterprises and organizations, as well as on the people's individual plots, and they must be given assistance in acquiring young animals and fodder.

The USSR Ministry of Agriculture, the V. I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences and their local organs must considerably improve selection work in improving the breed and productive qualities of animals and creating new breeds, lines and hybrids of livestock and poultry.

10. The Central Committee plenum sets party, soviet and agricultural organs and the leaders of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, as a most important and urgent task: to radically improve fodder production and to create in the next few years a reliable, stable fodder base for stockraising on every kolkhoz, sovkhoz and interfarm enterprise. Fodder production on farms must acquire a specialized, sectorial nature, cooperation and agroindustrial integration must be developed in every way, and interfarm associations and enterprises for the production and processing of fodder must be organized.

Seedgrowing for fodder crops and grasses must be improved and the production of seeds organized, especially for alfalfa, on specialized farms and associations located mainly on irrigated and other improved land. It is necessary to insure the rapid introduction of progressive technologies in fodder production and a steady rise in the yield of fodder crops and the productivity of natural meadows and pasture.

Particular attention must be directed to resolving the problem of fodder protein, above all by means of increasing the production of leguminous crops, soybeans, alfalfa, clover, rape and other high protein crops. Capacities must be stepped up more rapidly and production increased of fodder concentrates in state and interfarm enterprises. It must be insured that in the next 5-year plan practically all grain intended for the needs of stockraising is fed in a processed and balanced form. The production of fodder yeast, fish and meat-and-bone meal and mineral and other industrial feed supplements must be developed.

The responsibility of cadres for insuring a supply of high-quality fodder for stockraising must be raised. In summing up the results of socialist competition and defining measures for stimulating leaders and specialists on kolkhozes and sovkhozes and agricultural organs, particular attention must be directed to farms being provided with their own fodder.

The USSR Gosplan and its local organs must accurately plan the production of all types of fodder and the material and technical basis for the established targets.

The most active part must be played in creating a modern fodder industry by workers in agricultural machine-building and the chemical, microbiological, meat and dairying, food, fish, fodder concentrates and other sectors of industry.

11. The Central Committee plenum particularly stresses that as before, the production of grain remains a shock sector of work in agriculture. The task consists in consolidating and developing the successes achieved and overfulfilling the targets of the current 5-Year Plan, it is necessary to insure a dynamic growth everywhere in the grain yield, raising it to an average of 20 quintals per hectare for the country as a whole. It is necessary to improve the structure of sown areas and raise the proportion of grain crops, particularly in the zone of sufficient moisture, and to improve seedgrowing. Great attention must be devoted to the cultivation of millet, buckwheat, rye and corn for grain.

12. One of the most important agricultural tasks in the current 5-year plan and in future is to increase in every way the production and state purchases of sunflowers, sugar beet, cotton, particularly of fine-fiber varieties, potatoes, vegetables, fruit and other agricultural produce. It is necessary to struggle more actively to reduce wastage of the crop and to insure the product's high quality supplied to the consumer. In the production and processing of potatoes and vegetables work in creating autonomously financed associations must be launched widely, incorporating specialized farms in them. The USSR Council of Ministers must put forward concrete proposals on this question soon.

13. The Central Committee plenum makes it incumbent on the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Gosplan, the USSR Ministry of Agriculture and also local party, soviet and agricultural organs to constantly keep at the center of their attention questions of thrift in agriculture, raising production efficiency and reducing output costs, and also improving economic relations between sectors of the agroindustrial complex. These relations must promote the creation of a commonality and unity of interests between the state, the kolkhozes and direct producers and serve as an active factor in the growth of labor productivity. It is necessary to take into strict account V. I. Lenin's instruction that the correct combination of the interests of all sides participating in the production and sale of produce is one of the main principles of socialist economy.

14. In the sphere of planning procurements of agricultural produce it is essential to eliminate the multiplicity of plans and, starting with the 11th 5-Year Plan, to establish for republics, krays, oblasts, rayons, kolkhozes and sovkhoses a unified, strenuous but feasible plan for the procurement of agricultural produce over a 5-year term, broken down into separate years.

The further improvement of the incentive system for farms achieving high indicators in the production and sale to the state of agricultural produce is to be insured. Taking account of the proposals which have been voiced, the USSR Council of Ministers is charged with the task of drawing up, with the participation of local organs and scientific establishments, in the course of the year, and submitting to the Central Committee Politburo, specific proposals on this question. At the same time it is essential to devise additional measures for strengthening the link between material incentives for sovkhoz and kolkhoz workers and of production capital and physical resources. The system for awarding bonuses to farm managers and specialists is to be improved.

15. The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on raising (without altering retail prices) the wholesale prices for milk, wool, karakul pelts, mutton, potatoes and certain types of vegetables, aimed at enhancing the profitability of their production, is approved.

It is considered necessary that USSR Gosplan, the USSR Council of Ministers State Committee for Prices and the USSR Ministry of Agriculture study in greater depth problems of price formation both for agricultural produce and for industrial output supplied to this sector and also for services, paying particular attention to the economic validity of prices and the more efficient use of prices as an effective lever for the continuing development and improvement of agricultural production.

16. The plenum stresses the exceptionally important significance for boosting agriculture of the course adopted by the party toward the specialization and concentration of agricultural production on the basis of interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration. It is essential that the party organizations, soviet and agricultural organs and the appropriate ministries and departments pursue their work on developing interfarm cooperation more actively, performing it in a planned and well thought-out fashion and in conjunction with other measures for the intensification of agricultural production.

The USSR Gosplan, the USSR Ministry of Agriculture and their local organs are to insure the precise coordination of all work of interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration.

On the basis of the careful generalization of the accumulated experience of interfarm cooperation, its best organizational forms are to be defined as applicable to various sectors and directions in agriculture; and those types of cooperative associations and enterprises which are elevating the socialist collectivization of production and labor to a new level, which are based on the latest achievements in science, equipment and technology, and which insure the highest labor productivity and yield the maximum amount of low-cost produce, are to be recommended for widespread dissemination.

17. Under conditions of widespread intensification and growing investment in agriculture by the state and by kolkhozes, the enhancement of the efficiency and quality of the work of kolkhozes and sovkhozes is becoming increasingly urgent. It is essential to mount a persistent struggle in all economic links, from bottom to top levels, for economy and thrift, for the reduction of the prime cost of produce, and for the enhancement of labor productivity in every way, and also to put an end to instances of mismanagement and extravagance.

The party's strategic slogan--the struggle for efficiency and quality--must become the combat motto of all agricultural workers and all workers of sectors connected with agriculture.

18. The Central Committee plenum draws attention to the need to enhance the efficiency of scientific research as one of the decisive factors for accelerating the scientific and technical progress of agricultural production. The USSR Council of Ministers State Committee for Science and Technology, the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, the USSR Academy of Sciences and the V. I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences are to take steps to further enhance the role of science in implementing the tasks facing agriculture.

19. A more abrupt shift in the attention of the party, Soviet and trade union organizations and of economic organs to the matter of restructuring the countryside and improving rural working people's housing, cultural and everyday conditions is essential. Measures are to be taken to considerably strengthen the material-technical base of construction and planning subsections. The industrialization level is to be raised; the organization of rural construction work is to be improved; the time taken to carry out this work is to be reduced and the quality of installations being built is to be raised; progressive production methods are to be introduced; more economical materials and structures are to be introduced; housing construction using wooden panels is to be developed on a wider scale and building costs are to be steadily reduced. Greater attention is to be paid to road building, the necessary physical and financial resources being provided for in the economic and social development plans. Rural construction organizations are to be reinforced with highly skilled cadres and the training of engineers, construction technicians and architects specially for the needs of the countryside is to be organized.

The USSR Council of Ministers is charged with the task of devising, not later than the first half of 1979, and submitting to the CPSU Central Committee, specific proposals for the significant improvement of production, housing, cultural and every day construction work in the countryside.

20. A higher standard of party leadership and more sophisticated methods of organizational and political work among the masses must be developed to accord with the new stage of the struggle for the further boosting of agriculture. It is essential to elevate to an even higher level the role of the primary party organizations of the kolkhozes and sovkhozes and also of the construction, agroindustrial, land-reclamation, processing and other enterprises and establishments connected with agricultural production. The deployment of communists in the most important work sectors is to be constantly improved, their vanguard role is to be insured and party and state discipline is to be strengthened in every way. The authority, influence and responsibility of the rural raykoms as organs of the political leadership of the economic, social and cultural life of the countryside must continue to be enhanced.

Greater concern is to be shown over the training and education of leading kolkhoz and sovkhoz cadres, especially middle-echelon cadres, specialists and machine operators who have a decisive role to play in boosting agriculture. The lofty duty and daily obligation of the rural party organizations, soviets, trade unions and Komsomol is to conduct broad mass-political work, to constantly support the creative questing and initiative of the rural workers, to develop socialist competition, and to take constant pains to improve the conditions of their labor and everyday life, and also to satisfy their growing spiritual needs.

The Central Committee plenum expresses firm confidence that the kolkhoz members, sovkhoz workers, machine operators, specialists, scientists, farm managers, industrial workers and all urban and rural workers will unanimously approve the decisions of this CPSU Central Committee plenum and through their selfless labor will insure the successful fulfillment of these decisions which will make it possible to accelerate the solution of the party's main task--the considerable enhancement of the Soviet people's well-being.

CSO: 1802

BREZHNEV REPORT ON AGRICULTURE AT CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE PLENUM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 pp 14-43

["Report Delivered by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee on July 3, 1978"--TASS headline: 'On the Further Development of USSR Agriculture.']

[Text] Moscow, July 3, TASS--Follows the full text of the report delivered by L. I. Brezhnev at the plenary meeting of the CPSU CC:

Comrades,

This plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, devoted to the further development of agriculture, has assembled at a historic time--in the opening year of the seventh decade of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The October Revolution holds a special place in the solution of agrarian problems, in the destinies of the peasantry of our country, and not only our country for that matter. The working masses, all progressives of the world know that the victory of the Socialist Revolution in Russia simultaneously started the deliverance of the peasantry, the numerically biggest toiling class of the globe, from oppression, political rightlessness and ignorance.

For the first time in history running into many centuries, the party of Lenin actually delivered the peasantry from exploitation and poverty and put it on the socialist road. Our enemies concocted many fables of all sorts about the past and present of the Soviet countryside. However, no matter what they may say or write, the history of the 20th century, the heroic path traversed by the Soviet peasantry and also the one covered by the peasantry of other socialist countries have convincingly shown that for the correct and just solution of the peasant question there is one right road--the road of building socialism in the countryside; there is one genuine science--the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the agrarian-peasant question.

It is significant, comrades, that just over a month ago we marked the 55th anniversary of the publication of one of Lenin's main agrarian works, the outstanding fruit of Lenin's thought--his article "On Cooperation", in which he indicated the working masses of the countryside the high road to a new life. The peasantry of our country was the first to embark upon this road. Today Lenin's ideas about cooperation inspire millions of peasants abroad, particularly in the countries which have cast off the yoke of colonialism.

Lenin's teaching on the agrarian question and the ideas and principles of his cooperation plan have been and remain in the arsenal of our party. The CPSU invariably proceeds from them and develops them further with due regard for prevailing historical conditions. The teaching and behests of Lenin will continue to be our true compass in shaping and carrying out plans for the further development of agriculture.

Agrarian Policy of the Party in Action: Main Results

Comrades,

The present agrarian policy of our party stems, as is known, from the March 1965 plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. It scientifically reflects the new conditions and requirements of socialist society. The present agrarian policy is the Leninist strategy and tactics the party pursues in the field of agriculture under developed socialism.

Keeping firmly to the course it mapped out, the party has solved a wide range of agrarian problems. The agriculture of the country has made big steps forward in economic and social development. This was recognized and highly appraised by the supreme forum of our party--the 25th CPSU Congress. The congress, as is known, also determined the tasks of the party for developing agriculture in the tenth five-year period.

More than two years have passed since the congress. Presenting today the question about the development of agriculture for consideration by this plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, the Politbureau proceeded from the following:

First, to concentrate the attention of the party on the solution of the most important problems of agricultural production and the abolition of its bottlenecks, the more effective use of the means we have invested and invest in the growth of this sector; to mobilise the party and the people for the successful fulfilment of the five-year plan as regards both increasing the output and purchases of farm produce and carrying out the programme for strengthening the material and technical basis of the countryside.

Second, to establish the main directions of the further development of agriculture and sectors ensuring its industrialization and scientific and technical progress, and to discuss certain questions of the economics and the improvement of the planning and social development of the countryside. This will be of key importance for elaborating the 11th Five-Year Plan and the successful fulfilment of the party's task of turning agriculture into a highly developed sector of the economy.

As you know, last year the Politbureau set up a competent commission to promote allround, thorough preparations for this plenary meeting of the Central Committee.

What are, above all, the main results of implementing our agrarian policy since the March 1965 plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee?

Tackling a strategic task--to ensure the reliable provision of the country with food-stuffs and its industry with agricultural raw materials--the party saw its prime duty in considerably strengthening the material and technical basis of agriculture by stepping up the rates of mechanization, chemization and land melioration, and the integrated solution of questions connected with the development of this sector.

Everything possible has been done to intensify agricultural production. In the first place, we have changed the approach to investments in agriculture. We treat this matter as the cornerstone for the further development of agricultural production and we have made it a rule to systematically increase these investments as much as possible. The party has decided to redistribute the funds allocated for the national economy, ensured a sharp increase in capital investments in agricultural production and a considerable rise in the share of agriculture in overall investments. Whereas under the 7th Five-Year Plan, that is before the March plenary meeting, the share of agriculture constituted 20 per cent. It was 23 per cent under the 8th Five-Year Plan, 26 per cent under the 9th Five-Year Plan and more than 27 per cent under the 10th Five-Year Plan (target).

In this period, we have done much to build an up-to-date industrial basis for agriculture. Earlier we practically did not have such specialized self-contained big sectors as water conservance and land melioration, engineering for livestock and fodder production, agricultural construction, the mixed feed and microbiological industry. Nowadays they do exist.

The manufacture of tractors and agricultural machinery, the production of mineral fertilizers and processing industry have also been greatly developed. All they together constitute a growing industrial complex aimed at ensuring the steady growth of agricultural production.

The basic production assets in the socialized sector of agriculture have reached 183,000 million roubles, 2.8 times above the level of 1965. The machine-and-tractor fleet of the collective and state farms has been renewed almost fully, it has changed qualitatively, and the share of up-to-date machines of greater engine capacity, load carrying capacity and productivity has risen. The power capacities of agricultural enterprises have increased in these years from 232 million horse powers to 525 million horse powers, i.e. by more than two times over, and the amount of electrical power available per worker at collective and state farms has increased by 2.5 times. The electrification of agriculture proceeds vigorously.

The party has attached great significance to chemization and land melioration. It would not be an exaggeration to say that up till now neither our country nor any other has known of such huge scales of their development. We have raised chemization and melioration to the level of a major task of national importance. Last year our agriculture received 77 million tons of mineral fertilizers as against 27 million tons in 1965. Their production will continue to grow in order to meet fully the requirements of the farming industry. The country has nearly doubled the area of irrigated and drained land, and nowadays our collective and state farms have more than 27 million hectares of such land. About 40,000 million roubles will be invested in melioration under the 10th Five-Year Plan.

Such is, in brief, the result of the great job of work which has been done in these years to strengthen the material and technical basis of agriculture. Of course, we still have many concerns and bottlenecks in this field and we fully realize that in the future too it will be necessary to devote maximum attention to the provision of agriculture with materials and technology in all directions--both quantitatively and, more important still, qualitatively.

Simultaneously, it will be necessary to raise further demands as regards everything which concerns the skillful and effective use of the created basis. Today this is one of the prime tasks of rural party organizations, all workers of agriculture.

The development of the material and technical basis is closely connected with the training of manpower, particularly specialists and machine operators. Considerable work has been done in this respect too in the past period. Nowadays, the situation there is as follows: The affairs of the collective and state farms are managed by the educated cadres of specialists and technology is handled by a big army of machine operators. Specialists with a higher and secondary education account for 93.5 percent of the chairmen of collective farms and for 98.3 percent of the directors of state farms. More than 1,600,000 specialists are employed in agriculture nowadays, and the number of machine operators has risen to 4,225,000. Today

every fifth worker in agriculture is a machine operator. Technical progress has given rise to a big number of other categories of educated, qualified workers in the countryside.

As it was noted at the 25th CPSU Congress, growing deliveries of machinery and other material resources have made it possible to raise noticeable labour productivity at collective and state farms. According to the USSR Central Statistical Board, in 1977 per-worker productivity was 169 percent compared with the level of 1965, which is tantamount to saving the efforts of 16 million people a year.

The CPSU Central Committee has paid great attention to economic measures for the growth of agriculture, particularly to improving the planning of production and purchases of farm output, price formation, crediting, and labour remuneration. We are working for the entire great diversity of economic relations at enterprises and on the scale of the agroindustrial complex as a whole to create the commonness, the unity of the interests of the state, collective farms and the immediate producers. Lenin regarded the correct combination of the interests of all sides to the production and sale of goods as a main principle of socialist economic management. It must be said that the economics of the collective and state farms and the material wellbeing of agricultural workers began to improve noticeable already in the first years after the March plenary meeting of the Central Committee. In 1977 the gross income of the collective farms was double the average yearly figure for the seventh five-year-period. On the whole, the state farm system has been operating profitably in the past 12 years.

In the prevailing conditions the development of the productive forces of agriculture is connected particularly closely with the solution of the social questions of life in the countryside. For long years, due to a number of reasons, we were not able to duly regulate the system of labour remuneration in the countryside. At the present stage we have found a more suitable solution to this important question. I have in mind primarily the transition to the guaranteed payment for the work of the collective farmers. Key importance is attached to the measures of the party aimed at reducing the differences in the wages of agricultural and industrial workers. In the past 12 years the labour remuneration of the collective farmers has gone up by 100 percent and that of state farm workers by 90 percent.

Major undertakings have been effected during these years in the field of pensions and social insurance for the collective farmers. To be more specific, I shall cite the following figures. In 1977 the pensions and allowances to the collective farmers from the centralized all-union fund exceeded 4,000 million roubles, four-odd times more than in 1965. There is no need to prove how important these measures are, measures which concern millions, particularly those who devoted all their lives and labour to the common cause--the development and strengthening of the collective farm system.

The growing standards of the material wellbeing, culture and everyday life of the rural population is an indicative feature of our time. Here are generalized data on this score. In 1965-1977 the aggregate income of the family of the collective farmer grew by 80 percent. In the same period per capita commodity sales in the countryside rose from 222 roubles to 492 roubles a year, more than two times over. The investments of the state and the collective farms in non-production projects, that is, mostly in the social sphere, exceeded 40,000 million roubles in these years, amounting to three quarters of all investments made in this field since the inception of the Soviet state.

The task of the party is not to slacken attention to and display a constant concern for, the further growth of the living standards of agricultural workers and making our villages ever more comfortable.

End production results are the main criterion of all economic activity. What are these results in agriculture?

I shall begin, as usual, with gross output. In the past seven years (1971-1977) the average yearly volume of gross output reached 116,000 million roubles as against 81,400 million roubles in the years preceding the March plenary meeting. The per-hectare yields and the output of all crops increased. This can be seen from the table below.

Gross Output and Productivity of Crops (Annual Average by All Categories of Farms)

	Gross Output (Million Tons)		Productivity (Centners per Hectare)	
	1959-1965	1971-1977	1959-1965	1971-1977
Grain	128.1	189.6	10.3	15.1
Raw Cotton	4.84	7.91	20.6	27.7
Sugar Beet				
(Industrial)	56.8	81.9	168	229
Sunflower	4.62	5.86	10.4	12.9
Flax Fibre				
(Thousand Tons)	404	466	2.6	3.8
Potatoes	82.7	88.2	94	114
Other Vegetables	16.5	23.3	113	141

Favourable trends could be observed in the development of animal husbandry as well. The average annual gross output of livestock products over the same period increased by 45 percent. The number and productivity of livestock on collective and state farms increased. The output of meat increased from an average of 9.2 million tons in 1959-1965 to 14 million tons in 1971-1977, milk from 63.9 to 88.8 million tons respectively, and eggs up to 53,500 million, an increase of 90 percent.

These figures illustrate the big work being actively done today to intensify livestock farming. Nevertheless we must take even more radical measures in order to speed up progress in this field.

Agriculture has a great role to play in the practical implementation of the party's general policy aimed at substantially raising the people's standard of living. If we assess the results achieved in this field from this viewpoint, it will be quite clear that the living standards of the Soviet people are steadily rising, including the extent to which we meet their most vital needs, that is, the needs in foodstuffs and consumer goods.

I have an official report by the Central Statistical Board of the USSR in front of me. It says, for instance, that the sales of meat products to the population through the state and cooperative trade network almost doubled between 1965 and 1977 and came to an average of 10 million tons a year.

Per capita consumption of products is an important, although not the sole, indicator of living standards. We have made progress in this field too. Per capita consumption of meat and meat products with the growth of the population by 28 million increased by 16 kilograms and came to 57 kilograms in 1977.

Consumption of milk and dairy products, eggs, vegetables, gourds and fruit has noticeably grown. The consumption of bread products and potatoes is steadily falling, a fact which testifies to an improved diet of the population. The consumption of non-food products made of agricultural raw materials, such as cotton, woollen and flax fabrics, also has been steadily growing.

This situation is encouraging but does not make us complacent. We realize well that there is much room for improvement in this field. The Politbureau of the Central Committee and the government are aware of this and never relax their efforts to meet to a fuller extent the growing needs of the Soviet people.

Raise in Every Possible Way the Level of Agricultural Production

Comrades, the results we have achieved and the experience we have gained in managing agriculture under present-day conditions convincingly confirm the scientific soundness and vitality of the Leninist agrarian policy pursued by the CPSU. One may come to a logical conclusion that the policy formulated by the March 1965 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and elaborated at subsequent party plenums and congresses must be continued.

The main task we set for agriculture is to achieve comprehensive and dynamic development of all its sectors and to ensure stable supplies of foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials for the country, so that the growth in their production will secure a further substantial rise in the people's standard of living. Simultaneously we must redouble our efforts in tackling the task of obliterating distinctions between the material, cultural and living conditions in city and countryside.

To this end, in 1981-1985 we must ensure an annual grain harvest of 238 to 243 million tons and by 1990 increase it to an average of one ton per capita. Meat production should increase to 19.5 million tons by the end of the next five-year period. The output of milk and eggs must be increased substantially. This will make it possible to increase per capita consumption of the most valuable foodstuffs and to come much closer to scientifically rational norms by the end of the Eleventh Five-Year Plan.

I would like to emphasize that we have set fairly high targets for the output of major agricultural products and for their absolute rates of growth in the next five years. We must also ensure a growth in the material and technical resources of agriculture in order to attain those targets.

This applies to capital investments above all. We must firmly adhere to the party's fundamental policy of steadily increasing capital investments above all. We must firmly adhere to the party's fundamental policy of steadily increasing capital investments in agriculture. Consequently, their share in the overall volume of resource allocated for the development of the country's economy under the Eleventh Five-Year Plan should not be lower of the one [as received] achieved. The State Planning Committee of the USSR must take this into account in drawing up the new five-year plan.

Comrades, although today's plenum is concerned with agriculture, we always remember about the leading role of our industry. We invest and shall continue to invest in it as much as it needs.

The experience of the past years shows that the capacity of the industries servicing the countryside must be increased at a faster pace. So, the new five-year plan should make adequate allocations for the development of agricultural machine-building, the production of fertilizer and chemical plant protection agents, the processing industry and all other industries related to the argo-industrial complex. This approach fully corresponds to the directive of the twenty-fifth congress of the party.

Our task in the next five-year period is to complete comprehensive mechanization of cultivation of all major crops and substantially raise the level of mechanization in animal farming. To this end, we must continue to do

everything to increase supplies of tractors, lorries, combine harvesters and other agricultural machines to the farms. The output of tractors and lorries in this country is growing and agriculture should receive a substantial portion of this increment.

Simultaneously we shall have to tackle in a more radical way the problem of quality of agricultural machines. You know that shortcomings in this field were criticized at the October 1976 plenum of the Central Committee. Nevertheless, things are looking up slowly. Production of antiquated models of tractors and many other types of machines for crop cultivation and livestock breeding, which do not meet modern standards in terms of productivity, economy and reliability, continues. There is still a serious lagging behind in the production of systems of machines for loading tractors and introduction of new techniques in production. So, the plans for the remainder years of the current five-year plan and the 1981-1985 period should provide for a number of radical measures to raise the technical level of agricultural machine-building.

This applies above all to the structure of tractor production. The task is to supply collective and state farms with efficient and powerful tractors with all the necessary mounted and trailer machines and implements. Here we attach great importance to speeding up the retooling of the Volgograd, Pavlodar and Lipetsk tractor plants.

In the field of combine-harvester-building, we shall have to carry out urgent measures to modernize grain combine-harvesters manufactured at Soviet plants in order to rectify faults in their design, and increase their design, and increase their productivity. In the next few years we also must begin production of more powerful combine-harvesters of improved design, taking into account foreign know-how. Particular importance should be attached to increase in the output of self-propelled and trailer windrowers and machines for gathering the non-grain part of the harvest.

An important trend in agricultural machine-building is to ensure full mechanization of fodder production. Factories making fodder harvesting and processing machines must be modernized and new powerful ones should be built, enlisting other industries to this important cause.

The problems of transportation of agricultural cargoes remains very acute. The volume of such carryings is steadily growing, while the lorry pool in the countryside is expanding slowly. Moreover, farms receive as a rule lorries that are not designed for carrying agricultural cargoes. However difficult, the problem of transport for the countryside must be tackled in a radical way. Specifically, we must organize production of high-capacity and special-purpose lorries for agriculture.

There are many other problems involved in the further mechanization of agriculture. I have no time to report them all in detail to the plenum. At the same time, it is quite clear that industrialization of farming is one of our major tasks. We have to admit that in terms of fixed assets per worker and electricity power supply per worker agriculture is still way behind industry.

During preparations for the plenum the CPSU Central Committee made a thorough study of all these problems and took two decisions which we believe are very important. It adopted resolutions on measures further to develop comprehensive mechanization and to supply collective and state farms with highly efficient technology for crop cultivation, animal husbandry and also fodder production. You have received these resolutions.

We must continue to increase exactingness in improving the use of all machines supplied to agriculture. We must not tolerate the situation where many collective and state farms do not observe rules of maintenance and storage of machines. Many machines stand idle because of inadequate repair and maintenance. Many machines wear out and are discarded before time.

There is no strict accounting of consumption of fuel and lubricants. There is a shortage of machine operators and the coefficient of shift operation of tractors is low. All this increases production costs and causes great damage to the collective- and state-farm economy and the country as a whole.

Last year the CPSU Central Committee and the Council of Ministers of the USSR adopted a special resolution on the improvement of the use of agricultural machinery. The Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Water Conservancy, Soyuzselkhoztekhnika, all local economic and government agencies, and party and other public organizations must work more vigorously to carry out the measures outlined in that resolution.

Among the measures aimed at intensifying agricultural production most serious attention should be given to the further development of production of mineral fertilizers and means of plant protection. No rapid growth can be achieved in agricultural production without them. It would be wrong to say that our chemical industry is not advanced enough. Quite the opposite. We may take pride in the fact that in a short space of time our country has built a powerful industry for chemicalization of agriculture. The chemical industry can now cope with more large-scale problems.

Taking account of the planned output of crops and livestock products, supplies of mineral fertilizers for agriculture in the next five-year period are expected to come to 135-140 million tons and fodder additives to seven million tons. But quantity is not the only thing that matters. Emphasis should be laid on improvement of the quality of products. The increase of capacity and growth in the production of mineral fertilizer

should be mainly ensured by an increase in the output of phosphate, concentrated and compound fertilizers. A more effective solution should be found for the problem of lime production, particularly for the needs of the Non-Black Soil Zone.

Special mention should be made of herbicides and pesticides. Supply still fails to meet the needs of agriculture. The output is very low and the range is very limited in the production of herbicides for the treatment of plantations of rice, sugar beet, potatoes, cotton and vegetables. Herbicides for soy beans and sunflower are not produced at all. This results in substantial losses in agriculture. This situation should be rectified. We must work out a state programme for herbicides, plan research in this field, build production capacity and also extend the production and application of microbiological means of plant protection.

We are doing everything to increase supplies of mineral fertilizer for agriculture. At the same time, we must demand more of farm managers and agricultural agencies as regards the use of mineral fertilizers and also maximum accumulation and putting in soil of organic fertilizers.

Big losses and even damage of fertilizers are tolerated at many collective farms and state farms, agrochemical rules of their application are violated, and what is most important, there is still no due return. A role of no small importance in all this is played by the dissociation and insufficient effectiveness of the agrochemical service. The country practically still has no uniform, scientifically-organized system of agrochemical services. In some places chemicalization is dealt with by Selkhoztekhnika, in others, by inter-farm associations, while in certain places, this is let to take its course altogether.

To put such an important matter in order, it is expedient to concentrate agrochemical service both centrally and locally in the system of agricultural bodies, handing over to them the whole production basis earmarked for this.

Far more attention should be paid to agricultural aviation, which already today plays a significant role in the drive for increased crop yields of fields. It carries out more than 30 percent of the total amount of work in the application of chemicals. This is a promising line, and our task is to develop and strengthen the material and technical basis of agricultural aviation.

Land improvement should be promoted as perseveringly as ever. The central task here should be the better use of ameliorated lands, and the erasure of the lag tolerated in the economic development. Crops on irrigated land frequently still differ little from the results of dry farming. This is inadmissible. Large sums of money are invested in land improvement, a sufficiently strong production basis has been set up, and more cadres have been trained. This entitles us to demand that the workers of agriculture

and water economy ensure a high return of output from the irrigated and drained lands. In the future, it is necessary to ensure only the integrated development of newly ameliorated areas. Wherever it is possible, they should be concentrated in specialized husbandries or inter-farm associations for the organization of really effective farming.

Our science should make a big contribution to the solution of the tasks of further development of agriculture. Shortly after the 25th congress of the party, measures were drawn up, with the extensive participation of scientists, for enhancing the effectiveness of agricultural science and strengthening its ties with production. The resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the government adopted on this question defines the main directions along with science should develop with the purpose of achieving an uplift in agriculture.

Today I would like only to stress that we should constantly increase our attention to the scientific research institutions, to achieve higher results of their work, and improve in every possible way the introduction of scientific achievements in production, by putting it on a good, planned basis. It is very important that, not only the workers of agricultural science, but also the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, the academies of sciences of the union republics, scientists in all branches of knowledge continue to take an active part in the elaboration of many-sided problems of acceleration of scientific and technological progress in agriculture. The upsurge of agriculture, as we have noted more than once, is a matter of the entire people, it is a common concern.

The whole course of economic development of the country and the steady rise of the material wellbeing of the people now move to the fore the task of a faster uplift of livestock farming. It is quite natural that the growth of public welfare in recent times has brought about an increased demand precisely for livestock products. This has given rise to a situation where, in spite of a noticeable increase in the production of meat, milk and other products and improvement in the organization of work in the sector, the present level of development of livestock farming does not meet the swiftly-growing requirements.

The Central Committee of the party analyzed in great detail the questions of the further development of livestock farming and drew up a set of measures for increased production of meat, milk and other products. Resolutions were adopted on a number of questions connected with the development of the sector, and the members of the Central Committee had the possibility of studying them. The point is, by increasing the stock, to raise everywhere and as fast as possible the productivity of all kinds of cattle and poultry, to go over to intensive livestock farming techniques and to turn it into a modern, highly effective sector.

The achievement of a new upsurge in livestock farming demands a steep turn in attention to this sector by the whole party, by all our ministries and departments, by the leaders of the collective farms, by all the rural working people.

The immediate task is increasing the production of meat. For its solution it is necessary to make full use of all our possibilities and reserves, to work for the growth of production of all kinds of meat.

In most of the areas of the country, the solution of the meat problem is connected, above all, with increased production of beef. This is stipulated, on the one hand, by the rising demand of the population for beef and, on the other, by the specific features of the structure of our feed resources and natural conditions. We have extensive areas of meadows and pastures and great potential for the production of coarse and succulent fodder. Food industry enterprises provide a good deal of by-products. All this can be used for raising and fattening cattle with the greatest return.

Of all the reserves in raising beef production, that of increased weight of slaughtered cattle and reduced periods of fattening should be singled out especially. The task was recently set of boosting weight conditions to 350-370 kilograms. Many regions and republics have coped with it successfully. The average weight of cattle sold by the collective farms and state farms to the state has reached 355 kilograms in the country as a whole, and 400-440 kilograms in a number of regions and republics. On account of this, the country today receives additionally more than one million tons of meat a year.

However, a considerable part of cattle comes to the meat-packing plants virtually without fattening, with a low weight and poor fattiness. Many calves are slaughtered in some areas. It is necessary, as quick as possible, to effect everywhere the transition to intensive cattle-raising techniques and to deliver the animals for meat only after they are fattened to a weight of 400-450 kilograms. I think that it will be possible for many areas, whole regions, territories and republics to solve this task already in the current five-year plan period. It is necessary in the localities to carry out concrete work without delay, to determine where and how the cattle of every collective farm and state farm will be fattened intensively, either on specialized farms and in areas of their own husbandry or at inter-farm establishments.

Valuable experience in transferring meat production to intensive techniques has been accumulated in Voronezh and Orenburg regions, individual regions of the Ukrainian SSR, in Moldavia, and other places. Specialized cattle-fattening enterprises here already now supply more than half of the

✓ beef. The question arises: Are their conditions better than those of the overwhelming majority of other republics and regions? It is not a question of conditions, but of the standard of organizational and managerial work.

In order to solve the beef production problem radically, it is necessary to work more energetically in setting up an independent sector of specialized meat cattle-farming, making use of pasture lands and establishing sound fodder production with the help of irrigation. Many farms in Kazakhstan, in the Urals, in Siberia and the Volga area are taking this line and it is yielding good results. Big possibilities exist on the newly irrigated lands in the republics of Central Asia, in the south and in the Non-Black-Earth zone of the RSFSR, and in Belorussia. An extensive programme for the development of meat cattle-farming has been drawn up and is being carried out in the Ukraine. It is necessary, in the near future, to develop this sector in such a way that will turn it into a major source of ensurance of high-quality meat for the country.

The intensive development of the hog industry is equally important in the buildup of meat production. It holds a significant place in the shaping of the country's meat resources. Much has been done in recent years in introducing progressive technologies in the production of pork. Large-scale pig-rearing enterprises have been set up at the state farms and collective farms and on an inter-farm basis. The experience of their work shows that the transition to industrialized pork production makes it possible to increase the gains and cut the fattening periods, and to obtain output with the least expenditure of fodder, labour and money. It is necessary, within our possibilities, to continue creating such enterprises anew or on the basis of modernization of working farms, to consistently transfer swine breeding to an industrial basis.

However, I would like once again to warn against mistakes. In promoting this line, it would be wrong to slacken attention to pork production at non-specialized farms. Many of them have a good basis and established personnel for this, and can fatten hogs not only on grain, but also on potatoes, root vegetables, and other succulent and green fodder. All this has to be used thriftily with the object of increasing meat production and obtaining piglets both for public needs and for sale to the population.

As you know, an enlarged decision was recently adopted on the development of meat poultry-farming. It opens big possibilities for the replenishment of meat resources. It is intended to approximately double the share of poultry meat. Up till recent times, priority in poultry breeding was given to egg production, and the problem of supplying the population with eggs has been solved in the main. The funds of this sector are now being concentrated on increased production of poultry meat. Large-scale enterprises for the raising of chickens, ducks, turkeys and geese for meat will be put into operation in the next few years. At the same time, a good deal can

also be done at operating mechanized poultry farms through their modernization and expansion of capacities. It is necessary also to make wider use of the possibilities for the raising of boilers on the basis of cooperation of the mechanized poultry farms with the collective farms and state farms, as is being done in the Crimean and Dnepropetrovsk regions and in the Krasnodar territory.

Attention should be paid to the large reserves of sheep-raising. There are some successes in the development of this sector--the stock has grown and its qualitative composition has improved, and the production and purchase of work, goat's hair and karakul have increased. However, in a number of republics and regions, sheep farming is growing very slowly, whereas it is being curtailed altogether in the Non-Black-Earth Zone of the RSFSR, and in individual areas of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Moldavia and the Baltic republics. This is wrong, erroneous. We have all conditions to produce more, far more mutton, wool, sheepskins and furs and to meet more fully the country's requirements of these products.

We should in the future, too, receive the bulk of mutton and wool on pasture fodder. It is precisely sheep breeding that makes it possible to use the enormous territories of our steppe and semi-desert fodder lands with the greatest return. Therefore, it is necessary to strengthen more energetically the production basis of sheep-raising farms and to continue work in irrigating and improving pasture grounds. It is especially important to create transferable, reserve fodder stocks in these areas.

There should be another approach to the development of sheep farming in areas with large ploughed-up lands. It is necessary here to make wider use of industrial technology, both in the upkeep of sheep and in fodder production.

In this respect, the Stavropol territory, Rostov, Yaroslavl and Belgorod regions and the Mari Autonomous Republic have good experience.

A big job lies ahead in the further increase of milk production. Though a rather big step forward has been made in this direction in recent years, the qualitative showings of the sector remain low. The milk yields are rising slowly, there are cases of barrenness, and the specific expenditures of labour and fodder--meaning the cost of output as well--are virtually not dropping. Special attention should be paid to this aspect of work of the dairies. It is intended, in the near future, to bring the milk yield at the collective farm and state farms up to an average for the country of at least 3,000 kilograms, while in the areas of developed dairy farming, where 3,000-3,500 kilograms are already being received, the task is to reach the yield target of 4,000-5,000 kilograms of milk.

In conditions of growing intensification of livestock farming and its transfer onto an industrial footing, the role of selection and pure-strain stock-breeding is enhanced immeasurably. The Ministry of Agriculture and the All-Union Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences are faced with considerable work in creating new and improving existing breeds, strains and hybrids of animals, expanding the network of breeding-stock farms, and using more purposefully the resources of highly-productive cattle and poultry.

Examining the measures for the development of collectively-owned livestock farming, I wish to underline once more that we should also care for the personal holdings of the collective farmers, workers and employees. This is a vital source of replenishment of food resources. The new Constitution of the USSR says that "the state and collective farms provide assistance to citizens in working their small-holdings." The subsidiary farms of industrial enterprises, public catering establishments and other organizations should also play a useful role in the improvement of supplies.

In order to replenish food resources, it is necessary to deal more concretely with the production of fish through the better use of local water bodies. The possibilities here are practically unlimited. It would be useful for the corresponding bodies to draw up undertakings for the development of fish farming on a national scale.

All that we want to have from stock-breeding--more meat, milk and other products--all this, in the final analysis, depends on adequate supply of varied and high quality feeds. It cannot be said that these questions have been given little attention in our work. But the problem of fodder production has not received a cardinal, overall solution yet.

Fodder raising still proceeds along primitive lines at many collective and state farms. In adopting modern processes and the achievements of science and technology, this sector is not progressing as well as other branches. Good facilities for storing feeds are few, and this leads to great losses and an impairment of their quality. According to All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences data, the loss of nutritive substances in feeds, caused by primitive methods of their preparation and the unsatisfactory conditions of storage on many farms, averages more than 20-30 percent for hay, silo and hayage. The protein problem remains unsolved. The mixed feeds industry is poorly developed. All this bespeaks the necessity of major steps to organize the production of fodder, to create in fact a modern fodder production industry. By raising the quality of feeds and observing the established techniques for their production, it is possible to obtain considerable extra livestock output resources.

Proceeding from this, during the preparations to the Central Committee's plenary meeting, decisions for the overall development of fodder production in the country were worked out and adopted. They cover the space of time till 1985 and envisage measures for improving field fodder-production and natural meadows and pastures and increasing the application of fertilizers in fodder-cropping, as well as a considerable amount of land-reclamation work. Measures have been outlined for the mechanization of all the processes in fodder production, the introduction of advanced methods in the stocking up and preparation of feeds and the conversion of this industry to an industrial basis.

The relevant ministries and departments are to increase within a short time the production and supply of chemical farm preservatives, polymeric film, feed additives, mineral salts and means for the treatment of straw with a view to raising its value as fodder. To improve the quality of feeds, an extensive programme will be carried out in building modern storage facilities on farms for hayage, silo, hay and root crops, as well as fodder yards, and a feed quality control service will be established.

Great importance is being attached to measures of an organizational nature. The production of fodder must be made into a more specialized sector at the collective and state farms themselves. There should be created inter-farm associations for the production of fodder, and agro-industrial integration must be given a boost.

Much attention has been focussed on the problem of feed protein. I want to reemphasize that protein deficiencies in rations result in an enormous overexpenditure of feeds. Provisions are made that collective and state farms will expand their sown areas and increase their yields of grain, vetch and oil-producing crops, lucerne, clover and rape in the next few years. For the supply of perennial grass seed to areas of the country where their growing is faced with difficulties, it has been deemed expedient to organize the production of seed, especially of lucerne, in specialized farms and associations located mainly on irrigated and other reclaimed lands.

As you know, a decision on soya was adopted recently. We regard it as a first step in organizing the large-scale production of this valuable crop. The possibilities for expanding the area under it, especially on irrigated lands, must be explored and the technology of cultivation perfected.

Our chemical-industry workers and workers in the microbiological, pulp and paper, fishing, meat and milk, food, medical and other industries must make their contribution to the solution of the problem of protein. Appropriate assignments, as well as allocations of capital investments, are being given to them.

We are seeking to ensure that all the grain going for the needs of stock-breeding is fed after treatment and in a balanced way. The accelerated development of both the state-owned mixed feeds industry and the production of mixed feeds in state and collective farms and interfarm enterprises is provided for towards this end.

Here it must be noted that an absolutely wrong tendency is observable in a number of places. Some of the leaders at farm, district and even regional levels do not take proper care of increasing the production of hay, silo, hayage and root crops and improving their quality. They attempt to make good the fodder shortages by the use of concentrates, often at the expense of grain from state reserves. As a result, the expenditure of grain to feed livestock grows excessively, while the use of other types of fodder even falls.

The responsibility of personnel for the supply of feeds to stock-breeding must be enhanced. This index should be one of the main yardsticks in evaluating work on the farm. There must be special attention given to how well stocked the farms are with their own feeds in summing up the results of socialists emulation and determine encouragement measures for executives and specialists.

The Political Bureau of the Central Committee attaches great importance to measures pertaining to fodder production. The need for modern fodder raising as a specialized branch in the national economy becomes absolutely clear now. This matter is of great national significance. Accordingly, there must be devised a proper approach to the industry, with efficient fodder production planning introduced and plan targets backed materially and technologically.

We have always devoted exceptional attention to grain production. As you well know, the 25th Congress of the party designated grain production a top priority sector of work. In the first two years of the five-year period the average annual grain yields stood at 209.6 million tons against the targeted 210 million tons. Yet shortages of grain, especially feed grains, still occur. The demand for them grows more rapidly than production. The great variations in total grain output of individual years have an adverse effect on stock-breeding.

The proposed measures to advance mechanization, chemicalization and land-reclamation that I have reported above make it possible to produce grain more stably and to raise the yields of grain crops every year. This is the main road. The task being posed is to bring up grain yields to a national per-hectare average of 20 metric centners in the next five-year period, and for such areas as the Northern Caucasus, the Ukraine, Moldavia, Belorussia, the Baltic republics and some others it will be feasible to have per-hectare grain yields of 35-40 metric centners and more.

Fuller use should also be made of such a reserve as the area under grain crops in some regions. This particularly applies to the Non-Black-Earth Zone where it is possible to expand the grain strip of fields at the expense of less productive annual grasses and other crops.

Even more attention has to be paid to the cultivation of millet, buckwheat, rye and maize for grain production. A number of farms display an obvious underestimation of these crops.

The entire arsenal of agrotechnical methods must now be directed toward the obtaining of maximum grain yields, the raising of the soil fertility and the improvement of farming standards. All the potentialities and reserves should be utilized, and the work of local party, government and agricultural agencies, farm managers and specialists and ordinary workers of state and collective farms must be geared to this task.

Now I shall dwell on the questions of further advancement in some other branches of agricultural production, whose output is designated for the satisfaction of the growing requirements of the country.

A great deal of work is to be carried out in beet growing. Recently we adopted a detailed decision on this question, with which you obviously have already familiarized yourselves. In the next five-year period a considerable increase in gross sugar beet output is planned on the basis of higher yields to be obtained through the use of new techniques.

The capacities of sugar refineries will be expanded, enabling a reduction of the sugar refining season and a lowering of the losses of sugar in the period of beet storage and processing.

On the instructions of the Central Committee of the party the USSR Council of Ministers in conjunction with the local authorities is also working out goal-oriented programmes for raising the production of sunflower seed, cotton, potatoes, fruit and vegetables.

In the Eleventh Five-Year Plan period it is necessary to achieve a sharp increase in sunflower seed production. The yields of this crop must be raised, losses of seed in harvesting eliminated, the facilities for storage and processing more vigorously developed, and the deterioration of products prevented.

By the efforts of the party and the state and by the selfless work of cotton growers and land-reclamation workers, the country has built up a reliable base for the steady increase of cotton production. Its volumes should augment in the future as well. But the question now is not only that of quantitative indices of growth. The new task is to improve the quality of output and expand in every way the production of fine-fiber varieties. A high quality of cotton is the chief concern of all cotton growers of the country.

More attention has to be given to such products as potatoes and vegetables. I mean not only the need for their greater production; it does grow, even though not so rapidly as one would like. Speaking of vegetables, the most important thing here is, I believe, to complete the conversion of vegetable growing to irrigation as soon as possible, reduce harvest losses, ensure the high quality of output, and strengthen the facilities for its processing and storage. To improve the supply of vegetables in the winter time, it is very important also to expand the production of vegetables through constructing hothouses and hotbeds, drawing in this matter on the experience of Moscow, Leningrad and other cities.

The practice of many of our regions, territories and republics and the experience of socialist countries show that the task of the supply of potatoes and vegetables can most successfully be solved on the basis of new organizational forms--cost-accounting associations, including specialized farms for the production of these items and enterprises for their storage and treatment. Proceeding from this, we must ask the USSR Council of Ministers to submit proposals on creating such an organization in the immediate future.

A big role in our plans is assigned to the Non-Black-Earth Zone of the Russian Federation. I can state with satisfaction that the implementation of the comprehensive programme for the transformation of the agriculture of this vast territory is beginning to have a positive effect on the growth of production and the improvement of the working and living conditions of the farm workers. But still the work to develop the Non-Black-Earth Zone has not been given the scope and the efficiency that are necessary for the successful accomplishment of the tasks set.

Judging by the results of the two years of the five-year period, there is a lagging in the fulfillment of targets for land-reclamation and the improvement of soil fertility and the creation of the base for production, housing and socio-cultural construction. Little has been done to advance road-building. Work is slowly proceeding in moving families from small inhabited points to well-appointed settlements. Falling short of plan targets is the expansion of capacities for the plants of the flax processing, food and meat and dairy industries. Obviously, not all the workers of central, republic and local agencies have grasped the economic and political importance of the solution of the problems of the Non-Black-Earth Zone.

The ministries and departments which are responsible for the carrying out of work in the Non-Black-Earth Zone, as well as party, local government and economic bodies must do everything possible to overcome the lag and to fulfill the targets for the entire range of measures for transforming the agriculture of this territory on schedule in the future. Of course, the Eleventh Five-Year Plan will also give proper attention to the problems of the Non-Black-Earth-Zone.

Recently, as you know, I made a trip to areas of Siberia and the Far East. I shall say frankly it produced an indelible impression on me. I had the opportunity to meet and talk with working people, party activists and economic executives and to see at close quarters the work involved in the all-round development of natural resources and the advancement of productive forces of this vast region which plays an increasing role in the country's economy.

You know that an appropriate resolution on the results of the trip has been passed and that the necessary assignments have been given. Now I would like to touch only on some aspects of the agricultural production in Siberia and the Far East. The matter is that the problems of this industry have not yet found a proper place in the set of measures to develop the economy of that zone. Big funds have to be spent on the importation of agricultural products, many of which could successfully be grown locally. I think that the situation must be rectified so that the requirements of the population for such products as meat, milk, eggs, vegetables, potatoes and some others are met by local production to the maximum.

Comrades, at this plenary meeting we are defining the main objectives of the development of agricultural production for the future. Our immediate task now is to concentrate all efforts on the fulfillment and maximum overfulfillment of the targets of the Tenth Five-Year Plan. Despite the increase in the output of arable and livestock farming, the targets of the first two years of the five-year period, both for the total volume of production and for some of the items, have not been fully achieved.

Every year we allocate more and more capital investments and material resources for the development of agriculture. But it must be said that not everywhere do these investments yield proper returns in the form of output. Over the last two years the gross farm production was less than planned in a number of regions of the Russian Federation, the Ukraine and Kazakhstan, and in Moldavia, Latvia and Kirghizia. There are regions which registered a very small increment in output or even reduced its size. Among them are the Tambov, Oryol, Lipetsk, Chelyabinsk, Odessa, Pavlodar and Turgay regions, to mention but a few.

The Krasnoyarsk Territory and the Penza, Kurgan and Uralsk regions are in fact marking time as regards grain crop yields. The output of sugar-beet remains at a low level in many collective and state farms of the Central Black Earth area.

The Rostov, Chita, Taldy-Kurgan and East Kazakhstan regions and the Altay Territory did not make full use of the available possibilities for the production of meat and failed to fulfill the plan for meat sales to the state. Milk-yields on collective farms and state farms in Kemergovo, Ulyanovsk, Zhitomir and Minsk regions did not grow in practice during these years.

The efficiency of animal breeding remains low, as before, and the task of providing the population's requirements in meat and dairy products through their own production in the Transcaucasian and Central Asian Republics is being solved but slowly.

If one takes data on other products, there, too, not all worked equally and with due intensity. This can be seen from the materials of the Central Statistical Board specially prepared for the Central Committee's plenum and circulated among its participants. The heads of regions, territories and republics should critically analyse these indicators, compare their own performance with that of their neighbours having a higher level of production and procurement of products and draw the necessary conclusions.

The shortfall in the output of products during the first two years of the five-year period should be made up for and measures taken to ensure that the assignments set by the CPSU's Twenty-Fifth Congress are fulfilled without fail. There are good prerequisites for this. One can say with great satisfaction that the spring-time test has been passed successfully--the spring sowing was carried out in good time and at a high qualitative level. Matters are improving in the field of livestock breeding. The wintering of animals proceeded normally. As compared with last year, more meat and eggs have been produced, and the head of animals and poultry of all kinds has grown. I would say that the situation is shaping up favorably on the whole.

But ahead of us, comrades, is the most responsible period--harvest-time. The main task is to prepare the material and technical basis in good time and in a comprehensive manner, to harvest the crops in the shortest possible time and without losses. It is necessary to make maximum possible use of the ample opportunities offered by the summer season for further boosting the output of livestock-breeding products. What is really important is to build up reliable stocks of high-quality fodder for the forthcoming wintering of animals.

It is a no less important task to see to it that every kilogram of finished products reaches the consumer. In this field, much will depend on the efficient, well-coordinated and conscientious work of procurement, trade and transport organizations, processing enterprises, of all those through whose hands pass the valuable products needed by the people and gained by hard work.

Questions of Collective-Farm and State-Farm Economics

Comrades, the ensurance of stable and well-adjusted economic relations in agriculture, and also between sectors of the agro-industrial complex, plays an exceptionally important role in solving the problems of boosting

agricultural production. After the March 1965 plenum of the Central Committee, as I have already said, considerable work has been done in this direction.

Life does not stand still, however. In the past years, as a result of the party's and the people's tremendous efforts, the productive forces in the countryside have risen to a new level, the scale of production on collective farms and state farms increased, the socialization and division of labour have been further developed and economic relations between sectors of the agro-industrial complex have been expanded and become more involved. All these far-reaching changes call for further improvements in the economic machinery. This concerns questions of planning, incentives, strengthening the cost-accounting basis, and improving inter-relations between all sectors of the agro-industrial complex.

First of all, I want to deal with planning--a major lever in managing agricultural production. Of late, apart from fixed plans, the so-called general volumes of purchases and various additional assignments have begun to be set. Thus plurality of plans has, in effect, appeared. Somewhere, the practice of frequently and groundlessly amending them has been revived.

This detracts from the mobilizing role of plans, adversely affects the organization of production and economic activity, and stimulates but feebly the struggle for further boosting production. This situation should be remedied. In the next five-year plan period, a single plan of purchases of agricultural products should be drawn up for republics, territories and regions, districts, collective farms and state farms for the five years with a yearly breakdown.

At the same time incentives should be improved for farms securing high indicators in the growth of production and in the sales of products to the state. There are different proposals on this score. Apparently, questions of further improving the system of incentives for the sales of agricultural products should be thoroughly studied with the extensive participation of practical workers and by enlisting the services of scientific institutions so as to draft, say, within a year's time, specific proposals, which the Council of Ministers of the USSR should examine and submit for consideration by the CPSU Central Committee. Such principles of planning an incentives should be worked out that would create more favourable conditions for expanded reproduction at the present stage, improve the substantiation of plans and ensure the elimination of a subjective approach to drawing them up that still exists locally.

Thought should also be given to increasing the inter-connection between material incentives for state-farm workers and collective farmers and the results of their work, effective use of production assets and material resources. It is also important to improve the procedure of awarding bonuses to farm heads and specialists.

The comprehensive intensification of agriculture objectively widens and deepens its ties with the branches of industry, which supply the countryside with material and technical means and process raw materials. What is needed in such circumstances is well-organized cooperation between partners. Unfortunately, we have not yet succeeded in finally doing away with some negative phenomena in this matter.

Of fundamental importance is the question of prices on the manufactured products supplied to the countryside, and also of payment for the services rendered by the farm-machinery supply organization and several other organizations catering for collective farms and state farms. The facts of the last few years show that far from everything has been adjusted in this field.

All this should be properly analyzed so as to bring economic relations between sectors of the agro-industrial complex in line with the principles of socialist economic management.

In the last years, a great deal of work has been accomplished in the field of improving purchasing prices. However, everything has not yet been adjusted the way we would wish it to be. The prices of some kinds of products still fail to cover the outlays of collective farms and state farms. What does this lead to? The more products of these kinds are produced by farms, the greater are the losses they sustain, wittingly or unwittingly. The growth rate of production slows down, and at some places for this reason attempts are even being made to curtail it. Such a situation cannot be allowed to continue any longer. Of course, it is necessary, in the first place, consistently and steadily to raise labour productivity and to lower production costs. But, at the same time, one should agree to a certain rise in the prices of some products.

In this connection, a resolution has been passed to raise as from January 1, 1979, without changing retail prices, the state purchasing prices of milk, wool, karakul, mutton, potatoes and certain vegetables with a view to ensuring the profitability of producing them on collective farms and state farms. The additional sums to be paid to farms on account of the increased prices will approximate 3,200 million roubles a year.

The Council of Ministers of the USSR should continue the work of improving purchasing prices.

For the purpose of further strengthening the economies of collective farms and state farms and creating conditions for managing production on a self-supporting basis, it has also been decided to carry out several other measures. It has been thought advisable to exempt from income taxes collective farms whose profitability rate is below 25 percent, as compared to 15 percent in force now. The amount of compensation for losses by state farms from natural calamities is to be raised, with 1,000 million roubles from the state budget being made available for this purpose.

You know that in 1972 and in 1975 collective farms and state farms in many areas of the country found themselves, on account of an unprecedented drought, in exceptionally difficult circumstances, which could not but tell on their economies and lead to their considerable indebtedness. Therefore, for the purpose of improving the economies of these farms it has been deemed necessary to write off the collective farms' and state farms' debts under loans from the state bank to the sum of 7,300 million roubles and to defer the repayment of credits to the sum of 4,000 million roubles for a period of 12 years.

There is also the question of pensions for collective farmers. The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers passed a decision to advance the time schedules for implementing the 25th party congress's measures to improve the pension scheme for collective farmers. It is envisaged from January 1, 1980 to raise the collective farmers' minimum pensions by 40 percent. In the next five-year period it will evidently be necessary to bring it up to the level of industrial and office workers.

The measures we are planning to carry out in order to strengthen the collective and state farms economically involve, of course, additional state spending. But they open up new possibilities for a more rapid growth of collective and state farm production and it can be said with confidence that they will be more than recouped by additional grain, meat, milk and other agricultural produce contributed to the resources of the state.

But here I should like to say once again that returns in agriculture are not yet sufficient, compared with investment. And we all, beginning from the Central Committee, its departments, above all the Agricultural Department, as well as the USSR Council of Ministers, the State Planning Committee, the Ministry of Agriculture and other agricultural departments, party and local government executives of all levels should be fully aware of this. The task of better utilizing material and financial resources in the collective and state farms, and of increasing the efficiency of agricultural production in the present conditions should be given top priority. For this purpose it is necessary in all economic sectors from top to bottom to launch a still more vigorous drive for economy and thriftiness, for lower production costs and against instances of mismanagement and squandering. Only this way can lead to the efficient utilization of the countryside's economic potential.

As preparations were made for the plenary meeting, a number of questions arose dealing with improvement of management in agricultural production. They concerned the higher role and responsibility and greater rights and duties of the USSR Ministry of Agriculture and agricultural bodies in republics, territories, regions and districts, and soyuzselkhoztekhnika, better supplies and improved production and technical services for the collective and state farms. These questions deserve to be examined and are important in enhancing the efficiency of work.

The USSR Council of Ministers should, together with the republics, examine all these matters, formulate the necessary proposals and submit them to the CPSU Central Committee.

Greater Activity and Efficiency in Promoting Inter-Farm Cooperation

Comrades, specialization and concentration of production, that is, a further socialization of socialist production and labour as the Marxist-Leninists call it, is an imperative demand of our life, one of the decisive foundations of our advance. The Central Committee, having looked carefully into the performance of basis and also into the practice of the fraternal socialist countries, focussed on this major social development the attention of the entire party and the state and put it on planned lines. As you know, in May 1976 the CPSU Central Committee adopted a resolution on "Further Specialization and Concentration of Agricultural Production on the Basis of Inter-Farm Cooperation and Agro-Industrial Integration."

The Central Committee's decision has the full support of the party and the people and is regarded as a major political programmatic document. It embodies and furthers in specific conditions the ideas of the great cooperative plan put forward by Lenin.

With the publication of the resolution, fruitful work on a large scale started in the localities. Detailed plans have been made and are being put into effect for specialization and concentration of agricultural production, with more than 8,000 inter-farm and agro-industrial enterprises and associations functioning in the country at present. This is a new type of enterprise in the countryside, producing already large quantities of various products.

By cooperative efforts the collective and state farms set up modern enterprises for the production of meat and milk, for pedigree animal breeding, for the output of fodder. As a rule, labour productivity and rates of output growth at inter-farm livestock raising associations are higher than on the collective and state farms.

In crop farming, on the basis of cooperation, joint enterprises are being established for seed production, to grow vegetables, fruit, grapes and other crops. The high level of intensification in farming is inconceivable without inter-farm cooperation in the use of machinery, in the application of chemicals and in land improvement. Here, too, appropriate associations are being set up. Valuable experience in this respect, tested in practice, is available in Moldavia and other parts of the country. Apart from the output of farm produce, inter-farm cooperation is also being introduced in all other spheres of life in the countryside.

The well-considered organization of this important work makes it possible, with less spending and in less time, to attain the targets the party sets before agriculture. But we must remember that this is no simple work. In organizational, scientific, technical and economic terms it is undoubtedly far more complicated than, say, the enlargement of collective farms, that is, something we have done in the recent past.

Implementing the course we have taken in this matter requires day-to-day attention, concrete leadership, and detailed analysis of practical results. The party's course towards specialization and concentration of agricultural production does not mean at all the slackening of attention to some or other branches in the collective and state farms, and especially their curtailment. That would do harm to the national economy.

Inter-farm cooperation and the intensification of collective and state farm production are the only and most effective way of increasing the output of agricultural produce.

Unfortunately, there are facts on record when no necessary conclusions are drawn from the Central Committee's warnings on this question, with cuts in the head of livestock and even closure of whole farms tolerated. The basic question in conducting work on specialization and concentration is profound thought given to it, scientific substantiation and high production effect.

At the same time we cannot but be worried that the work to implement the Central Committee's resolution is not yet in full spate everywhere. If we look at the root of shortcomings and negative phenomena in the work on specialization and concentration of agricultural production, we may easily see that the main thing here is apparently the fact that among our cadres there are many people who have not yet grasped either the vital necessity of the profound meaning of all this work. Some give their own interpretations to the Central Committee's warning against haste in this undertaking. They have seen it as a possibility to stretch the work over many years. That is a mistake. The resolution is dealing not with deadlines, but with the quality of work. To do well does not mean doing it long.

Inter-farm cooperation is a big and complicated objective process. It cannot be held back, nor can it be hastened. The work should be carried out in a planned fashion, with careful consideration given to it, in conjunction with other measures for the intensification of agricultural production. This is, of course, voluntary undertaking, and we shall strictly adhere to this principle. But voluntariness and laissez-faire are anti-podal, [as received] not close cousins.

I have some hard words for individual union bodies and above all the USSR Ministry of Agriculture and the USSR State Planning Committee. They have not yet become centres for coordinating and directing all work on specialization and concentration of agricultural production in the country. Narrow departmental positions are not infrequently taken by some top executives of ministries and departments, particularly in the food, meat and dairy industry. Instead of vigorously collaborating with agricultural bodies in the development of production cooperation, they slow down this progressive process and occasionally, to put it mildly, do not recommend their farms to join in inter-farm cooperation, or seek to set up isolated associations.

These are the most essential conclusions and remarks that have to be taken into account in the further work on implementing the CPSU Central Committee's resolution. At the same time, as experience suggests, more concrete recommendations are needed on some fundamental aspects of the work being done. Particular attention and serious treatment should be given to a choice of the best organizational forms of specialization and concentration on the basis of inter-farm cooperation and agro-industrial integration when applied to the various branches and directions of agriculture. We need not all sorts of associations, but only those that really raise to a new level the socialist socialization of production and labour, are based on the latest achievements in science, engineering and technology, ensure the highest productivity and give a maximum of lowcost produce.

Our own practice offers a great variety of forms. The thing to be done is to examine them thoroughly and select the ones most suitable and most effective for each given branch.

In general, comrades, we should be more active in putting on a practical plane the work on specialization and concentration of agricultural production. Questions of inter-farm cooperation should become standing items in the agenda of rural party organizations, district, regional and republic leading bodies.

It must become a firm conviction of us all that by way of specialization and concentration of agricultural production through inter-farm cooperation and agro-industrial integration our agriculture, using the advantages of the socialist system, will be able greatly to quicken the rate of its advance and much more fully to satisfy the country's growing requirements in food and in raw materials for industry.

More Attention to Construction in the Countryside

Comrades, successful implementation of the big programme for boosting agriculture further is connected directly with the organization of capital construction. Concern for the development of rural construction is now a major component part of the party's agrarian policy.

Since the March 1965 plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee a great deal has been done to expand and raise the level of rural construction as a new branch of the national economy. I will remind you that specialized state building organizations were set up, united in the USSR Ministry of Rural Construction. The system we already have of inter-collective farm building organizations is increasing its capacities.

Over the past ten years the state and the collective farms have invested almost 16,000 million roubles in the provision of production facilities for rural construction. Some three million builders are now working on the construction of rural projects. This is a new and big section of the working class in the countryside. The Ministry of Rural Construction and inter-collective farm building organizations have already reached the mark of more than 10,000 million roubles' worth of building and assembly work a year.

This means that every year sees more and more installations built in the villages--livestock raising units, poultry farms, repair shops, agro-chemical centres, grain elevators, mixed food plants, storages for seeds, potatoes and vegetables, and hothouses.

Rural construction today is very important for solving social problems as well. The party is firmly committed to its line of radically improving the living, cultural and every-day conditions in the countryside. I have already said recently that a total of 450 million square metres of housing has been built in the rural localities in the past 13 years. You may recall that in the pre-war year 1940 this was the total housing available in all cities and towns of our country. Housing development both in the countryside and in cities is being out on an industrial basis. Rural communities are being developed comprehensively, according to existing master plans. Together with residential buildings modern public projects are being erected. Now it is not rare to see in a village a modern shopping centre, well-equipped public services centre, canteen or cosy cafe.

Not so long ago construction of creches and kindergartens in the villages was a very rare occasion and these as a rule were accommodated in primitive buildings. Since 1965 standard designs have been used to build pre-school establishments for nearly two million children, general educational schools for 11 million pupils, clubs and palaces of culture with a total seating capacity of eight million, and many public health and municipal service centres and sports grounds.

And yet rural construction still remains a bottleneck, I would say. Despite the measures taken the production facilities of construction in the countryside are as yet inadequate. More than one-third of building work is done by the collective and state farms by the economic method, and this greatly reduces the quality of building, results in delays and greater costs.

As a result of capital investment scattered over a large number of building projects, the time schedules for putting capacities in farming into operation are not observed, which increases the amount of construction in progress.

In design and building inadequate account is taken of the specific conditions of the countryside, and industrial components and structures are often mechanically introduced. I have already said that new construction is very expensive now. Over the past ten years, for example, the cost of accommodation per animal on milk farms has risen by more than three times, on pig-fattening complexes by four times. Instances are not rare when heavy materials are used in construction, there is unjustified sophistication in power circuits, and units are over-fitted with cumbersome equipment. On some new livestock-raising farms and complexes there are up to eight cubic metres of concrete per cow and up to 400 kilogrammes of metal per calf. Isn't that too heavy for the animals?

In designs used for rural building projects there are also serious failings, extravagances are tolerated, and slight account is taken of zonal features, which in the final analysis pre-determines greatly the low efficiency of capital investments. The present procedure for economic incentives and for assessing the work of buildings and designers has a negative effect. It stimulates building costlier, rather than cheaper projects.

There are many complaints and criticisms on the part of both builders and the farms about the provision of building sites with equipment and materials. Things are greatly confused and muddled here. Farm managers, in order to get complete sets of equipment for building projects, often have to go through dozens of stages and to send messengers to all parts of the country.

If we look at housing construction and the provisions of recreational and public service facilities in the countryside or the supply of water in steppe areas, we shall see that there are still more shortcomings over there. There is a systematic failure to carry out the plans to turn housing over for tenancy and complete the construction of child welfare facilities and other projects connected with the improvement of services, health care and recreational facilities for rural inhabitants in many districts, regions and republics.

We must make a sharper turn towards the construction and improvement of recreational and service facilities for agricultural workers in the countryside. It would be reasonable to ask the USSR Council of Ministers to draft concrete long-range plans by 1979 for improving the entire business of organizing industrial, housing, recreational and public service construction in the countryside, having allocated more funds for the purpose.

This programme should embrace a whole range of problems connected with accelerated development of industrial facilities for rural building complexes designed to put out full sets of light industrial structures of high degree of readiness at factory level for building industrial premises to be turned over to the customers ready for service, the creation of production units for carrying out special building and assembly work, measures to intensify housing construction, setting up of a network of rural house-building complexes and the development of wood panel house-building. Considering the importance of keeping manpower in the countryside, farm machine operators and specialists, first and foremost, we could afford to reallocate some of the general funds for nonproductive building in favour of the countryside.

There must be the right approach to rural construction, considering the specific characteristics of the life and interests of the rural population. Evidently, rural construction should be aimed at providing families, as a rule, with their own well-appointed houses complete with private holdings and backyard premises for domestic livestock, poultry as well as private means of conveyance.

It is very important to ensure the development of individual and cooperative housebuilding financed by the rural population with their own money. A relevant decision has been taken to stimulate individual homebuilding with long-term loans on easy terms.

It is necessary to give close attention to combining new building with reconstructing and modernizing business premises on collective farms and state farms, livestock premises, first and foremost. It may be recalled that in earlier years the collective farms and state farms have built a large number of fundamental standard-type premises. These have to be reconstructed and adapted to modern requirements. Such an approach, as has been pointed out more than once, makes it possible to apply forward-looking technologies of production at lower costs. However, this job has not yet assumed its due proportions. Designers are shirking it, builders do not see it as a paying proposition, and planning agencies and supply organizations do not provide for making equipment available to this end. The USSR Council of Ministers and appropriate departments must set things right in this matter and create the conditions to stimulate reconstruction work on rural industrial projects.

I should now like to touch on such an important issue as road building. The continued advance of agricultural production and enhancement of the living standards of the rural population are directly connected with the development of the network of motor roads--the major transport arteries, the life lines, one may say, of the countryside. Yet good roads are still far and few between. Agricultural losses because of the lack of roads are still too high.

The USSR Planning Committee and the councils of ministers of the constituent republics should have road building properly featured in economic and social development plans and duly kept up with financial and material resources.

Concern for manpower in rural construction is, as indeed everywhere else, a matter of paramount importance. The country's institutions of higher learning produce a great number of good specialists for industrial and urban construction. However, designing and building in the countryside have some specific features of their own. It would be right for the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education to train still more building engineers and architects expressly for employment in the countryside. National and local authorities must give more attention to training well-qualified building workers for the countryside within the vocational training system and to improving their living and working conditions.

It is well known that patronizing of the countryside by cities and industrial centres has a great part to play. Experience of recent years in this respect has offered quite a few valuable forms of this work to emulate. I am referring to the assistance provided for designing and building hothouse facilities, livestock farms, fodder producing establishments, housing, recreational and service facilities. Some enterprises are making certain types of machinery, mechanisms and spare parts which the countryside has in short supply, and training farm machine operators. A large amount of work is being done to improve recreational and cultural services for crop and stock farmers.

Much is being done in this direction by the party organizations of Moscow and Moscow region, Leningrad, Sverdlovsk, Kiev, Dniepropetrovsk, Volgograd, Minsk and Tashkent. The initiative taken and experience gained by these party organizations deserve to be seconded in every way by the party committees of other cities and industrial centres.

Organizational and Ideological Work in the Countryside

Comrades, the new stage in the drive to advance agriculture must be matched by a still higher standard of party guidance and better methods of mass work. We have every reason to expect the party organizations to cope with these tasks worthily.

Our party's prestige in the countryside is continuously rising. It goes much to the credit of the party and its local organizations that party contingents in the countryside have appreciably grown since the March plenary meeting of the Central Committee. The party organization in the countryside today has a membership of 5 million 800 thousand communists, 1 million 200 thousand more than in 1965. Two million 700 thousand full and candidate members of the party are engaged directly in agricultural production, primarily in its major sectors.

In short, rural communists are a big and efficient army of workers, primary party organizations are its backbone. It is these organizations that are directly responsible for the solution of all problems of production and education. It is their persistent and consistent work and their ability to rouse and organize people that are decisively instrumental in consistently and effectively carrying out the party's agrarian policy.

The experience of the past few years has amply proved how correct and far-sighted the Central Committee has been in reconstituting and consolidating district party committees as the principal political bodies in the countryside, and the authoritative vehicles of party guidance of the economy, social and cultural activities in the countryside. There are more than 3,000 of them now. The district party committees are increasingly applying a genuinely creative style of party work. We must go on enhancing the role of the rural district party committees. This is a job for the whole of our party to do.

Regional and territorial party committees and the central committees of the communist parties of the constituent republics are carrying on a vast amount of organizational work in agricultural management.

They have accumulated considerable experience in the practical application of the party's agrarian policy and marshalling the efforts of the party organizations, the soviets of people's deputies, trade unions, the young communist league and all agricultural workers to tackle the major problems of development of agricultural production and those of raising its efficiency.

However, it would be uncritical of ourselves to say that the work of all party committees is up to all modern requirements. We have to admit that certain party committees fail to give adequate attention to the economic and social processes under way in the countryside, to see all the new opportunities created for the faster growth of agricultural production or be always objective in assessing the state of things, sometimes tending to overrate the results achieved.

Sometime ago, as you know, the party's Central Committee reviewed the work of the Tambov regional party committee. It noted big shortcomings in the region's agricultural development and the style and methods of the regional party committee's work. The leadership the regional party committee provided had often been willful, sometimes in disregard of the opinion of the core of the local party organization and specialists, and in commanding tones. The regional party committee failed to rely properly on district party committees and primary party organizations. It tuned down criticism and self-criticism.

Those are, of course, isolated instances, but isolated though they are, they are utterly inadmissible and intolerable in the modern context. The Party's Central Committee could not put up with such a state of things, and drew, as you know, the necessary organizational conclusions.

The Central Committee's plenary meeting in December 1977 considered the issue of discipline and that of a high sense of responsibility of manpower as one of full urgency. This is something I must speak about today as well. It is one of the major fundamentals of all our activities. Take, for example, the progress of fulfillment of procurement plans.

In any year, whether good or lean, in every region, territory or republic, we have some collective farms and state farms failing to carry out their plans of sales of certain products to the state. This is principally attributable to a lack of responsibility and an inadequately exacting attitude to manpower. References are sometimes made to difficulties and objective causes, but whatever the difficulties may be, nobody has the right to damage the common interests and break state discipline. The regional and territorial party committees as well as the central committees of the communist parties of the constituent republics must step up their efforts to end such practices and root out whatever breeds them, improve all forms of party, government and public supervision.

Manpower work has been and remains to be the key problem of party guidance of agriculture. In this area, as I have already said, much has been done, but far from everything has yet been done. What worries us most is the issue of middle management--sector, team and farm chiefs. Agricultural specialists make up so far only 40 percent of the staff engaged in these jobs. There are many educated people in the countryside today, and we must constantly look for and find among them those who could make good business managers. Party organizations must show more concern for the selection, allocation and training of this type of manpower.

More about farm machine operators. Our country has a wideranging system to train them. But, unfortunately, far from all of the trained farm machine operators do actually on collective and state farms.

The problems of training and keeping farm machine operators in the countryside are a matter of our constant concern, but we have not yet found a full solution to this problem. A study of this issue has shown that what matters increasingly in this respect is the conditions of life and work and the extent of meeting the cultural and intellectual needs of the people. Business executives, party and trade union organizations must make fuller use of the considerable potentialities every collective farm and state farm has for this purpose.

It is not only production but relations between people, their everyday life, their cultural education, mentality and consciousness that are an object of the party's unfailing attention. One of the major tasks before us today is to combine agricultural production with culture seen in the broadest possible sense as the culture of work, everyday life and human relationship. You know that since the 25th congress, the CPSU Central Committee has considered some issues involved in extending the material facilities for cultural and recreational institutions in the countryside and improving the operation of the schools of general education and those of the vocational training system.

The only way to look at this matter today is this: farm managers, party committees, local government and trade union bodies must show no less concern for meeting the farm workers' demand for housing and service facilities as well as their increased cultural requirements, as they do for the development of production.

The task of advancing agriculture, to quote Lenin, "cannot possible be fulfilled by single acts of heroic fervour; it requires the most prolonged, most persistent and most difficult mass heroism in plain, everyday work". (V.I. Lenin, COLL. WORKS Vol 3, p. 423)

And this heroism of plain, everyday work of millions upon millions finds its striking expression in the actual practical work and in the productive, social and political activities of the masses, in the sweeping scope of socialist emulation. What matters to us is both the concrete economic results of labour competition and the great educational potentialities it offers.

The ultimate economic objective of emulation is to produce more grain, meat, milk and other products and at lower costs. And it is important for us to know by what particular means the best results have been achieved, and for what particular reasons some have moved up in front while others have stayed where they were, and still others have fallen behind, and why, finally, what has proved possible on one collective farm or state farm has not been achieved on another? Why is there still such a discrepancy between economic performances?

In short, there is ample room for action by the party, trade union, YCL organizations and soviets of people's deputies, as well as for our press, television and radio, indeed, for all who can and must bring into play their experience, tried out by science and practical activity. We must give every possible support to the initiatives of farm workers, such as the drive of crop and stock farmers to raise bumper harvests, achieve the highest possible rates of livestock productivity, and reduce production costs; that of farm machine operators to make the utmost use of the technical potentialities of machinery; and that of entire collective farms and state farms to step up the productivity of their labour and fulfil the assignment of the present five-year plan ahead of schedule.

It is up to the rural communists to lead the emulation. The important thing is for all party organizations and communists in the countryside to be first to grasp the full meaning of the targets of the party's agrarian policy at the present stage and the ways of attaining them. They are expected to apply their methods of party persuasion and communist education to enable millions of people to understand these tasks, inspire them and concentrate their efforts on carrying into effect the party's program of agricultural development. Every communist must set a model of selfless work. He must be an able organizer and a carrier of advanced know-how, taking the common cause as one of his own vital concern and striving to create an atmosphere of close-knit, selfless and creative collective work. A communist cannot and must not close his eyes to a careless attitude to one's job, nor tolerate any facts of mismanagement, heavy drinking, loafing or any other misbehaviour dishonouring the Soviet man.

Comrades, we have golden ears of wheat in our state emblem. They are not there by chance. Our bread is the product of the combined effort of the peasant, worker and intellectual. The advance of agriculture is an inalienable part of the country's allround economic progress. The economy, as Lenin emphasized, involves "the deepest roots of the human life of hundreds of millions". And it is in matters affecting the life of millions, the conditions of their everyday life and work that the communists have the most serious politics to pursue and the major route to follow in their organizational, ideological and political work.

The solution of the big and complex problems posed by the CPSU Central Committee in agriculture will make it possible to raise still higher the people's standard of living. This is the meaning of the measures this plenary meeting has been called to consider. It will take a hard effort, energy and creative initiative of the masses, as well as the entire rich experience of the party and the knowledge and organizing ability of its core to achieve the targets fixed.

Let me express my conviction that the party organizations, communists, YCLers and workers of town and countryside will do everything to translate the decisions of this plenary meeting into reality.

CSO: 1802

ON MEASURES TO IMPROVE THE TRAINING OF PARTY AND SOVIET CADRES IN
REPUBLIC AND INTEROBLAST HIGHER PARTY SCHOOLS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 pp 44-46

[CPSU Central Committee Statement]

[Text] The 13 June 1978 CPSU Central Committee decree dealing with this matter points out that the central committees of communist parties of union republics, and the party kraykoms and obkoms, together with the rectorates and faculties of republic and interoblast higher party schools are doing considerable work to train and upgrade the skills of party and soviet cadres. In the past 10 years these schools have graduated over 16,000 people most of whom are successfully working in party and soviet organs, ideological institutions, and organizations.

Yet, the CPSU Central Committee considers that the level of cadre training in republic and interoblast higher party schools is not entirely consistent with contemporary requirements and the tasks formulated at the 25th Party Congress and subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums. The school curriculae and programs do not adequately reflect the topical problems of the theory and practice of the building of communism. The training of the students is insufficiently related to reality and the experience of organizational and ideological work. The ways and means of organization of the training process require substantial improvements.

The CPSU Central Committee has made it incumbent upon the central committees of communist parties of union republics, party kraykoms and obkoms, and rectorates of higher party schools to elaborate and implement measures to advance cadre training and skills.

Using previous experience and the new and effective training methods, the higher party schools must arm the students with solid knowledge in the field of Marxist-Leninist theory and CPSU policy, methods of party leadership in the development of the economy and culture, and the art to work among the masses. Particular attention should be paid to the profound study of the historical experience of the CPSU and the topical economic,

socio-political, and international problems developed in the materials and decisions of party congresses, CPSU Central Committee plenums, and works by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and other party leaders.

The CPSU Central Committee has approved in essence the curriculae of republic and interoblast higher party schools. The CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences and the higher party schools have been instructed to ensure on the basis of the new curriculae the formulation and publication of programs and training-method aids.

It has been resolved to open three year correspondence departments at the higher party schools at the Minsk, Baku, Moscow, Leningrad, Gor'kiy, Novosibirsk, Rostov, Saratov, Sverdlovsk, and Khabarovsk higher party schools (based on higher education); five year correspondence departments (based on secondary education) will be opened at the same schools. Three year correspondence departments will be opened at the higher party schools at the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee, and the Alma-Ata and Tashkent higher party schools; five year correspondence departments will be opened at the Vil'nyus and Odessa higher party schools.

It is considered expedient for the higher party schools to have the following chairs: CPSU history, Marxist-Leninist philosophy, political economy, scientific communism, party construction, Soviet state construction and law, international communists, workers, and national-liberation movement, economics and organization of industrial production and construction, economics and organization of agricultural production, Russian language and literature, and foreign languages; for the higher party schools of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee and Moscow, Leningrad, Alma-Ata, and Novosibirsk higher party schools, chairs of journalism as well. The chairs will have training-method offices.

The CPSU Central Committee has made it incumbent upon the rectorates of the higher party schools to improve the organization of the training process, raise the ideological-theoretical and scientific-methodical level of the lectures, seminars, and practical training classes, apply new forms of training more energetically, and make more extensive use of motion pictures, television, and other modern technical facilities in the course of the training process.

One of the basic training methods, the decree notes, should be the independent study by the students of the works of K. Marx, F. Engels, and V. I. Lenin, and the CPSU documents. Systematic help should be given to the students in this work. There should be consultations and discussions on theory. The students should submit and discuss in training groups papers and reports on topical problems of Marxist-Leninist theory and party and Soviet construction.

The differentiated training of the students, based on their experience and future specialization, should be organized at the final training stage, in the following directions: Party organization work, ideological work, party management of the national economy, and Soviet construction.

The central committees of communist parties of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Azerbaydzhan, and Lithuania, the Khabarovskiy Kraykom, the Moscow, Leningrad, Gorkovskaya, Novosibirskaya, Odesskaya, Rostovskaya, Saratovskaya, and Sverdlovskaya oblast party committees and rectorates of higher party schools have been instructed to ensure the further strengthening of the schools with highly skilled professorial-instructor cadres.

The CPSU Central Committee has suggested the systematic organization of addresses to the students by secretaries of central committees of communist parties of union republics, party kraykoms and obkoms, chairmen of councils of ministers of union and autonomous republics and of kray and oblast executive committees, senior ministry and department personnel, major scientists, national economic specialists, and noted men of culture.

It has been deemed expedient for the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences to organize courses for upgrading the skills of teachers in republic and interoblast higher party schools. Teachers will undergo systematic practical training for up to one month provided by party and soviet organs and with newspaper, radio, and television editors.

It has been recommended to the rectorates of higher party schools to improve scientific research on topical problems of Marxist-Leninist theory, party and state construction, and managing the development of the economy and culture. The active participation of party school professors, teachers, and students in such work must be ensured. The results of scientific developments must be used more extensively in the training process and in the formulation of suggestions aimed at improving the activities of local party organizations. The republic and interoblast higher party schools will set up laboratories to sum up the experience gained in party and soviet work.

The CPSU Central Committee has deemed it expedient to set up, on the basis of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, a council of rectors of higher party schools to coordinate training-method, scientific research and publishing activities.

The central committees of communist parties of union republics, and the party kraykoms and obkoms must ensure the careful selection for training at higher party schools of experienced and well prepared party members with promotion possibilities, as follows:

Two-year departments: Party, soviet, and ideological workers with higher education, under 40 years of age, recruited, above all, among secretaries of okrug, city, and rayon party committees, secretaries of party committees

of big party organizations, chairmen and deputy chairmen of executive committees of okrug, city, and rayon soviets, and senior personnel within the apparatus of the central committees of communist parties of union republics, kray and oblast party committees, councils of ministers of union and autonomous republics, kray and oblast executive committees, ministries, departments, ideological organizations and establishments, secretaries of kray and oblast Komsomol committees, and other categories of party and soviet workers;

Four-year departments: Personnel with secondary education under 35 years of age, among the former secretaries of primary party organizations, senior party gorkom and raykom workers, national economy specialists and leading production workers who are members of elected party and soviet organs.

The CPSU Central Committee decree stipulates that individuals who have completed the two-year primary and three-year correspondence departments shall be issued diplomas for completed higher party-political training; individuals who have completed the four-year basic departments and five-year correspondence departments shall be awarded diplomas for higher education and higher party-political education.

5003

CSO: 1802

BREZHNEV SPEECH AT MINSK CEREMONY

Moscoe KOMMUNIST in Russian No. 10, Jul 78 pp 47-54

[Speech by Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at a ceremony in Minsk to present awards to the capital of Belorussia--live

[Excerpts] Respected comrades, dear people of Minsk, I have been entrusted with the responsible and honorary mission of presenting to the city of Minsk, the capital of Soviet Belorussia--which has earned the honorary title of Hero City--the motherland's highest award: the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal. [applause]

Allow me, on this ceremonial and festive day, to cordially congratulate you and all the working people of the republic on this high award. [applause] Accept the warmest congratulations from the CPSU Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet Presidium and the USSR Council of Ministers. [applause]

All Soviet people today send their congratulations and greetings to the glorious Belorussian people, who are courageous, steadfast, love work, are modest, possess a developed sense of international duty, and are assuredly advancing in unity of purpose with all nations and nationalities of our motherland. [applause]

An award to cities is also, of course, an award to people. People build cities, defend them, raise them up from the ruins, provide them with amenities and transform them. Your city has lasting revolutionary traditions.

The First Russian Social Democratic Workers Party Congress took place here. The Minsk Red Guard volunteers, who were sent to revolutionary Petrograd, took part in the storming of the Winter Palace. And in the stern days of the war and peaceful construction Minsk communists were real leaders and organizers of the masses, consistent in their implementation of the party's political course. [applause]

Today we address our first words of thankfulness, gratitude and very great respect to those thousands and thousands of people of Minsk who opposed the Hitlerites' military machine with their heroism and will for victory. [applause] Minsk was seized by the enemy, but was never conquered. [applause] Under the leadership of the underground party committee, an extended network of conspiratory groups and organizations operated in the city. Neither mass executions nor the atrocities of the punitive forces were able to crush the heroes. Minsk became a hell for the occupiers. The enemy did not feel safe for 1 day. There were 1,500 combat operations-- that is the impressive result of the 3 years of struggle by the Minsk underground fighters.

Minsk was not alone. Minsk men and women were linked by thousands of connections with the partisan movement, which covered all of Belorussia. A total of 213 partisan brigades and 258 separate partisan detachments fought courageously behind enemy lines. This was truly a people's sacred war. [applause]

There are war veterans in every town, in every Belorussian village-- partisans, members of secret organizations, frontline soldiers. There are many here in this hall. It is hard to find the words to express our boundless gratitude to those who saved their motherland in one of its gravest tests. Our thanks to you, and good health, dear friends! [applause]

Belorussia lost over 2 million sons and daughters. We bow our heads before the deeds of those who have entered immortality and who accepted death in saving their homeland. I ask that we stand in honor of the glorious memory of these heroes. [sounds of movement as the gathering apparently rises in its seats followed by a short pause]

Comrades: The salvos of the victory salute have died down. The epic of war has become an epic of reconstruction. Many of you probably remember Minsk as it was at the end of the war--ruins, ashes, sites overgrown with weeds. The city virtually ceased to exist. Then there was another battle, another struggle--a struggle not only to raise the capital of Belorussia from the ruins, but to make it even finer. Relying on the aid of the CPSU Central Committee, Soviet Government and the fraternal support of all union republics, the people of Minsk rebuilt their city in an unprecedentedly short time. Honor and glory to those who took their part in the restoration even though they didn't have time to take off their overcoats, or shirts, or embrace their closest friends and relatives returning from the front, or shed tears at their loss. [applause]

The high award to Minsk is your award also, dear comrades [applause]

I have been to many, very many of the country's cities, and I can say in all sincerity that present-day Minsk is one of the most beautiful. [applause]

Driving through the streets of Minsk, I had a feeling of profound satisfaction. This is a city that delights in the unity and wholeness of its architectural concept; modern planning; the fine way in which it has been built; the cleanliness of its streets and parks. Minsk today is not just a big industrial center of the republic, but of the entire country.

The vehicles, tractors, machine-tools, instruments, computers and optical items you produce have a fine reputation. The annual production of the city is 72 times greater than in 1940. Over 1/3 of the items have the quality mark. Minsk can be justly proud of its young but already mature science. It has boldly made its mark with considerable achievements in such fields of knowledge as physics, technical cybernetics, mathematics, nuclear power and others. Your scientists offer a good example of fruitful ties between science and production. Minsk is the center of Belorussian culture, a city that is making a worthy contribution to the development of all of multinational Soviet culture. There is a concentration here of large educational establishments where highly qualified specialists are trained, not only for the republic and the country, but also for friendly states. Your theaters are popular and widely known, as are your song and dance groups.

It is particularly pleasant to note that today in the museums of Minsk, in the names of its streets and in its majestic monuments, the memory of the town's fighting past, of the heroes of Minsk, is carefully preserved--a memory that has served and still serves as a source of patriotic feelings and labor enthusiasm. [applause]

The achievements of Soviet Belorussia, including its capital, are a living embodiment of the Leninist national policy and a realization of the creative might of the people's spiritual strength, which has been emancipated by socialism. [applause]

In congratulating the workers, engineers, technicians, scientists, cultural figures, doctors, teachers, all toilers of Minsk on this high award, I would like to express the certainty that the people of Minsk will continue to carry high the banner of their city, a banner covered with the glory of combat and labor achievements. [applause]

Under the leadership of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and the Minsk Gorkom, the 100,000-strong detachment of Minsk communists is constantly perfecting the forms and methods of party work, training splendid cadres, party, administrative, economic, trade union and Komso-mol leaders, and is possessing a feeling for the new and capable through

their resolving of the tasks set by life and by the period of advanced socialism. This is worthy of a high appraisal, and I wish you great success, dear friends. [applause] I am convinced that the communists of Minsk and Belorussia will make a worthy contribution to implementing the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress. [applause]

In the life of your republic there is much that is interesting and much that it would be useful for comrades in other republics to take a closer look at. The initiative, purposefulness and persistence with which questions of economic and social development are being resolved are especially pleasing. A great merit of Belorussia's party organization and its labor collectives is the persistent and high economic growth rates. You successfully fulfilled the Ninth 5-Year Plan, and in the first 2 years of the 10th 5-Year Plan, the volume of industrial production has grown by 16.2 percent as against the plan figure of 13.9 percent. Above-plan production worth R590 million has been manufactured. Well, what can one say? You are working well. Keep it up! [applause]

Notable successes have also been achieved in Belorussia in developing agriculture. There was a time when Belorussian land was considered infertile: 7 or 8 quintals of grain per hectare was virtually the maximum yield. But now what? The average annual yield of graincrops in the Ninth 5-Year Plan amounted to 21.3 quintals, and in the last 2 years it has been 25 quintals per hectare. This is what modern agricultural equipment does; this is what a thrifty and wise attitude to the land means. [applause]

It is important that not only the rural toilers but also all who supply tractors, combines and other machinery and mineral fertilizers to the countryside and who carry out land improvement work, should multiply their efforts in the struggle to further increase agricultural production.

Comrades: We will all have to work very strenuously in 1979 and 1980. In order to fulfill the tasks of the 5-year period as a whole, it is necessary to considerably increase the rates of production and labor productivity and improve many other indexes in the remaining 2 years. Raising production efficiency is a major task put forward by the party. We are mobilizing all collectives to resolve this. This applies fully to you, also. Every possible reinforcement regarding the observance of economy, strengthening financial autonomy at all levels and above all the strict and steadfast observance of plan discipline are of special importance in this connection.

What does observance of plan discipline mean? It means drawing up a plan on time and insuring good coordination and balance of tasks regarding all indexes and branches of the republic's economy. This means the unconditional fulfillment of the plan tasks for all indexes without exception. It is often the case that our plan indexes are treated as if they were

divided into main and secondary ones. People strive to fulfill the plan according to the main ones and have a carefree attitude to the allegedly secondary ones. This cannot be tolerated. The plan must be considered to be fulfilled only if the tasks for all indexes have been fulfilled. Observing plan discipline means establishing efficient and daily supervision on progress toward fulfilling plans. It also means strictly calling into account violators of plan discipline. The situation and changes in objective conditions might require the introduction of some corrections to the plan task. This is understandable and unavoidable. But there are corrections made sometimes that are in no way the result of objective need and are designed to make life easier for some of our economic executives. It is as if they legitimize negative deviations from plan indexes. Such amendments to the plan often result in disorganization and idleness by individual workers. As a result the plan loses its mobilizing force and turns into a screen covering up shortcomings in the work. The leaders of the higher organizations, if they make concessions to those who like lightened plans, show lack of principle and flabbiness.

Such juggling with the plan must receive principled party assessment. We do not need dubious kindness at the expense of the state. I am posing this question of observing plan discipline so strongly here not because things are particularly bad in Minsk or in Belorussia; with you, the picture is rather positive. I have been told that at your enterprises, fewer and fewer cases of infringement of plan discipline are seen. This is the result of much party-organization and ideological-educative work by the party organizations. It would be well to consolidate that experience and circulate it widely. [applause] The successes of Belorussia in all economic and social construction work are beyond doubt, but when we rightly assess what has been done, we communists see unsolved questions.

Unfortunately, we cannot but say that in your republic--including Minsk--there are still backward enterprises and construction organizations. At many works and factories of the republic, the yield on capital is growing too slowly. There are now a few cases of overconsumption of metal, raw materials, fuel and electricity. Equipment is not being operated so as to give a good factor of idling-time reduction [koeffitsient smennosti]. The list could be continued: you, of course, know better than I do what enormous reserves [words indistinct] have not been brought into use and what shortcomings you have. [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1522 GMT on 25 June in a report on Brezhnev's speech omits the phrase "and what shortcomings you have"]

It is a matter of honor for the party organization to involve all the workers of the town and countryside in the all-round use of these reserves. The CPSU Central Committee rightly hopes that the communists and working people of Belorussia, while maintaining the assured and stable pace of the republic's advance, will be able to successfully fulfill the tasks of the 5-year plan and emerge on new fronts of economic and social progress. [applause]

Comrades, here on Belorussian soil, over which the bells of Kahtyn sound like a tragic warning, one feels particularly clearly the importance of the steadfast struggle for peace being conducted by the Soviet Union and the struggle not to permit the outbreak of the conflagration of a fresh world war.

The special UN General Assembly session on disarmament is now coming to an end in New York. It has again confirmed the most profound interest of all of mankind in halting the arms race. The overwhelming majority of UN members have spoken in favor of disarmament. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries put forward a broad, bold and simultaneously realistic program at the session for a full halt to the arms race. The proposals have been at the center of the businesslike discussion at the assembly. The session also showed that the leaders of a number of leading NATO countries, and above all the United States, are clearly unwilling to show a constructive approach to the solving the tasks of disarmament.

What other interpretation can one give to holding the NATO Council session in Washington, where a new long-term arms program was adopted, while exactly the opposite subject--of how to curb the arms race and implement disarmament--was being simultaneously discussed in New York at the special session of the UN General Assembly. Surely, this position disregards the vital concerns and expectations of peace-loving peoples. The outcome is as follows: The NATO countries make their real policy in Washington and in New York, it turns out, they take part in discussions as a distraction so as not to be subjected to justified criticism and condemnation.

The Peking rulers are acting in unison with this position. It was as if their representative got his rostrums mixed up. He should have delivered his bellicose speech not at the United Nations but at the NATO bloc session. By the way, Peking's line is given a worthy assessment in Washington. Recently, attempts have been made in the United States--and at a high level and quite cynically at that--to play the Chinese card against the USSR. This is a short-sighted and dangerous policy. I hope its authors do not have to bitterly repent (raskayatsya) it.

The General Assembly session is drawing to a close but the ideas and proposals put forward at it will undoubtedly continue to live and will have their influence. The struggle for real measures in the sphere of curbing the arms race and disarmament continues and must be strengthened. [applause]

One of the most important directions in this field is the Vienna talks on the limitation of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. I have frequently had occasion to discuss this problem, and, to tell the truth, I have done so with a heavy heart. Indeed, the 15th round of the talks has begun. They have been going on for nearly 5 years now, but so far there have been no practical results. Yet the question is not a trivial one; it is of the utmost importance for Europe and for the entire international

situation. After considering the situation in all its aspects, the socialist countries have taken another important step to get the Vienna talks moving again. Our countries have put forward proposals in Vienna, new wide-ranging and concrete proposals, taking into account the whole considerable experience of those talks.

What is their main feature? First, they are completely clear and precise proposals. They name concrete figures for the Soviet and U.S. forces to be withdrawn in the first stage; and those figures are substantial. The USSR, for its part, is willing to withdraw, in the course of a year, a total of 3 divisions together with their military equipment, including about 1,000 tanks. Secondly, the reduction of NATO and Warsaw Pack armed forces would be carried out in such a way as to preserve their balance, or, as it is called, parity.

As a result of the force reduction of all countries for each of the groupings in central Europe, it is proposed to establish an identical common ceiling. Incidentally, the actual idea of such a ceiling corresponds to what was proposed by the Western countries; although, of course, we firmly believe that none of the participants has the right, hiding behind the backs of others, to evade reduction, or, still less, to increase its armaments at the expense of the others reduction. The socialist countries are proposing to their partners a reasonable and realistic compromise. In putting forward their proposals, they have met the other side even more than half-way. We appeal to the NATO countries: Let us, at last, get down to business. A basis for agreement certainly already exists. Now everything depends upon the political will of the West. The achievement of agreement in Vienna would enable us to go on to discuss other specific questions of European military detente of interest to both sides.

The improved European political climate is one of the most important peaceful gains of the last decade. This was particularly evident during our recent visit to the FRG. There is hardly any European country within which the path of normalization of mutual relations was so strewn with both objective and subjective obstacles, where every step was so complex. Yet today, relations between the USSR and the FRG, without ignoring the negative moments, have become one of the important elements of stability in Europe and detente on the European Continent.

The Soviet Union and France have come along in the development of relations. Our relations are developing well in all respects with Italy, Switzerland and Austria, [as heard: Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1522 GMT on 25 June, in reporting Brezhnev's speech, lists countries as "Italy, Sweden and Austria"], not to mention our neighbor, friendly Finland.

The visit to the Soviet Union by Turkish Prime Minister Ecevit was a real contribution to the development of peaceful cooperation between the countries that took part in the all-European conference. The talks with him and the signing of the political document on the principles of neighborliness and friendly cooperation between the USSR and Turkey are an important stage in developing our relations on the path marked out by Lenin and Ataturk.

I entirely agree with the words of Federal Chancellor Schmidt recently speaking from the General Assembly rostrum that there is considerably more mutual trust in Europe now than at any time during the past decades.

But this common possession of peace-loving states in Europe must be constantly supported, strengthened and expanded. This is particularly important now that the international situation is again becoming more acute. It is precisely Europe which can in practice show how it is necessary to coexist, cooperate and work together.

The struggle for lasting peace is the cause not only of governments but also of peoples. Back in the middle of the last century Karl Marx called on the working class to master the secrets of international policy, to actively struggle for peace among the peoples. This idea lives on in the consciousness and deeds of the broad masses of working people and their political vanguard.

The vital interests of the working people of all countries demand that all the good that has been achieved on the world arena in recent years should not be wiped out and that headway should be made toward a really stable peace for all peoples. With the combined efforts of all peace-loving forces, this aim can and, we believe, will be achieved. [applause]

Comrades: The increasingly strong cooperation of the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries has become in our time a very important constituent part of international life. Soviet Belorussia is an active builder of remarkable and firm bridges of friendship, spanning the waters of the Bug and the Soviet Union's borders with other socialist countries. The participation of your enterprises in international socialist integration, your lively friendly ties with Poland's voivodship, Czechoslovakia's regions and the districts of the GDR and Bulgaria and with the other socialist countries, are convincing confirmation of this. [applause]

The flights of international space crews are becoming a brilliant symbol of the new level of cooperation among socialist countries. Recently we feted the first cosmonaut from socialist Czechoslovakia. There are joint flights ahead with representatives of the other socialist countries.

Let us wish the heroes of space great successes. They truly carry the banner of socialism, peace and the friendship of peoples high above the earth. [applause]

Dear comrades: I cordially congratulate you once again, and wish all those present in this hall, all the working people of Minsk and Soviet Belorussia, great creative successes in the struggle for the fulfillment of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and the targets [applause] the targets of the 10th 5-Year Plan. [applause]

In conclusion, dear people of Minsk, I would like to say to you that I feel great satisfaction from this new meeting with your fine town and its remarkable people. [applause]

Permit me now to read out the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on conferring on Minsk the honorary title of Hero-City: [applause]

Permit me on behalf of the Central Committee and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to present the city of Minsk with the high award. [applause]

Dear comrades, permit me as a memory of this notable day and as a memory of our meeting to present to you and in your person all the inhabitants of Minsk a commemorative gift, a picture of Red Square. [applause]

It is a picture by the well-known Soviet artist, Comrade Kitayev. The convincing, vivid images of the picture convey the spirit of the unbreakable friendship of the peoples of our country and their loyalty to the ideals of communism and peace on earth. [prolonged stormy applause]

CSO: 1802

LOYALTY TO THE LENINIST NORMS OF PARTY LIFE AND MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 pp 55-65

[Article by A. Masyagin, candidate of historical sciences]

[Text] I.

In his book "What Is to Be Done?", which became a most important landmark in the elaboration of the foundations of the theory of a party of a new type, summing up the results of the previous stages in the revolutionary struggle, and assessing the incoming stage, V. I. Lenin wrote: "Here we are shifting from the field of history to that of the present and, partially, the future." This means that "the truly progressive detachment of the most revolutionary class will take over from the opportunistic rear guard" ("Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 6, pp 182-183).

Lenin's prediction proved to be accurate. The second RSDWP Congress was held one and a half years after these writings, a congress whose universal-historical significance is that it organized the party of the working class in Russia on the basis of the ideological, political, and organizational principles formulated by the leader. It became the type of new revolutionary organization which proved to be able not only to lead the masses to the storming of the obsolete exploiting system but to head the building of a new world and to resolve the great problems included in the constructive plan, a party which truly embodied the future.

Today the CPSU's policy which expresses in a concentrated way the interests of the working people and its tremendous organizational and ideological-educational work determine, to a decisive extent, the pace, nature, and direction of socioeconomic changes. The party's leading role has assumed a complex universal nature. It permanently keeps track of problems of economics and politics, ideology and social life, and processes developing in the international arena.

As was noted at its 25th Congress, the source of the powerful influence exerted by the CPSU is not a typical but a most vital characteristic. It lies in the revolutionary experience of the generations, the organic ties between party and people, and their inflexible loyalty to the Leninist ideals and principles.

The norms of party life which determine the nature of party membership, internal life, structure, and leadership principles, and thanks to which the vanguard role of the party members is practically implemented, has been comprehensively tested in the crucible of history and have legitimately been clearly and efficiently reflected in the CPSU bylaws. Starting with the Second RSDWP Congress, they were formulated under Lenin's direct guidance. Their objective base and vital necessity were confirmed through decades of revolutionary activities and the building of a new society. As long as the Communist Party is fighting for the final objectives of the workers' movement, the Leninist norms of party life and principles of party management will retain their effectiveness, developing and enriching themselves.

Developed socialism faces party activities with ever new requirements, for the socialist society itself is steadily reaching ever higher levels of progress. One of the characteristics of developed socialism is that at this stage the possibilities inherent in the socialist system begin to expand immeasurably; the beneficial changes effect all facets of social life including those which were not adequately developed in the past by virtue of objective reasons.

The problems to which, under socialist conditions, the party has always ascribed a basic significance were comprehensively considered at the 25th CPSU Congress: Building the material and technical base of communism, equalizing the two forms of ownership and the cultural-living conditions of town and country, eliminating major disparities between mental and physical labor, eliminating distinctions among classes, and ensuring the communist education of the working people.

At the same time, today a new range of problems and areas of social life on which attention is being focused to an ever greater extent and which are shifting ever more noticeably toward the focal point of the party's policies, have become particularly outstanding. This includes, for example, the set of socio-cultural measures which has now been given the well-established name of "social program"; the ever more thorough elaboration of management problems; the systematic development of socialist democracy, particularly in production work, within the labor collective; problems of the socialist way of life; economic integration with the socialist countries; and protection and rational utilization of the environment.

At the mature socialist stage that which K. Marx indicated in his time is taking place in the life of our society: " . . . in the course of its historical development, the system turns into integrity" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch" [Works], Vol 46, Part I, p 229). The party had already become such a system. Its development of democratic norms, organizational principles, methods for communist upbringing and work with cadres, and the strengthening of discipline are creating favorable conditions for a rich internal life, the factual exchange of ideas, experience, and information, and the accumulation of knowledge on the course of social processes for purposes of their analysis, comparison, summation, and drawing of practical conclusions. It would be difficult to overestimate all this from the viewpoint

of the party's functioning as the vital center of the socialist political system. The harmonious and comprehensive development of the party itself guarantees the success of our dynamically developing society.

From the very beginning of the struggle for the party Lenin ascribed a tremendous importance to its development as a single organism. According to Vladimir Il'ich it was only the creation of a "great . . . entity: A party," an organization whose members were joined through a "single great party link" could give the revolutionary struggle a stable and purposeful nature. The conversion of the party into an "integral political organism" living its "autonomous political life" is based on the Leninist norms and principles. The steady transformation of activities in their totality into a law governing the function of this organism leads, in Lenin's words, "to the creation of a common party experience, the creation of party traditions and continuity," ensuring the "steady guidance of party life" and "planning."

Essentially, concern for molding a party whose internal rules would be inviolable and impervious to circumstantial fluctuations runs through the entire inordinately comprehensive, intensive, and truly gigantic work done by Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. The leader's remark to the effect that "throughout . . . we have emphasized the tremendous importance of continuity in party development . . ." ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 12, p 85), as well as many of his other statements confirm the persistence with which he strived to promote the highest possible respect for the norms, rules, and principles governing party life and the foundations of its activities.

The most important result of our party's progress toward the building of socialism and communism is that, guiding this process, the party itself organically becomes an ever more intrinsic part of the fabric of developing social relations. Its influence on society and, in turn, society's influence on it become ever deeper and comprehensive. This is one of the basic sources of the organic integrity and dynamism of the social system, its political stability, and its inviolable internal unity discussed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the extraordinary Seventh Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, describing the characteristics of the developed socialist society.

The systematic observance and assertion of the Leninist norms and principles remains the inviolable law governing the development of the party. Defending them and fighting their violation, the party has always displayed high principle-mindedness.

The decisions of the 23rd, 24th, and 25th CPSU Congresses promote a single line toward the basic problems of party construction. At each congress these problems have been interpreted and enriched on the basis of acquired experience and the new practical requirements. Continuity and development is the party's approach to the basic Leninist norms of its life and management principles. These are the positions held in solving problems of party growth and improvements in the qualitative structure of its ranks, democratic centralism, party management of the economy and culture and of state and public organizations, cadre policy, and work style.

II.

The life of a complex integral organism such as a party is determined by intraparty relations which, in the course of time, are enriched and become ever more comprehensive. Intraparty relations based on democratic centralism create the environment, the climate within which the party members develop their activeness and in which their qualities as political fighters are shaped. The level of development of intraparty relations largely determines the party's ability to influence the masses and maintain closest possible relations with them. It is a particular type of laboratory developing new ways, means, and principles of social activities which could be adopted by the state organs, mass organizations, and labor collectives in one or another of their aspects.

Intraparty democracy is particularly important on this level. Its improvement and intensification is an objectively necessary process for a party directed toward the future. The CPSU not only does not "fear" democracy within its organization, as the anti-communist critics claim, but, conversely, is always taking effective measures to promote its development. The party's nature is such that the democratic procedures taking hold within it strengthen its ranks rather than "shake them loose."

In the party everything is decided on a broad democratic basis. Starting with the acceptance of new members and ending with decrees passed at the highest party forum, in the final account everything expresses the will of the party members. Consequently democracy is manifested in an exceptional variety of forms, for which reason its development is a many-faceted process.

At the present stage, under contemporary conditions, the broadest possible opportunities have been created within the CPSU for the effective manifestation of party democracy. The 25th Congress analyzed the process of its implementation and development on a party scale in terms of the activities of its superior organs, local and primary organizations, and the entire mass of the party's membership. On the basis of scrupulously observed norms of electivity, accountability, publicity, and collectivity in the work, the party acquires the element of stability and firmness thanks to which, within it, democracy and discipline are not manifested occasionally but become an inseparable feature of its activities.

The development of party democracy is largely determined by the general circumstances prevailing within the party, by the development of an atmosphere of political trust and real interest in the views of the party members, a collective search for solutions, and participation in their implementation. Such are the circumstances created within our party over the years through purposeful and systematic efforts.

It is indicative that in the post-war period, starting with 1952, the congress--the party's supreme organ--has been convened regularly, within the deadlines stipulated by the bylaws. Within that time seven CPSU congresses have been held. Conferences of local and meetings of primary organizations and sessions of all elective party organs have been held on time. Between the 24th and 25th congresses 11 Central Committee plenums, 215 Politburo sessions, and 205 Central Committee secretariat meetings were held. A number of CPSU Central Committee plenums have been held after the 25th Congress to consider most important problems of the country's socio-political life. Within that period the Central Committee passed important decrees aimed at the implementation of the congress' resolutions in the fields of industry, agriculture, party construction, ideological activities, and international relations.

Such active and intensive work done by the higher party organs ensures the prompt solution of ripe problems of party and country life, skilled management of all communist construction sectors, and unification of the efforts of all organizations, party members, and working people for the implementation of the policy formulated at the congress. All CPSU units implement the principle of collective management on a daily basis.

The party mass is the main force of the party. The objective of intraparty democracy is precisely to enhance the activeness of all party members and to maintain it steadily on a high level. This enables the broad membership strata to exert a decisive influence on the formulation of the party's policy and the shaping of its leading organs.

In Lenin's view the interdependence existing in the activities of the party mass in making and implementing decisions leads to the development of conditions under which the leading organs "truly rely on the good and conscious will of the army following the staff and, at the same time, directing its staff!" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 8, p 97.)

The direct participation of every party member in the party's life is achieved, above all, through the primary party organizations. Their widespread network covers, essentially, all labor collectives and communist construction sectors. The increased activeness of the party members means, in fact, also their increased influence on the entire realm of labor and all other social relations in the country. It is no accident, therefore, that, continuing the line of the previous congresses, the 25th Congress paid great attention to the primary party organizations, to their work content and methods, and to the tasks they face today.

Improving the work of the primary party organizations is a permanent project. Also important in this respect is the fact that they are being established in practically all young and new collectives. Through growing structural differentiation--bearing in mind shop organizations and party groups--the primary organizations extend and intensify their influence over new sectors and subunits in the national economy. The following figures

clearly show the scale of this process. In the past five years the number of primary organizations has risen by over 20,000; the number of organizations in which party committees were set up rose by 4,700; the number of shop party organizations rose by 50,000, while that of party groups by over 87,000.

The party is interested in every party member to participate knowledgeably in party affairs and properly to assess the significance of operative norms and principles. The CPSU strives to base the participation of every party member in the work of this organization not on intuition, guess work, or purely empirical knowledge, but on an understanding of the main problems of politics and party construction. For this reason it pays tremendous attention to political training whose system ensures the systematic study of Marxist-Leninist theory and party history and politics. Millions of party members have thoroughly studied Lenin's party theory, problems of party construction, and economic policy. Focal point of the study has shifted from introductory and basic courses to the deeper study of all structural components of Marxism-Leninism and topical communist construction problems; classes at the higher level of party education are becoming the main form of the Marxist-Leninist training of the party members.

The development of intraparty democracy and of the initiative and activity of the party members and party organizations within the CPSU is inseparably linked with upgrading the importance of party discipline and centralism. This was the way in which the problem was considered at the 23rd and 24th Party Congresses and such was the approach of the 25th Congress as well. This consistency is noteworthy. It has contributed to the fact that the problem of democracy and discipline has been effectively placed within the framework of a scientifically defined historical perspective.

Frequent claims are found in anti-communist and revisionist publications according to which the requirement of upgrading the discipline is the result of the urgent need to protect CPSU ranks from the effects of some kind of political, ideological, or moral "erosion." It is claimed that the interrelated formulation of problems of democracy and discipline leads only to the fact that any development of democracy will be inevitably "suppressed" by strengthened discipline. Such ideas are false, from beginning to end, for they stem from a clearly distorted nature of the party of a new type, or of communist parties in general.

As demonstrated by the CPSU congresses, the problem of interconnection between democracy and discipline is not transient. Discipline can not be considered a means for protecting democracy from "excesses." In precisely the same manner democracy could not be considered an antidote to the "rigidity" and "levelling nature" of discipline, a means for "softening" these two discipline facets. Discipline and democracy have a richer meaning and purpose: Both principles play a highly constructive role in the party. To the communists this is no new formulation of the problem.

Marx himself, drafting the bylaws of the International Association of Workers--the First International--formulated the following basic requirement: "There are no rights without obligations, and there are no obligations without rights" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch," Vol 16, p 546). To Lenin democratic centralism has always represented the organic unity between democracy and discipline. They may have different manifestations in the different stages of the struggle. However, the requirement of their interpenetration in the interest of successful party activities has remained inviolable.

A convincing proof of this was offered as early as the Second RSDWP Congress. Here Lenin and the Bolsheviks launched a struggle for the assertion of centralism to counteract the cliquishness which could corrode any organized work. Yet, was this centralism of a type in which nothing other than strict discipline existed? Far from it.

Lenin's defense of the concept that thanks to centralism the Central Committee would be able to reach each individual organization and party member (see "Vtoroy S"yezd RSDRP. Protokoly" [Second RSDWP Congress. Minutes], Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1959, pp 89-90) is both a requirement for centralism and democracy, which also means that each party member and organization could address itself to and establish contact with the Central Committee rather than operate on the local level only. In other words, in this case centralism legitimizes, strengthens, and secures democracy.

Lenin's statement that " . . . centralism is nothing but a 'stage of siege' for the numerous sources of political woollyness" (Ibid, p 374) means that thanks to centralism conditions are created for the existence of true party democracy, for the establishment of sensible frameworks for discussions and behavior within the party is a positive rather than negative quality required for conducting fruitful work among the people's masses and organizations.

The historical necessity of democratic centralism is vividly manifested in the fact that it has become the basic principle governing the organization of the various institutions and structures within the socialist society and a method for their activities. "Nowhere else is higher discipline and higher organization more necessary," said E. A. Shevardnadze, addressing the 25th Congress, "than in a country of free people, free nations, and free republics. . . . The life-bringing force of Soviet democracy continues to find its highest manifestation in the dialectical unity between freedom and discipline, concern and exactingness, rights and obligations, and national and local interests . . . "

Speaking of the future, the development of the party could be conceived as a process in the course of which intraparty democracy will become ever deeper while centralism will advance further and further. In turn, the activity of the party members in discussing and resolving all party matters will rise while their discipline will become ever more conscious. These

conclusions, stemming from the decisions of the 23rd, 24th, and 25th congresses, are of major theoretical and practical significance to the party at large, to its organizations, and to all party members. They are both of domestic and international importance.

The party's democratic organization implies a well-organized intraparty information. The CPSU ascribes to it a most important significance as a prime factor in the development of party democracy, a tool for management, and a means for education and control. To an ever greater extent party information is being organized as a system which does not duplicate mass information media (even though, naturally, it uses them extensively), acquiring, to an ever greater extent, its specific features and characteristics.

The CPSU Central Committee decree on the work of the Georgian party organization, passed after the 25th Congress, notes the positive changes which have taken place in recent years in the republic's economic and cultural life as a result of the improved activities of party organizations. The decree characterizes as a positive phenomenon the fact that the party committees "are increasing the amount of information given party and non-party members on economic and political problems, thus contributing to the further development of control over the activities of leading organs and cadres on the part of the broad masses. The party committees regularly inform the party organizations and all party members of their work."

Lenin considered the organization of information a necessary prerequisite for the organization of all party activities. Essentially, an actively operating information, well-planned from the viewpoint of the range of problems, deep in terms of meaning, and objectively reflecting the situation, contributes more than anything else to the strengthening of the party's democratic foundations.

Criticizing in his time the bureaucratic organization of the bourgeois power machinery, Marx noted its following typical feature: "The upper echelons rely on the lower circles in anything pertaining to the knowledge of particulars; the lower circles entrust to the upper levels anything related to the understanding of the general situation. Thus they reciprocally lead one another into error" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch," Vol 1, pp 271-272).

The strength of our party and of its democratic organization lies precisely in the fact that the entire mass of party members is fully informed of all party policy and is well-acquainted with the "general situation." The leading organs attentively study the "particulars," the local situation, considering it their prime duty to study the experience of the masses and take it maximally into consideration. This is confirmed by a number of convincing examples.

Suffice it to recall, for example, the tens of thousands of letters addressed by the working people to the central organizations and departments, local party organs, newspapers, and periodicals. Their overwhelming majority is

dictated by social interest and lofty civic feelings. The letters sent by party and non-party members assess the party's policy covering the entire range of problems. The letters sent by the Soviet people are the voice of the masses, the true documents of the epoch. Immediately after the 25th Congress the Central Committee passed a decree on improving further the work with the letters of the working people. This proves the significance which the CPSU ascribes to one of the most important forms of its ties with the masses. The party's requirement of strengthening such ties was effectively implemented in the course of the nationwide discussion of the draft of the new USSR Constitution, when an efficient mechanism was developed in the country which made it possible accurately to take into consideration the hundreds of thousands of suggestions submitted by the citizens through all channels.

Here are other facts. In recent years the Central Committee has considered the work of a number of primary party organizations and labor collectives. Matters were studied from various sides. Everything positive, any minor manifestation of new and useful experience were noted. At the same time, specific shortcomings were emphasized. All this is not aimed in the least at specifically regulating the work of the primary organizations. The Central Committee decisions emphasize the specific nature of the activities of the various party member detachments and provide a methodological base for the development of the activeness of party members. It would suffice, for example, to refer to the CPSU Central Committee decree on the work of the party organizations at the Gor'kiy Automotive Plant under the conditions of a production association.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's letters and messages to individuals, collectives, and organizations which have developed outstanding initiative and achieved noteworthy labor successes are examples of solicitous attitude toward public initiatives developing in a great variety of areas, and concerned support of progressive experience and good initiatives.

III.

The strength of the CPSU lies in the fact that its democracy is a democracy of action while its discipline is a discipline aimed at reaching the lofty objectives of the workers' movement. As G. V. Plékhanov who, together with Lenin, was defending revolutionary Marxism, aptly noted at the Second RSDWP Congress, each principle governing the party's organization and democracy should be considered from the viewpoint of the "supreme law"--the success of the revolution (see "Vtoroy S"yezd RSDRP. Protokoly," p 182).

Everything for the good of the people, and everything with the support of the people. Such are the highest parameters and the objective and method determining party activities. This was most strongly reemphasized at the 25th CPSU Congress. This is the main aspect of the principles governing party leadership of all fields of social life in the country.

Today raising the level of political leadership is inseparable from the ability to promote and develop the people's initiative which, under contemporary conditions acquires new strength and wider boundaries. This applies to socialist competition, production and socio-political initiatives, and participation of the working people in the administration of societal and governmental affairs.

The constant search for new approaches to the working people based on the changes taking place within the people and the development of society is a party tradition. The masses are not an abstract extra historical concept but people, constantly changing from the social, political, professional, cultural, and moral viewpoints. In precisely the same way the ways and means of work with the masses may not remain fixed but require constant improvements and differentiation. The party always considers the organizational role of its different units, ranging from the Central Committee to the primary organizations, and all social and state organizations and cadres, party as well as economic, and all trends of activity from the position of the ever fuller interpretation of the factors and conditions contributing to the development of the labor and political activeness of the working people.

Life offers daily proof of the exceptional importance which the party ascribes to the activities of the mass organizations of the working people--the soviets, trade unions, and Komsomol. A new confirmation of this fact is the precise definition which a number of constitutional articles provide of the status, rights, and possibilities of mass organizations and the working people. This convincingly refutes farfetched slanderous views expressed in bourgeois and revisionist publications to the effect that the role of the socialist organizations in the USSR, of these "transmission belts," is purely decorative, and that they are merely the facade behind which the building itself does not exist.

Our party has never considered such "transmission belts" a purely mechanical one-way connection. The essence of the matter has consisted of something entirely different. The party believed that in the system of proletarian dictatorship it could lead only through the mass organizations of the working people. The "feedback" is being developed in this case comprehensively--a most detailed knowledge of all social processes, feelings of the masses, and anything taking place "below." In fact, the party and the mass organizations constitute a single entity in the work with and upbringing of the masses.

The development of the mass organizations of working people and of their activities is taking place in our country on the solid foundations of the steady improvement of the political system and of socialist democracy. The party firmly knows where and how to guide matters, comprehensively taking into consideration objective conditions and accurately determining what is essential and what is secondary in this process. The party has always approached the development of democracy from class positions. In

this respect F. Engels' statement to the effect that democracy has become a proletarian principle, a principle of the masses, has not lost any of its validity. "Any other type of democracy," he wrote, "could exist only in the heads of theoretical clairvoyants who are unconcerned with real events and who believe that principles are developed not by people and circumstances but by themselves" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch," Vol 2, p 589).

Soviets, trade unions, and the Komsomol, whose influence extends to practically the entire population of our country, enabling it creatively to participate in all governmental and social affairs, are engaged in rich and varied activities. The internal life of these organizations is as developed and rich as the party's. All this was vividly confirmed at the 16th Congress of USSR Trade Unions and the 18th Komsomol Congress.

The rights and possibilities which the social organizations have today are tremendous. The broadest possible horizons have been opened for their fruitful activities in all realms of social life and influencing decisions concerning all problems effecting the working people. That is why the further development of the "specific activities" of mass organizations is so important. Their possibilities are far from exhausted offering a boundless area for initiative and creativity, constituting the biggest possible reserve for the harnessing of public energy for the purpose of communist construction.

The country's development, the interests of its present and its future, and the satisfaction of the people's needs and requirements are the focal point of party concern and the fact to which it directs the attention of the party members. The complexity of the problems, their scale, and the time for changes dictated by history require extensive efforts and the intensive and creative thrust of all party members and working people.

The party's documents systematically follow the line of unity between politics and economics. They are imbued with Lenin's thought that today as well the basic economic problem can not be resolved without a proper political approach. The party clearly formulated the main tasks of economic activity--upgrading social production effectiveness and work quality in all sectors.

The formulation of problems of the proper political approach to the leadership of society was manifested in its most concentrated aspect in connection with the Leninist work style--a problem given priority at the 25th Congress and extensively developed in a number of subsequent speeches by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and in works written by him such as "Malaya Zemlya" and "Vozrozhdeniye" [Rebirth].

As Lenin pointed out no revolutionary movement could endure without a stable maintaining continuity of the managerial organization. Continuity largely means the following of the Leninist work style, this priceless party possession, by our cadres. The more fully the Leninist style is

manifested in cadre activities, the more effective the party's influence on the building of communism becomes, and the more extensively its experience, principal traditions, above all the tradition of a political approach to all matters, big and small, imbued with communist idea-mindedness, become part of the life of our society. The party's leadership does not consist of simple managerial or command functions. At all times it is a politically and ideologically directed leadership.

The most important feature of the party style is the class approach, the permanent and comprehensive support of the overall objectives of the working class. As the "Communist Party Manifesto" itself stipulated the communists are people who "always represent the interests of the movement as a whole." The party reminds us that today as well--in a new form and under new conditions--this communist feature should remain the leading one, as it has been for millions of party members at all stages of the revolutionary struggle and the building of socialism in our country.

The requirement of imbuing with a party approach all our practical activities remains topical to this day. In practical economic work, for example, we frequently come across distortions of economic objectives in individual enterprises or departments. Pursuing gross output, some administrators ignore the problem of variety, considering it "unprofitable." Profiting from the shortage of one or another item, they do not promote with sufficient adequacy the quality of such goods, focusing their activities above all on bonuses. Yet, as Lenin cautioned, uncertainties as to whose interests should be higher "may lead to the fact that the people may consider the interests of the socialist state as being the interests of individual groups" ("Leninskiy Sbornik XXXVIII" [Leninist Collective XXXVIII], pp 300-301).

In connection with such cases the imperfection of existing economic indicators is frequently mentioned. Naturally, the party ascribes tremendous importance to their improvement. Extensive work is being done in this direction. Its importance was reemphasized at the December 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

In no case could the party members tolerate manifestations of departmentalism, parochialism, bureaucracy, and neglect of party and state interests. We must bear in mind that universal indicators of incentives which would influence ideally and equally all aspects of economic activities of enterprises and establishments are hardly possible. The interests of the cause --not formally conceived but interpreted thoroughly and honestly--have been, and remain higher than anything else. The CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th Party Congress clearly states to this effect that "every party member, anyone caring for our common cause must work for the accurate implementation of party directives, basing everything on the interests of society, the state, and the people."

Criticism and self-criticism have been and remain an inseparable aspect of the Leninist work style. A critical approach to all matters plays an important role under the conditions of the steady expansion of the scale and increased complexity of problems to be resolved. Considering criticism an effective means of struggle against stagnation, shortcomings, and obvious misuses, the party tries to promote criticism and self-criticism as a daily work method. Obviously, the task of the extensive dissemination of criticism and self-criticism is not simple. Criticism is a right. In certain conditions, however, it is also a moral, a political obligation.

Along with the general progress of our life and the growth of the educational, cultural, and spiritual standards of the Soviet people, their intolerance toward all imperfections in life rises and their reaction to criticism becomes more sensitive. The working people do not tolerate false or groundless criticism or settling of accounts. The essence of criticism, as the Central Committee emphasizes, is that all aspects of activities of one or another organization or individual worker be objectively assessed and existing shortcomings be comprehensively analyzed with a view to their elimination. This indication reliably determines the direction and way of development of criticism and self-criticism.

Every Soviet person has the desire to contribute to improving his life and that of society. Nothing is more important than the development of an enhanced atmosphere in the labor collective, favorable possibilities for creative work, and proper relations between managers and subordinates. It is precisely in this fine area of human relations that the norms of socialist community life, our democratic order, are particularly refracted. The success with which problems are resolved here determines production successes and, to a large extent, the people's concept of the overall democratic atmosphere in our society. That is why managers in all sectors must take into consideration the socioeconomic and educational aspects of their activities.

In any historical period the Leninist norms of party life and management principles, the initial stage in whose development was marked by the Second RSDWP Congress, have been of the highest importance. Under developed socialist conditions these norms and principles are playing an ever more fruitful role, revealing, in the course of time, the tremendous wealth of their content. On the basis of such norms and principles applicable to all fields of social life and to itself the party formulates proper guidelines for further progress. Success along this way is certain, for history has proved that the Leninist way leads to victory.

5003

CSO: 1802

TOPICAL TASKS OF ECONOMIC SCIENCE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 pp 66-74

[Article by M. Volkov]

[Text] The social sciences, the science of economics among them, play a major role in resolving the problems of the building of communism.

We could note with satisfaction that the science of economics has scored certain achievements in the implementation of the tasks assigned at the 25th CPSU Congress. Economic scientists are actively working on topical problems of the developed socialist economy, and the creation of the material and technical foundations for communism under the conditions of the developing scientific and technical revolution. Intensive studies are being made of means to improve the planning mechanism for economic cooperation among socialist countries. Great attention is being paid to the study of the economic aspect of relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist states, and to the economics of contemporary monopoly capitalism.

A number of major works have been published in recent years such as "Politicheskaya Ekonomiya Sovremennogo Monopolisticheskogo Kapitalizma" [Political Economy of Contemporary Monopoly Capitalism], "Ekonomika Razvitogo Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva (Osnovnyye Cherty, Zakonomernosti Razvitiya)" [Economics of the Developed Socialist Society (Basic Features, Laws of Development)], "Ekonomicheskaya Entsiklopediya. Politicheskaya Ekonomiya" [Economic Encyclopedia. Political Economy] (the first two volumes), the textbook "Politicheskaya Ekonomiya" [Political Economy], a textbook, and many others. The institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences department of economics have prepared about 350 reports, analytical notes, and reference-information materials many of which contained recommendations of major practical value.

Yet, we can not fail to see that the level at which a number of problems are studied is still behind practical requirements. Scientific conclusions on many important problems are excessively general. Yet, the social practice of existing socialism is developing and formulating new vital questions which must be answered by Marxist-Leninist science. That is why at the

present stage of the country's development, as was noted at the 25th CPSU Congress, the need for the further creative elaboration of theory becomes even greater. "It is obvious that the problems facing our social science," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the congress, "can be resolved only by establishing closest possible relations between it and reality. Scholastic theorizing could only hinder our movement. Scientific effectiveness can be enhanced only if related with practice. This today is one of the main problems."

The strengthening of ties with practical work presumes the proper combination of basic and applied research, and the steady acquisition of scientific knowledge. This means increasing rather than reducing the role of long-term strategic developments, focusing the efforts on the most topical problems and leading studies to conclusions which could become the basis for practical decisions. The economic scientists must continue to focus their attention on the further development of political economy as the methodological foundation of the entire system of economic sciences.

The conference held last April at the CPSU Central Committee department of science and scientific establishments dealt with topical problems related to the development of the science of economics. It was attended by economic scientists, heads of economic and scientific research institutes and faculties of a number of higher educational institutions, and senior party, planning, and economic personnel. The conference heard and discussed the following reports: "On the Work of the USSR Academy of Sciences Department of Economics in the Study of Topical Economic Problems," by Academician N. P. Fedorenko, academic secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences department of economics; "On the Work of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics in the Study of Topical Problems of Socialist Political Economy" by Ye. I. Kapustin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics and USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member; "On the Work of the Institute of World Economics and World International Relations on the Study of Topical Problems of World Economics and International Relations" by Academician N. N. Inozemtsev, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economics and International Relations; and "On the Work of the Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System on the Study of Topical Problems of Economics of the World Socialist System" by O. T. Bogomolov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The conference was addressed by S. P. Trapeznikov, head of the CPSU Central Committee Department of Science and Training Institutions and USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member. He described in his address the development of the social sciences in recent years and showed the increased significance of the science of economics under contemporary conditions. He noted that along with the successes achieved in the field of scientific-economic research there have been weak aspects whose elimination depends, above all, on the development of basic topics. The main prerequisite for the further

development of the science of economics is the growth of theoretical cadres who must master profoundly the legacy of the Marxist-Leninist classics and the entire wealth of ideas contained in our party's decisions and documents; they must skillfully apply contemporary methods of scientific analysis and always manifest their feelings of duty and responsibility to the people. The speaker discussed the tasks related to improving research by economic scientists and the need to ensure coordination in the activities of economic scientific research institutes and VUZ chairs. He paid particular attention to upgrading the ideological role of the science of economics and to increasing its relations with life and the practice of the building of communism.

Study of the Developed Socialist Economy

The documents of the CPSU and the other fraternal parties and the works of economic scientists comprehensively substantiate the historical place and the characteristic features of mature socialism as the natural stage of the first phase of the communist system. This provides a clear direction for scientific research. At the conference academicians A. G. Yegorov and A. N. Yefimov discussed the significance of developing the methodological problems of economic sciences under developed socialist conditions.

The developed socialist society built in the USSR offers full scope for the effect of socialist economic laws. Its advantages as a social system under which the people work for themselves and for their society, while the economy is conducted on a planned basis, are multiplied by the fact that our country has today a tremendous economic and scientific potential and a multimillion strong army of skilled workers. This raises to a qualitatively new level the implementation of the main and immediate public production objective--ensuring the ever fuller satisfaction of the growing material and spiritual needs of the people. The task of the science of economics is comprehensively to show the advantages and possibilities of the economic growth of the developed socialist society, and find practical means for their utilization in the interest of the building of communism. It is a question, above all, of intensifying the scientific study of changes in the material and technical base of the various economic areas and the production relations system, and their influence on social production effectiveness. The collective work of the scientists on a comprehensive program for scientific and technical progress and its socioeconomic consequences is an example of such studies. This was described at the conference by Academician N. P. Fedorenko.

Currently this work is entering its final stage. Together with the other scientists and planning personnel the economists are refining the basic parameters of the long-range development of the national economy so that the comprehensive program may in fact become an organic component of current and long-term planning. However, we must note something which applies not only to the USSR Academy of Sciences Department of Economics: The work on the completion of the comprehensive program is still too slow. The institutes of the Department of Economics account for the bulk of the development of its social aspect which entrusts them with great responsibility to the party and the state.

The theoretical level of works studying the material and technical foundations for communism and the criteria and means for their establishment is rising. Studies conducted in recent years have indicated that in the developed socialist society equipment and technology are not only means for achieving an abundance of material and spiritual goods but a condition for the all-round development of man, the creation in every worker of satisfaction with his work, and the development of his creative potential. An attempt has been made to define the general characteristics of the technological aspect of the production process and the basic trends of scientific and technical progress for a 15 to 20 year period. Together with the scientific research institutes, the USSR Gosplan Council for the Study of Production Forces has formulated a general plan for the location of the country's production forces through 1990. The theoretical concept and foundations for a practical program for the development of production and scientific-production associations in industry and other sectors have been elaborated.

At the same time, however, a number of problems related to the development of the material and technical base are awaiting their solution. This includes trends of the further development of the scientific and technical revolution and their impact on labor tools and objects and manpower, defining the social requirements concerning machine systems and technologies of the future, organically combined with their economic effectiveness, and refining the ways to improve the functional, sectorial, and organizational structures in material production and services, and the trends in the development of the cultural and technical aspect of the workers. We must complete the elaboration of the scientific concept of the location of production forces on a longer range basis and the creation of regional complexes. Problems of further production concentration require the deeper study of the influence of specialization and cooperation processes on the organization of production associations.

In recent years progress has been achieved in the formulation of a concept for the development of production relations at the mature socialist stage. USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member Ye. I. Kapustin focused his attention on this problem. He described the experience in the formulation of a system for the planned control of ownership, distribution, and trade relations and, consequently, the influence of the state on improving the economic base.

A number of methodological problems of the study of production relations have remained unresolved. No profound study has been made of their interconnection with the growth of production socialization occurring under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution. The study of socialist ownership is focused mainly on problems of the development of cooperative-kolkhoz ownership. The attention paid to the intensified study of the property of the whole nation is clearly insufficient.

The appearance of interfarm kolkhoz-sovkhoz associations in our countryside represents a further development of cooperative-kolkhoz ownership. The party's line is to make full use of the advantages of the kolkhoz system, to strengthen and develop both the sovkhoz and kolkhoz economy, to convert kolkhozes and sovkhozes to modern industrial tracts, to reorganize life in the countryside, and to enhance the cultural and technical standard of the peasants. The economic blossoming of the kolkhoz system is the factual way leading to a gradual rapprochement and, in the future, merger between kolkhoz and nationwide ownership within a single communist ownership.

As a whole, the problems of relations within the agrarian sector of the economy must assume a considerably more important role in scientific research. Practical work needs profound elaborations of the means for the gradual elimination of major disparities between town and country in the field of economics. Unfortunately, scientific works inadequately study production changes related to the factual processes of production socialization. The problems of settlements and, consequently, of rural amenities and cultural developments can not be resolved radically without taking this into consideration. The elaboration of the mechanism for equalizing the conditions governing the economic management of kolkhozes and sovkhozes and the strengthening of cost accounting of interfarm associations are important social tasks.

In the field of distribution relations greater attention should be paid to the problems of the long-term ratio between the income of the working people from the wage fund and payments to the population from social consumption funds, means to enhance the role of the latter in public production incentive, and the ratio between individual and collective consumption methods.

The need is ripe and a factual possibility has developed for the writing of a definitive work on socialist political economy. As a result of scientific research dealing with topical problems of the building of communism the necessary background for this has been essentially established. Particularly notable progress has been made in the elaboration of problems related to the social consequences of scientific and technical progress. Extensive work has been done in the field of the systematic study of socialist economic categories and laws.

The Marxist-Leninist science of economics must provide thoroughly substantiated answers to problems formulated by life itself, to be resolved now and in the future by the party and the entire Soviet people in the course of the building of communism. These are problems related, above all, to laying the material and technical foundations for communism, the development of socialist production relations and their gradual conversion into communist production relations, the molding of a communist attitude toward labor, upgrading the prosperity of the Soviet people, and improving national economic management. The difficulty presented by their solution is known and, in this case, the help of science is extremely important.

Elaboration of Theoretical Problems of National Economic Management

The Soviet scientists have carried out considerable studies in the area of improving national economic planning and management. This was discussed at the conference by academicians P. N. Fedoseyev and G. A. Arbatov, and other speakers. It was pointed out that the economists have laid the methodical foundations for the elaboration of national economic programs, formulated proposals on coordinating the plans for material, manpower, and financial resources, and for a system of indicators governing association activities; they have developed a method for determining the effectiveness of new equipment and for computing the development and placement of production facilities with the help of computers, methods for the economic assessment of minerals, and a number of other topical management problems.

Nevertheless, the elaboration of the theoretical foundations of management remains one of the most vital problems. Until recently research conducted in this field did not encompass the totality of the problem, as a result of which it was not always effective.

The huge national economic complex, the complicated intraeconomic relations, and the tremendous scale of the production process determine the need for improving further the centralized principles in the planned management of the economy with the all-round development of the creative initiative of the masses and with upgrading the responsibility of labor collectives for the results of economic management. The assignments of the unified state plan are the main economic management lever in the developed socialist society. The creation of an intercoordinated system of long-term, medium-term, and current plans covering production, circulation, finances, and credits is a topical task from the viewpoint of upgrading the scientific level of planning. All other economic levers and incentives are subordinated to the plan.

The study of the optimizing of the national economic complex as an integral economic organism in which the social production effectiveness indicator, and the conditions for the dynamic balancing of all its areas are basic in the activities of individual production sectors and the credit and financial systems, determining the structure of capital investments and shifts in the territorial location of production facilities, assumes particular importance. Correspondingly, we must establish the significance and direction of economic work aimed at the comprehensive solution of problems on the national economic level, at ensuring coordination in the activities of central planning and management organs, and at applying program-target planning.

Contemporary production development problems could be resolved only by taking into consideration the long-term development of the scientific and technical revolution. Hence the need for constant forecasting of basic scientific and technological development trends, and the study of the socioeconomic aspects and of the way the conclusions are reflected in the comprehensive programs for scientific and technical progress containing recommendations for long-term planning.

The intensification of the sectorial and territorial division of labor determining the organizational structure of management is related to the concentration, specialization, and cooperation of production. The conversion to a sectorial management structure enabled us, in its time, to surmount the underestimating of the significance of the sector in the national economy, inherent in the territorial system, and to remove the consequent obstacles to technical progress. However, as revealed by practical experience, management must take into consideration the existence of interrelationships among different related sectors. Ignoring this fact leads to departmentalism which hinders the comprehensive solution of problems of economic construction. The task is to surmount the underestimating of sectorial and territorial technical and economic relations in the course of scientific studies of problems related to the creation and activities of production associations.

The elaboration of the methods for the study and ever fuller consideration of the vital requirements of society is of great importance to improving planning. A high level of production development enables us to take into consideration both social resources and requirements and their level of satisfaction. Hence the need for a profound study of individual and production requirements and the elaboration of means for actively influencing their growth and structure. In this connection a comprehensive study must be made of the experience gained in complex socioeconomic planning of the development of rural rayons and of small and big towns through 1990.

Coordinating management and planning with developed socialist conditions presumes the extensive use of new economic-mathematical methods and computers. The scientists have created a number of economic-mathematical models considered by the USSR Gosplan suitable for use in planning practices. Some of the models are undergoing experimental testing. However, there still is no overall system of long-term planning models and the existing models are largely uncoordinated. Occasionally they are oriented toward obtaining a variety of data not covering a number of important planning areas.

The development of a system of long-term models is related to the solution of major theoretical problems. Between the end of the 1960's and beginning of the 1970's attention toward such problems rose considerably. However, the road to success was hard and many scientists who hoped for fast overall results and failed to achieve them abandoned this work. Generally speaking, in recent years attention to the elaboration of theoretical modelling problems has weakened. The interest of this cause demands the elimination of lagging in this important sector. Above all attention should be paid to the elaboration of problems such as the socially necessary working time and the mechanism of its formation, social usefulness, and criteria of production optimality and the quantitative manifestation at different levels of economic management.

Problems of Upgrading Social Production Effectiveness

Many of the participants in the conference, Academician T. S. Khachaturov, and Academician I. I. Lukinov of the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences imeni Lenin in particular, addresses themselves to problems of upgrading production effectiveness.

An entirely clear understanding of the category of production effectiveness as a summed up manifestation of labor and material savings, i.e., of upgrading labor productivity on the scale of the entire society, has been accepted in economics. Intensification is the basic way for upgrading production effectiveness. The intensive factors determining the growth of output are working time savings, i.e., upgrading labor productivity at enterprises and sectors, enhancing technical standards, improving the utilization of productive capital, and lowering material intensiveness. In recent years the advantages of socialist production relations in the field of technical progress, the main source for the growth of effectiveness, have been analyzed in a number of studies. The elaboration of methods for determining increased production effectiveness in the building of new enterprises and the installation of new equipment has been a major contribution to economic theory. Such methods have been practically tested and applied extensively. Yet, as scientists have properly noted, at the present time the scientific successes have been reduced mainly to the elaboration of individual local problems while the theory of public production effectiveness as a whole is still being shaped. A number of important problems whose solution has long been expected by practical workers have remained unresolved.

One of them is that of the summing up indicator of public production effectiveness. Such an indicator must become the basis for comparing the effectiveness of the various plan alternates and, consequently, for selecting the best among them. It is necessary to create a system of coordinated effectiveness indicators suitable for various levels of economic management and reflecting the utilization of all types of labor and natural factors. The methods used for determining overall effectiveness are unrelated to social tasks. Yet, the socialist society does not need any kind of effectiveness but an effectiveness which would ensure an upsurge in the prosperity of the working people and the development of the economy on the way to communism. As to the individual effectiveness indicators, they frequently do not fully reflect the situation for which reason they are insufficiently effective. No criteria or effectiveness indicators for outlays in the non-production sphere--trade, health care, and education--or outlays for the elimination of still occurring losses of agricultural raw materials, chemical fertilizers, and construction materials have been elaborated. Let us add to this the preservation and reproduction of natural resources.

Science must discover new sources and ways of growth of production effectiveness. This applies, above all, to further improvements in planning and encouraging the development and application of new equipment. The main thing is to achieve the unified management of production and technical

progress. Together with the Gosplan, the State Committee for Science and Technology, and other organizations, the scientists must speed up the elaboration of a comprehensive system for technical progress planning and stimulation.

The need for upgrading effectiveness raises particularly urgently the problem of the efficient utilization of nature and the preservation of the environment. In this case it is important to bear in mind that expenditures for environmental protection and improved utilization of natural resources are an element of socially necessary outlays and that they contribute to the growth of production effectiveness. Furthermore, preventing economic damages resulting from the destruction or pollution of the environment, society improves the sum total of socioeconomic factors governing human activities.

The efforts of the scientists are focused on the elaboration of an economic mechanism for controlling environmental protection based on the principle that enterprises and economic organizations would compensate for the damage caused to society as a result of pollution and the inefficient utilization of land, water, timber, and mineral resources.

Production effectiveness is largely determined by the condition of capital construction. The problems of ensuring the concentration of resources on the most important construction projects, the building of industrial projects consistent with the latest scientific and technical achievements, the increased industrialization of construction work, and the balancing of production plans with material resources must be profoundly studied.

Organizational factors offer a major possibility for upgrading effectiveness in industry and agriculture: Specialization and production concentration based on it, increasing the number of shifts during which the equipment operates, improving auxiliary services, and reducing the time needed for mastering production capacity. Here again the economists could make a substantial contribution.

The development of Siberia and the Far East is a task of essential national economic and political significance as formulated by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. In this connection the USSR Academy of Sciences institutes must speed up the formulation of special plans for the development of production forces and shaping territorial-production complexes in these areas. The institutes of economics of the Siberian Department and the Far East Scientific Center face major tasks related to the further development of economic research.

On the Study of World Economic Problems

The problems of the Soviet economy, already mentioned, do not cover all the tasks of the science of economics.

In his report USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member O. T. Bogomolov stated that the summation of international experience in the building of socialism enables us to further the elaboration of the problem of properly combining general with specific national aspects in the development of the socialist countries. In this connection the deeper substantiation of the stipulation that the way to socialism and its main features are determined by common laws and that their effect is manifested in different ways consistent with specific historical conditions and national characteristics remains topical. The law of equalization of economic development of member countries is inherent in the world socialist system. However, the closer the economic levels of the individual countries become, the closer the forms of manifestation of the general laws governing the building of socialism become. The significance of the search for the most effective international forms for their implementation rises. This applies, in particular, to methods for managing economic construction. Generally speaking, improvements in the mechanism of the planned managements of the national economies of CEMA-member countries are following a single direction: The role of centralized planning rises; big economic complexes turn into basic management units; the responsibility and material incentive of economic units rise. The study of the means for the further equalization of methods for production accounting and planning, price setting principles, and the organizational structure and functions of planning and management organs is an important task.

In recent years a great deal has been done to determine the meaning of socialist economic integration the objective need for which stems from the present condition of production forces and the development of the scientific and technical revolution. A high level of production concentration is needed in order to upgrade production effectiveness, ensuring specialization and cooperation, mass production, and low production costs.

The study of the current trends of economic integration indicates that a gradual steady process of rapprochement among the economies of the socialist countries is taking place without loss of their national sovereignty. This law is clearly manifested in the solution of current problems of economic cooperation. The shaping of national economic complexes is taking place, in general, in accordance with the position of each country in the international socialist division of labor. Since the effectiveness of each individual national economy depends, in the final account, on the efficient organization of the international division of labor, the task of optimizing the world socialist economy as a whole is taken into consideration in resolving practical problems related to expanding cooperation. Scientific studies must pay greater attention to substantiating the fact that the peoples of each fraternal country obtain, as a result of their economic cooperation with the other countries, additional possibilities to increase their national wealth and raise the prosperity of the working people. Economic interrelationship does not mean in the least the loss of national independence by the socialist countries. On the contrary, it strengthens their individual positions within the complex system of contemporary world

economic relations. Economic integration influences all other forms of rapprochement among socialist countries, making it comprehensive. It contributes the strengthening of their political unity. The real benefits of integration processes to the broad masses influence the molding of internationalist views. The desire for cultural contacts among nations increases.

Academician N. N. Inozemtsev dedicated his address to the study of problems of the general crisis of capitalism. In recent years a Marxist analysis has been made of the qualitative changes in the intensification of the crisis which developed in the mid-1970's and of the ratio of forces in the world arena. The fact that the 1977 state prize was awarded to the IMEMO [Institute of World Economics and International Relations] for the work "Politicheskaya Ekonomiya Sovremennogo Monopolisticheskogo Kapitalizma" [Political Economy of Contemporary Monopoly Capitalism] (Second Edition) is a recognition of achievements in the study of capitalist political economy.

Yet, the study of capitalist contradictions remains one of the main tasks. A thorough study is needed of the changes occurring under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution. Scientific and technical progress leads to quality changes in the production forces of society and to tremendous capital and production concentration. It is entirely legitimate to speak of a new stage of production monopoly effecting, in addition to industry and agriculture, the non-production sphere. The role of the international monopolies, covering entire sectors, has increased sharply. Unable to deny the economic domination of the biggest corporations, the bourgeois scientists are trying to prove that the activities of such corporations do not conflict with the interests of society and that, allegedly, they themselves belong to the people. In reality, the full power in industrial and commercial corporations, banks, and insurance companies in the capitalist countries is focused in a handful of billionaires and millionaires constituting the financial oligarchy. This is precisely the source of political reaction in the imperialist countries.

The tremendous socialization of production, on the one hand, and its subordination to the selfish interests of the financial oligarchy, on the other, confirm the further aggravation of the basic contradiction within capitalism. The level of production forces reached makes it possible to ensure the high prosperity of the entire people. However, in the capitalist countries the gap between the wealth of a narrow cluster of monopolies and the living standard of the broad population strata is widening. The situation of the working class and the other categories of working people is worsening in relative and absolute terms: Real wages are periodically declining. Unparalleled mass bankruptcy of peasant farms and other petty producers is occurring and unemployment is growing. All this proves that the law of the absolute impoverishment of the working people, discovered by K. Marx, remains valid under contemporary capitalism as well.

The competitive struggle among monopolies for markets and for domination of new sectors has become aggravated and profound economic disproportions have arisen. A deeper study is needed of the occurring upheavals indicating that state control overproduction, developed in a number of capitalist countries, is encountering insurmountable contradictions. The modern production forces call for the establishment of new production relations based on the public ownership of productive capital. The important task is to show the way the militarization of the economy of the imperialist countries contributes to the intensification of internal contradictions and to a worsening of the economic structure, reducing both consumption and markets.

The attempts of the ruling circles of the capitalist countries to eliminate the radical contradictions within the world's capitalist economy through the development of international imperialist integration and the use of a variety of organizations such as the International Monetary Fund to regulate economic relations among countries, have proved groundless.

Thanks to the growing power of the socialist world which is comprehensively supporting countries following a progressive path the non-capitalist development of the former colonial countries became possible. The elaboration of the theory of socialist orientation, and the use of Soviet experience in non-capitalist development under specific African and Asian conditions have assumed particular importance.

The scientist must comprehensively prove that today the main obstacle to surmounting the economic backwardness of the former colonies is the economic dependence of many among them on imperialism, and their involvement with the international capitalist division of labor based on operation and exploitation. Life leads the developing countries toward a more profound and comprehensive participation in the international socialist division of labor.

Upgrading the Economic Role of Economic Science

The participants in the conference paid great attention to problems of upgrading the role of the science of economics in the party's ideological work. The determination of the nature of the economic system under socialism and of the means for the reorganization of society in the interest of the working people creates a solid foundation for the dissemination of the achievements of the USSR and the other fraternal countries in all fields of life. The economists actively counter the desires of the bourgeois promoters of "psychological warfare" to prevent the increased influence of socialism on the toiling masses. Such work developed particularly extensively following the adoption of the new USSR Constitution and the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Economic theory has a tremendous impact on the molding of a communist awareness in the working people. Here the main role is played by promoting a conviction in the advantages of the socialist system. This contributes to upgrading the awareness, culture, and civic responsibility of the

people, the development of socialist patriotism and internationalism, the strengthening of the confidence in the inevitable victory of communism on a universal scale, and the development of a communist attitude toward labor and public wealth.

The establishment and dissemination of the advantages of socialism and the communist education of the working people are inseparably linked with the countering of the anti-communist ideas of bourgeois reformist and revisionist theories. The substantiation of their criticism is based on the level of scientific research and the extent to which the groundlessness and class meaning of anti-Marxist views are exposed. Here the study of the new phenomena in the capitalist economy, particularly those arising under the direct influence of the scientific and technical revolution, is of particular importance. It is precisely around such new phenomena that the ideological struggle becomes aggravated.

Neocolonialism, representing a new imperialist system of dependence and exploitation of developing countries, is one of the main tools of the imperialist bourgeoisie. The purpose of neocolonialism is to block socialist orientation and spread capitalism wider as a system of economic management, keeping the developing countries as industrial-raw material appendages to the economic complexes of the imperialist countries.

Considering the specific characteristics of the social system of countries emerging from a colonial status, some western politicians and scientists claim that neither capitalism nor communism "suits" such countries, offering them a certain "third way" which, in fact, only conceals the new forms of dependence.

USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding Member M. I. Sladkovskiy, dedicated his address to the criticism of Maoism. He exposed the anti-national and reactionary nature of this doctrine, proving that the Maoists ignore the unity and interconnection between production forces and production relations and separate politics from economics.

Improving Cadre Training and Perfecting the Organization of Scientific Work

The conference paid great attention to the problem of cadre training. Since 1971 the overall number of scientific workers-economists rose by one-half, including an 80 percent increase in the number of doctors of sciences and 70 percent of candidates of sciences. The fast increase in the number of scientific workers confirms the party's concern for the development of the science of economics. The main task now is to improve the structure of the scientific collectives and to upgrade the practical skills of the scientists. The main link here is to increase the number of upgrade the skill of political economists who have mastered to perfection Marxist-Leninist methodology and contemporary methods of scientific research. This means, for example, that the political economists employed at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics must master economic-mathematical

methods while scientists working at the TseMI [Central Economics-Mathematical Institute] must be well familiar with political economy as well as economic-mathematical methods. The training of specialists in international economics is of great importance. All scientific institutions must make it possible for the young scientists to speed up their creative growth.

The uncontrolled dispersion of cadres must not be allowed. Strict control must be imposed on the expediency of creating new scientific institutions, bearing in mind both the need for such institutions and the factual possibilities for staffing them with skilled specialists.

Essentially, the advancement of developed socialism is also a process of gradual transition to communism. The various tasks involved in the building of communism are the individual aspects of this single process. In the scientific field this is related to upgrading the role of comprehensive general theoretical and applied developments. This is possible only with the proper concentration of the forces of skilled scientific workers.

Bearing this in mind the system of cadre training, post-graduate studies above all, should be reorganized. Even at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics it has not been properly directed toward the training of political economists: Only 12 of the 41 students it accepted in 1977 had basic political economy training. Between 1973 and 1977 25 people defended their candidate dissertations in political economy, 10 of them without higher economic training. Yet, the cadre structure in the institute is far from perfect. Only 15 of the 63 doctors of sciences are political economists or economists. Forty-three out of 164 candidates of economic sciences, or 26 percent, are without higher economic training. The training of political economists at economics departments of universities and their placement and utilization need to be improved as well.

Improvements of practical skills must be organically linked with the political education of cadres and with developing in them qualities such as ideamindedness, loyalty to the cause of the party and the people, profound knowledge in the field of party theory and policy, belief in the justice of its ideals, and loyalty to Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism.

The organization of scientific labor presumes proper planning of scientific research. The state plan, which is the assignment of the state to the economic scientists, is the main organizing principle for scientific development. Planned assignments must be more precisely formulated in such a way as to ensure control of execution, close links between the plans of institutes and their separate subdivisions and, in the final account, close ties between the individual scientific associate and the state plan.

Proving further the coordination among the work of the economic institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the republic academic institutes, and the higher schools is an important factor in upgrading the effectiveness of

scientific research. This directly stems from the instructions issued by the party's Central Committee on upgrading the role of the USSR Academy of Sciences as the coordinator of all scientific work in our country. In recent years the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics has improved its coordination work. Practically all economic institutes of the academies of sciences of union republics are participating in the formulation of general plans for the development of USSR production forces. Attention should be paid to the experience of the Ukraine and Belorussia where coordination plans for scientific research by all scientific and training institutions are being formulated on the republic scale and ratified on the governmental level, regardless of departmental affiliation, along with plans for the practical application of scientific results. However, many unresolved problems remain in the field of coordination which is sometimes conducted on a formalistic basis. That is precisely why the research topics of the economic institutions of the academies of sciences of union republics and of branches and scientific centers are not always closely coordinated with the development of the basic economic problems of developed socialism, the methodological problems of the socioeconomic development of the various regions, and problems of improving the economic mechanism of the planned management of the national economy and of upgrading public production effectiveness in accordance with local conditions. The coordination of scientific research between academic and sectorial institutions and VUZ's remains particularly underdeveloped. With a view to upgrading the responsibility for coordination work it would be expedient to grant the head institutes certain rights and means.

The USSR Academy of Sciences Department of Economics has nine scientific councils on basic scientific directions. Furthermore, an interdepartmental council has been set up on price setting problems between the USSR Council of Ministers State Committee on Prices and the USSR Academy of Sciences. The department provides scientific-methodical guidance to the council for the study of production forces of the USSR Gosplan. This is a major organizing force. It is precisely through the scientific councils that the coordination of scientific research is organized, above all, on the scale of the entire country. Most councils are successfully fulfilling their coordinating role.

However, we must point out that some councils are not sufficiently active. The councils on scientific foundations of cost accounting and price setting problems rarely formulate major theoretical problems for discussion even though many such problems exist. Upgrading the activeness of the scientific councils is one of the important means for the intensification of economic research. Together with them, the scientific journals act as coordinators of scientific research. The USSR Academy of Sciences Department of Economics has seven such journals whose work contains great unused possibilities. The main among them is increasing the number and increasing the quality of articles on basic scientific problems. Both scientific councils and journals sponsor scientific debates. Some debates are still weak and do not end with conclusions on achieved results and the formulation of practical suggestions on further scientific progress. The organization of scientific debates is a complex matter requiring constant attention.

In recent years positive scientific research results have been achieved by the economics institutes of the academies of sciences of union republics. As a whole, however, the work of many institutes requires improvements. Being academic institutes, they must engage in the study of major theoretical problems. Currently an excessively broad range of scientific topics is characteristic of some institutes resulting in the splintering of their relatively small scientific forces.

The republic economics institutes must become the basic scientific and coordination centers for topical local economic studies closely linked with the economic institutes and VUZ's of their republics and with the scientific centers of the other union republics. This could be achieved by developing a system for the division of labor among institutes in the elaboration of comprehensive basic problems headed by the USSR Academy of Sciences institutes. Experience in this field exists. However, so far the efforts related to the division of labor account for an insignificant role in the overall volume of work and, as the saying goes, do not make the weather.

The work on applying the suggestions of scientists in socialist economic management must be improved. Occasionally this calls for surmounting the conservatism of some workers and the fact that not all suggestions are sufficiently substantiated and experimentally confirmed. Some institutes limit themselves merely to the discussion of submitted suggestions to the planning authorities, remaining unconcerned with their influence on practical work. The main way for the acceleration of scientific developments and their application is steady cooperation with planning and economic organs.

As the discussion of topical problems of the science of economics indicated, the economists face complex and major tasks. However, natural possibilities also exist for their successful implementation. Now the problem lies in the ability to organize scientific research and enhance the creative activeness and responsibility of the scientists.

The stipulation of the 25th Party Congress regarding quality and effectiveness fully applies to Soviet science and all its subdivisions, particularly to the science of economics. It is precisely from this viewpoint that we must consider the scientific activities of the corresponding institutes and other scientific establishments.

5003

CSO: 1802

MAIN TRENDS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 pp 75-83

[Review by T. Timofeyev, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, of the book by B. N. Ponomarev, "Izbrannoye. Rechi i Stat'i" [Selected Works. Speeches and Articles], Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 624 pages]

[Text] The creative development of Marxist-Leninist theoretical thinking has always constituted an inviolable condition for the successes of the labor movement. As V. I. Lenin emphasized, "there can be no revolutionary movement without revolutionary theory" ("Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 6, p 24). In our time, when the process of social renovation has become truly universal, the role of revolutionary theory and the influence of the scientific communist outlook of the working class among the masses become even greater.

The Leninist party has always paid tremendous attention to such problems, considering this its high international duty to the international revolutionary workers' movement. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out, activities aimed at joining efforts in summing up revolutionary experience and ensuring the further development of the theory of scientific communism created by K. Marx, F. Engels, and V. I. Lenin, are an important realm of cooperation among Marxist-Leninist parties.

The solution of such problems is greatly helped by the works of L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and of the works published in recent years by the leading figures of our party--Comrades Yu. V. Andropov, V. V. Grishin, A. P. Kirilenko, A. N. Kosygin, F. D. Kulakov, D. A. Kunayev, M. A. Suslov, D. F. Ustinov, and V. V. Shcherbitskiy.

One such work is the collection of selected articles and speeches by Academician B. N. Ponomarev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and CPSU Central Committee secretary. The materials contained in the book reflect almost 50 year long career of the author's party and scientific activities, ranging from pre-war articles in the press to works published in recent years, a career noted by the systematic defense of the line of our Leninist party, a principled and creative approach to considered problems, and inflexible belief in the justice of the great communist cause.

The theme of the collection is the development of the world's revolutionary process. B. N. Ponomarev singles out and studies the following main trends of this development: The increased role of Marxism-Leninism in the development of the social revolution in the contemporary epoch; the increased influence of the CPSU, the Soviet state, and the members of the socialist comity on the struggle of the peoples for national and social liberation, and the rise of existing socialism to the vanguard of the world's social progress; the successes achieved and prospects for the development of the communist, workers, and national-liberation movements; the increased role of proletarian internationalism in the upsurge of the anti-imperialist struggle and the development of the interaction among the main currents of the world's revolutionary process; and the increased interconnection between the struggle of the working people for social progress and that of the peoples for peace and detente. These trends are considered in the book on the basis of the comprehensive study of the historical experience of the revolutionary movement and in close connection with the changes in the world's situation, and within the organic context of the ideological struggle taking place in the world.

The collection convincingly proves that Marxism-Leninism provides the only correct understanding of the laws governing the development of the society. It enables the party members confidently to find their way in the most complex of circumstances and to choose the proper type of struggle and most expedient methods for political action. In a speech delivered at the international scientific session dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the Great October Revolution (1967), B. N. Ponomarev emphasized that, "the experience of the entire world communist movement indicates the tremendous significance of the proper attitude toward revolutionary theory, loyalty to Marxist-Leninist principles, unbreakable ties between theory and practice, and creative development of theory on the basis of the international experience of the revolutionary struggle in the success of the struggle for the ideals of communism" (p 276).

The October Revolution was the greatest triumph of Marxism-Leninism. The author dedicates his closest attention to the study of its universal-historical significance. The revolution gave a new direction to the development of the entire human society. It speeded up its forward movement, debunked the myth of the inviolability of capitalism as the alleged "natural order of things," and proved that its replacement by socialism has been irrevocably placed on the agenda by history.

B. N. Ponomarev notes that one of the most important ideological and political results and international consequences of the victory of the October Revolution was the insurmountable influence of the ideology of scientific communism on the revolutionary process and the life of the nations. This ideology "began irrepressibly to spread throughout the earth, acquiring the importance of a universal banner of the struggle against all types of human oppression and rightlessness" (p 281).

The Great October Revolution and the entire development of the world's revolutionary process in the 20th Century have been inseparably linked with Lenin's name and cause. The author continually turns to him in his works, both those especially dealing with the brilliant philosopher and leader of the working class as well as articles and speeches on various problems of the theory and practice of the liberation struggle. He convincingly proves that the doctrine of Lenin, as the great theoretician and strategist not only of the world's workers but the entire anti-imperialist movement, and as the spokesman for the basic interests and expectations of the broadest popular masses, and as the teacher of the working people the world over, became a manual for action for all truly revolutionary forces of our epoch. "As the most consistent student of Marx and Engels, as a loyal and passionate defender of the revolutionary science they created, Lenin made a tremendous contribution to Marxist doctrine, creatively developing and enriching it, raising scientific socialism to a new, higher level" (p 347). The social practice of mankind convincingly proves, the author states, that Leninism is the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the building of socialism and communism, the appearance and development of the world's socialist system, the national-liberation revolutions and breakdown of the colonial system, and the epoch of the transition of mankind to communism (ibid).

Developing revolutionary theory in close contact with the practice of the building of communism in the USSR and its internationalist policy in the world arena, together with the fraternal parties the CPSU is establishing Leninism as a truly international doctrine of permanent importance in the struggle waged by the working class and its revolutionary vanguard against all forms of exploitation and oppression and for the socialist reorganization of society. By heading the first victorious proletarian revolution our party assumed tremendous historical responsibility. In order to be on the level of this responsibility and accurately to determine the political line at any given moment, the party constantly turns to the experience acquired in building a new social system in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and the practical experience of the world's revolutionary movement. In this connection the author characterizes the 25th CPSU Congress as a new major contribution to the treasury of the political and theoretical experience of the Leninist party. The ideas and conclusions contained in the Central Committee Accountability Report to the congress, presented by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, are of particular importance. "This outstanding party document encompasses the sum total of various and complex problems resolved by the party. The depth of the formulation of problems whose solution is of interest not only to the Soviet people but to all people on earth; combining practical decisions with their theoretical substantiations; considering the topical task of the building of communism on a broad international level in close connection with strengthening the positions of world socialism in the general context of the struggle for peace and security of the peoples and for social progress are factors which, in their totality, gave the congress its truly universal sound and significance (p 606).

The author studies extensively the role of the working class as the leading force in Soviet society. This role is implemented, above all, through the Communist Party, for it is precisely the party that combines a scientific knowledge of the laws of social development with the creative initiative of the masses and their practical activities in all fields of the building of communism. The party formulates the theory of the revolution and of the building of the new society. Its political line embodies the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, and the combination of the interests of the working class with those of all physical and mental workers. The party is the superior form of organization of the working class expressing the will of the working people regardless of their professional or national affiliation. It can harmoniously combine the specific interests of the individual social strata in groups with the long-term strategic objectives of socialist development. "The source of the party's strength and authority lies in its close unity with the people, the infinite trust in the party by the working people, and the ability to provide permanent and effective leadership in all sectors of social life" (p 609).

Analyzing the essentially important problem of the influence of the first country of victorious socialism on the world's revolutionary process, B. N. Ponomarev emphasizes that the international duty of the Soviet working class is to do everything possible in its own country to support the revolution in other countries and that it is precisely through its economic policy, as Lenin taught, that it exerts its main influence on the development of the world's revolution (see pp 218-219).

The USSR influences the international revolutionary movement and the social progress of mankind as a whole above all through the successes of the peaceful toil of the Soviet people. To the working people the world over it offers a factual example of the new organization of a society capable of ensuring the implementation of its ideals and expectations. The conversion to the developed building of communism in our country represents an unparalleled growth of the power of the example of developed socialism. The 10th Five-Year Plan adopted at the 25th CPSU Congress represents the grandiose program of a new, a comprehensively qualitatively higher stage of the building of the material and technical base of communism. This program relies on the tremendous achievements of the previous development of the country and faces the working people with the most important task of upgrading labor effectiveness--a decisive prerequisite for the further upsurge of output and people's prosperity. The party considers the implementation of this plan as a new contribution made by the Soviet people to the common cause of all revolutionary and democratic forces in the world. The author notes that the tremendous achievements of developed socialism become particularly apparent against the background of the profound and comprehensive crisis which has encompassed the capitalist system in recent years. "It would be no exaggeration to say that never before has the superiority of socialism over the capitalist system based on profits, exploitation, and oppression, been so impressive as today" (p 607).

One of the leading trends of the contemporary revolutionary process is the strengthened unity of the members of the socialist comity and their increased influence on world events. The book offers a profound and comprehensive study of this trend which the author considers as the most important direction in the struggle for the social renovation of the modern world.

The study of the experience acquired in the course of three decades of relations among members of the socialist comity shows that as the successes of socialism increase the historical law of the gradual rapprochement among fraternal countries and peoples is appearing ever more clearly. Together with the blossoming of each socialist nation and the strengthening of the sovereignty of the socialist states their interrelationships become ever closer. An ever larger number of common elements appear in their politics, economics, and social life. B. N. Ponomarev stresses the tremendous role of socialist economic integration accomplished within CEMA. "It is important to note," he writes, "that the fraternal cooperation among CEMA-member countries contributes to the considerable equalization of differences in development levels. In turn, this makes possible the further enhancement of the effectiveness of this cooperation and its positive influence on the economy and the entire social life of the socialist states" (p 529).

The increased economic and defense potential of the members of the socialist comity and their strengthened unity contributed to the strengthening of their international positions and to the broadening of their possibility to influence world circumstances. The 1970's are marked by the effective utilization of these possibilities whose implementation determined a qualitative change in the ratio of forces in the world arena in favor of socialism and the international communist, workers, and national-liberation movements. As the author points out, this is convincingly confirmed by the victory of the heroic people of Vietnam and the other peoples of Indo-China, the strengthened positions of socialist Cuba, and the international acceptance of the western borders of the members of the socialist comity. Also unquestionable is the connection between the new circumstances in the world and the liberation of many colonial peoples and the fall of the last fascist regimes in Europe.

Addressing himself to the problems of the workers movement in the capitalist countries, B. N. Ponomarev proceeds from the basic Marxist-Leninist stipulation that the working class is the main motive and mobilizing force of the revolutionary struggle and the entire democratic and anti-imperialist movement. The currently growing upsurge of the mass actions launched by the working people is the most important indicator of the growing possibilities of the working class and its strengthening fighting moods. A characteristic feature of such actions, including the biggest strikes, is their intensified class, political, and anti-capitalist orientation. The workers are not only defending already gained positions but mounting offensive actions, formulating new demands effecting the very foundations of capitalist ownership and power. "Despite individual failures, the overall result of the development of the workers movement is unquestionable. It is expressed in the predominance of aggressive trends, the strengthening of positions, and the enhancement of the social role of the working class" (p 501).

The book deals extensively with the revolutionary vanguard of the working class--the communist movement--as the most influential political force of our time expressing the vital interests of the working people of all countries. Studying the trends of development of the international communist movement, the author points out the steady growth of communist party ranks and greatly intensified social influence. There were 27 communist parties in 1920 and 43 in 1939; they total a membership of 4.2 million. In the course of World War Two and in the first post-war decade 32 new communist parties were formed and the number of communists in the world exceeded 33 million. By the middle of the 1970's the number of communist parties had reached 89 (see pp 105-106, 525). "Their possibilities have increased immeasurably. As always, the communist parties are in the front lines of the struggle for the interests of the working class and of the peoples" (p 525).

The path of the communist movement is not smooth. The author focuses his attention not only on the successes of the communists but, above all, on the complex problems which they must resolve and the difficulties they are surmounting in their struggle. His study proves that declines which have taken place in the history of the communist movement have been temporary while its growth and strengthening are an objective law of historical development.

The class enemy well knows that the strength of the working class lies, above all, in the communist parties it has created. That is why it focuses its main strikes at the communists. The revisionists who call for the abandonment of the Leninist principles of party work and for the conversion of the communist parties from combat revolutionary organizations to something similar to debate clubs pour grist into the mill of the bourgeoisie. The author offers a profoundly substantiated criticism of such attempts. "The class battles of our time have proved, yet once again, the vital force of the Leninist principles governing the building of a party of a new type. Armed with the scientific ideology of Marxism-Leninism, built on the principles of democratic centralism, maintaining extensive and close ties with the toiling masses, the revolutionary party of the working class is the soul and the brain of the progressive movement of our time and of all liberation and anti-imperialist battles of today. The ideological and organizational strengthening of the communist parties is the guarantee of new victories in the struggle for peace and socialism" (p 111).

Currently the struggle on the subject of how to come out of the economic crisis is aggravating in the capitalist countries. The bourgeois methods are universally known and extensively applied. They involve shifting the burden of the crisis to the working class and the other toiling strata and to the peoples of underdeveloped countries. Under present day conditions, however, the size, nature, and organization of the forces opposing imperialism make it possible to defend the previously gained rights and the interests of the working people and ensure the type of surmounting of the crisis which would represent, as the fraternal parties emphasize, progress toward true democracy and development on the way to social progress.

Currently the efforts of the fraternal parties in the capitalist countries are directed precisely on the solution of this very important and difficult problem. The objective and subjective conditions for its successful solution vary from country to country. However, they exist everywhere. The extent to which and the time of solution of this problem largely determine the pace and nature of development of the workers' revolutionary movement in the contemporary capitalist countries. This increases the importance of the cooperation between communists and other progressive and democratic forces. This problem as well is extensively treated in the collection. The Marxist-Leninist approach to its solution is clear: "Throughout the world the communists sincerely offer their hand to anyone ready to fight for peace, democracy, national freedom, and social progress. They do not alienate themselves or oppose the other democratic or leftwing forces, offering to anyone honest cooperation based on equality and mutual respect" (p 619).

The author considers the problems of the national-liberation struggle of the peoples in close connection with the development of international socialism and the communist and workers' movements. He considers this struggle one of the most important progressive forces of our time. The old colonialism could be considered abolished with the fall of the final colonial empire--the Portuguese--and the gaining of independence by the peoples of Mozambique, Angola, and Guinea-Bissau. At the same time, of late imperialism has suffered major blows in the realm of the struggle waged by the peoples for full economic liberation. This enables the author to draw the basically theoretically and practically important conclusion that a crisis has broken out in the economic base and the entire political superstructure of neo-colonialism (see p 579).

Anti-imperialism is the common socioeconomic direction of the national-liberation movement. Pointing out in this connection the main trends of the changes which have taken place in recent years, B. N. Ponomarev notes that they include, above all, the shifting of the center of gravity in social development to socioeconomic changes, the elimination of the vestiges of feudalism, the nationalization of foreign enterprises, the establishment of revolutionary-democratic parties, and the implementation of other progressive changes. In our time the struggle for the implementation of anti-feudal and anti-imperialist programs is intensifying. Its successful development presumes the close cooperation between communist and revolutionary-democratic parties. Revolutionary democracy is an influential current in the national-liberation movement. It leads the countries which have chosen a socialist orientation and counters the imperialist neocolonialist course.

The internationally organized opposition to neocolonialism, and the strengthened cooperation between the liberated countries and the socialist states and all revolutionary and democratic forces play a tremendous role in strengthening the positions of revolutionary democracy and the further intensification of progressive changes. The author emphasizes that here the strengthening of their alliance with the members of the socialist comity which, through their achievements and international policy contribute to

the creation of conditions for the acceleration of the socioeconomic and political progress of the peoples in the liberated countries, is of prime importance. The USSR and the fraternal socialist countries are helping to strengthen the positions of many developing countries and their struggle against all discrimination, giving them extensive and varied aid and support.

The growing mutually profitable cooperation between socialist states and liberated countries has become one of the major positive factors contributing to the growth of the struggle for a progressive reorganization of international economic relations. "Such cooperation has already brought about major changes in the system of international economic relations. It would be hardly possible to question the fact that already in the 20th Century the economic map of the world has changed substantially in this respect as well" (p 472).

Under the contemporary conditions of confrontation between socialism and democracy, on the one hand, and imperialism and reaction, on the other, one of the main tasks of the Marxist-Leninists, is to energize the struggle for ensuring closer interaction among the basic revolutionary forces of our time--the world socialist system, the workers' movement in the capitalist countries, and the national-liberation movement. The content of the collection is largely determined by the all-round investigation of this task. The author indicates the only true key to its solution--proletarian internationalism--the great revolutionary principle which determines the Marxist-Leninist approach to the major problems of the revolutionary process. Proletarian internationalism is the most important factor in the unification of the world's revolutionary movement, broadening and strengthening on the basis of the international solidarity of the working people, inseparable from its social essence, basic interests, and historical objectives. This thought is comprehensively developed and substantiated in the work.

The attention which the Marxist-Leninists pay to problems of internationalism is determined by the current shifts in the world's revolutionary process. The present day reality of the international class struggle links ever more closely the solution of such problems with the tasks of strengthening the socialist comity, unifying the world's communist and workers' movements and consolidating all anti-imperialist forces in the world. ". . . Experience proves," the author concludes, "that proletarian internationalism has always been a reliable and powerful weapon of the working class" (p 235).

The further internationalization of the entire social life of the nations is taking place in our epoch. Under conditions in which the class struggle is intensively waged not only within national frameworks but in the world arena, objectively requiring the international consolidation of the domestic and allied forces of each of the participants in this confrontation, its outcome largely depends on whose socio-political and ideological influence will predominate.

It is precisely in this respect that the international proletariat has always enjoyed unquestionable superiority over its class enemy, based on the objectively international nature of the workers' movement. The common views, interests, and objectives of the workers in different countries predetermine the internationalist nature of the ideology, politics, and practical activities of the proletariat and its organizations. "The strengthening internationalization of production, science, and culture broadens and increases the objective prerequisites for the manifestation of proletarian internationalism in action. However, in order for its possibilities to come to light, proletarian internationalism must be given a specific political shape. The workers of the different countries must feel and act as structural parts of the international labor army" (p 499).

B. N. Ponomarev interprets proletarian internationalism in his works as a permanently developing and an ever richer principle of relations among the different detachments of the working class the world over; among the Marxist-Leninist parties of different countries; between the international working class, including its victorious detachments, and the progressive and anti-imperialist forces operating in the national liberation zone. Finally, as a principle expressing the essence of relations among fraternal socialist countries, since as a result of the enrichment and the ever wider dissemination of the principles of revolutionary internationalism of the working class, adopted by such countries and by the broadest popular masses as a whole, here socialist internationalism has developed and strengthened as a manifestation of proletarian internationalism and as a consequence of its further development. The fact, the author notes, that the class policy and revolutionary ideology of the workers' movement is being accepted ever more frequently by certain non-proletarian strata does not change in the least the class nature of proletarian internationalism and should not result in the least to the lowering of its significance. On the contrary, this proves that its importance and realm of influence are increasing further and further (see pp 234-236).

The Marxist-Leninists proceed from the dialectical interaction between the international and the national in the revolutionary workers' movement, not admitting the absolutizing or ignoring the national characteristics of the various detachments of the international proletariat and the specific conditions governing the class struggle in one or another country. "To Marxists-Leninists," B. N. Ponomarev writes, "the truly national is not opposed to the international. The great force of scientific socialism is that it found a proper combination between the national interests of the working people and the people's masses of each country and their patriotism and love for the homeland with internationalism, with unity of common interests of the working people of different nations and countries" (p 238).

The increasing variety of conditions of the class struggle and forms of mass progressive and anti-imperialist movements in the various countries not only do not reduce but enhance even further the importance of international proletarian solidarity and the interaction among all main revolutionary forces

of our time. The author's study of these problems irrefutably proves that the main factor rallying the revolutionary forces is the international communist movement whose solidarity determines, above all, the strengthening of their revolutionary alliance and cooperation.

In his works B. N. Ponomarev pays considerable attention to the correlation between proletarian internationalism and the peaceful coexistence among countries belonging to the two opposite social systems, and to the class struggle and detente. Some bourgeois ideologues and politicians claim that peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems is allegedly incompatible with the support which the socialist states give the national-liberation movement and their solidarity with the revolutionary struggle in the capitalist countries, and that it is possible only providing that the socio-political status quo in the contemporary world is maintained. According to the logic of such claims peaceful coexistence should be based on the abandonment of the revolutionary struggle for national and social liberation, the abandonment by the socialist countries of the principles of proletarian internationalism, and the cutting down of the world's anti-imperialist movement. On the other hand, the Maoists and their extreme leftwing allies claim that detente represents a way of reconciliation with imperialism."

Our party has given a proven answer to such fabrications. Peaceful coexistence is a principle of intergovernmental relations aimed at removing from them wars and violence. Detente neither deletes nor could delete the laws of the class struggle or change their nature. No one could rely on the fact that under the conditions of detente the communists would accept exploitation or that the monopolies will become supporters of revolutions. As to the leftwing opponents of detente, the Marxist-Leninist answer is the following: Any revolution is, above all, the result of the all-round development of a given society. Detente not only does not hinder such a development but, conversely, is consistent with its requirements. This is convincingly proved by the very practice of the liberation struggle and the impressive victories won under the conditions of detente by revolutionaries, democrats, and fighters for peace. "Successes in detente," the author states, "create favorable conditions for strengthening peace on earth, the building of socialism and communism, the defense by all nations of their independence and their advance along the path of social progress, and for the struggle of the working people in the capitalist countries for their political rights and material interests and against the policy of reaction and militarism" (p 557).

B. N. Ponomarev considers the trends in the world's revolutionary process from the positions of historical optimism, assessing them on the basis of the firm conviction that "socialism is the main way to universal social progress" (p 528).

The study of the topical problems of the world's revolutionary process contained in B. N. Ponomarev's works represents a major contribution to summing up the international experience of the class struggle and the Marxist-Leninist science of the revolutionary transformation of society.

IN THE NAME OF NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE AND SOCIALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 pp 84-90

[Article by Nguyen Duy Trinh, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Politburo, vice premier, and minister of foreign affairs of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam]

[Text] The total victory gained in the struggle against American aggression and for national salvation inaugurated a new stage in the Vietnamese revolution. Creatively applying the Marxist-Leninist doctrine under the practical conditions of Vietnam, the fourth Congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam, held in December, 1976, faced the entire party and Vietnamese people with new great tasks: Rapidly to heal the wounds inflicted by the war, put an end to poverty and backwardness, and successfully build a peaceful, independent, and united socialist Vietnam. At the same time, the congress analyzed the international situation and earmarked the party's foreign political course at the new stage.

The development of events after the congress has confirmed, to an ever greater extent, the correctness of the CPV conclusions.

The world socialist system is steadily strengthening in all respects. It has achieved important successes in building the new society. Combining the advantages of socialism with the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, the planned economy of the socialist countries is developing at a high pace. The day is not far when socialism will fulfill V. I. Lenin's prediction and mandate: To reach a social labor productivity far higher than under capitalism. This will be an exceptionally important step toward the solution of the problem of "who-whom?" in the struggle between socialism and capitalism on a universal scale. The world socialist system is steadily increasing its influence as a decisive factor in the development of human society and as a firm bulwark of the universal proletarian revolution and a reliable support of the movement for peace, national independence, democracy, and social progress. Today the influence of socialism in the world is wider and stronger than ever before.

The peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are continuing to hold aggressive positions in the struggle against imperialism, old and new colonialism, racism, and Zionism, converting the once safe rear and reserve force of imperialism into a front line and, as an active force in the struggle against it, winning a number of new and very important victories. Rallied within the non-alignment movement, the developing countries are intensifying their struggle against imperialist intrigues with a view to strengthening their political independence and achieving economic independence. The victories of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, South Yemen, Ethiopia, and Afghanistan revealed a characteristic feature and trend of the contemporary national-liberation movement--combining the struggle for national independence with the struggle for socialism.

Aiming their actions directly at the foundations of imperialism, the working class and working people of the capitalist countries are intensifying their struggle and broadening its scope. They have achieved considerable successes contributing to the further weakening of the domination of state-monopoly capitalism.

Under the continuous all-sided attacks mounted by the world's revolutionary movement and as a result of the aggravations of internal contradictions inherent in the capitalist system, imperialism is sinking ever more deeply into the mire of an all-round profound crisis. Contradictions among imperialist countries are becoming ever more noticeably aggravated. Holding ever weaker positions, and finding themselves under conditions of passive resistance, the imperialists are, meanwhile, seeking any possibility to mount a counter-attack in the hope of retaining the positions they still hold. The U.S. imperialists are trying to retain their control over their Western European allies and Japan. They are continuing the arms race and resorting to treacherous and false tricks in their struggle against the national-liberation movement. They are trying to retain their positions in important areas such as Latin America, the Middle East, the southern part of Africa, and the northeastern and southeastern parts of Asia. They are doing everything possible to divide and weaken the socialist countries and to hinder the strengthening of socialist forces. However, even should the imperialists succeed in creative difficulties and damage locally the cause of the revolution in one or another part of the world, it is obvious, nevertheless, that they are unable to block the energetic pressure of the world's revolutionary movement.

As a whole, the ratio of forces in the world arena is very advantageous to the cause of the revolution. The three worldwide revolutionary currents have jointly mounted an offensive against imperialism, and old and new colonialism and their service, rejecting and defeating them bit by bit.

In such international circumstances all foreign political activities of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam are aimed at comprehensively ensuring advantageous external conditions for the "fastest possible healing of the wounds inflicted by the war, creating the material and technical foundations

for socialism, and strengthening defense capability," and "shoulder to shoulder with the fraternal socialist countries and all peoples on earth, continuing the struggle for peace, national independence, democracy, and socialism, and against imperialism, headed by United States imperialists" (from the Resolution of the Fourth CPV Congress).

The basic principles of the foreign policy of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam are the following:

Bear high the banner of national independence and socialism. This noble objective of our epoch is also Vietnam's major objective. Having achieved complete independence and unification of the homeland, the Vietnamese people are now dedicating all their spiritual and material forces to the building of socialism on the scale of the entire country. At the same time they are tirelessly upgrading their vigilance, fighting all attempts at intervention and subversive actions launched by imperialists and reactionaries. We are continuing to bear high the banner of national independence and socialism with a view to building and defending our homeland and helping to broaden the united front of the peoples the world over in the struggle against imperialism and for peace, independence, democracy, and social progress;

Closely combining true patriotism with proletarian internationalism, and fight against all opportunistic deviations or manifestation of bourgeois nationalism. Comprehensively implementing the task of building and defending socialism in Vietnam, at the same time we are actively supporting the struggle waged by the peoples of the world against imperialism, old and new colonialism, oppression, and exploitation, and for national and social liberation;

Implementing the foreign political course, firmly supporting the principles of independence, autonomy, and international solidarity, developing a spirit of reliance, above all, on our own forces, while, at the same time, strengthening cooperation in the international arena. In our efforts to follow an independent and autonomous creative line in the building of socialism in Vietnam, we also respect the independent and autonomous course of the fraternal parties and countries. We ascribe exceptional importance to the study of their experience. On the one hand we are developing the spirit of reliance on our own forces while, on the other, we are using the various forms of cooperation and all external assistance;

Using the favorable circumstances, energizing foreign political activities and promoting an active and initiative-minded foreign policy. At the present time the three revolutionary currents are holding active and offensive positions while imperialism is weakening and experiencing a major crisis. The American imperialists have deeply entrenched themselves in strategic defensive positions. Compared with the past their possibility to unleash wars have become more limited. The current circumstances are very favorable for the cause of the building and defense of our homeland and for the revolutionary struggle waged by the peoples of the world.

Both in the past, in the stage of the national-democratic revolution, as well as now, in the building and defense of socialism, the fraternal socialist countries are our reliable strategic allies. We shall continue comprehensively to strengthen and develop the combat solidarity and all-round cooperation between Vietnam and all fraternal countries on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The trips taken in recent years to the socialist countries by Comrade Le Thuan, Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee general secretary, and by other Vietnamese party and government leaders, as well as the visits to Vietnam paid by many heads of parties and governments of these countries have strengthened our ties and the comprehensive cooperation between the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the fraternal socialist countries.

Along with political support, the aid and cooperation of the socialist countries in the fields of economics, science, culture, and exchange of experience have become the main content governing our relations with them and an exceptionally important factor contributing to the development in Vietnam of an independent and autonomous socialist economy. The broadening of economic relations and the gradual involvement of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in cooperation and division of labor with the fraternal countries offer favorable conditions for strengthening the economic independence of Vietnam and, at the same time, contribute to the growth of the strength and influence of the world socialist system.

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam is rich in manpower and natural resources. It is strong from the political and defense viewpoints. It occupies an important geographic and political position. Developing feelings of patriotism, loyalty to socialism, and proletarian internationalism, and qualities such as sincerity and modesty, obeying the dictates of their hearts and minds, the people of Vietnam are fully resolved to fulfill their international duty toward the friendly peoples and to make their contribution to the restoration and strengthening of the unity of fraternal parties and socialist countries based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. We are fully resolved to follow firmly the legacy of Comrade Ho Chi Minh:

"The Lao Dong Party (today Communist Party of Vietnam--the author) has never separated itself from the other fraternal parties. It has proved, through all its practical experience, that consistent patriotism is inseparable from proletarian internationalism, and that the fraternal alliance among all those who fight for the common cause and for the liberation of mankind is unbreakable"*

* From the article by President Ho Chi Minh written for and published by PRAVDA on 3 August 1956 under the heading of "Strengthening and Developing the Ideological Unity of Marxist-Leninist Parties."

In this spirit we invariably respect and comprehensively defend and strengthen the friendship and unity between the Vietnamese and Chinese peoples. We invariably favor settlement of issues existing between the two countries through talks. Of late a dispute has arisen between the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the People's Republic of China on the subject of individuals of Chinese nationality living in Vietnam. The Chinese side fabricated this problem in order to promote anti-Vietnam feelings among the Chinese people, create difficulties in the building of socialism in Vietnam, and undermine the traditional friendship between the peoples of the two countries. Pursuing its unchanged policy, the government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam suggested to the government of the People's Republic of China to hold talks for settling the dispute. We are confident that justice will mandatorily triumph and that all intrigues and sinister thoughts will be inevitably defeated and that the valuable friendship between the peoples of the two countries will be preserved.

Great friendship, developed in the course of the common, almost century-old struggle against colonialism and, particularly, in the course of the joint struggle against the aggression of American imperialism and its puppets, for the sake of the national independence and liberation of our countries, exists between the Vietnamese people and the peoples of Laos and Cambodia. Deeply realizing that this combat unity is of vital importance to the victory of the revolution in each of the countries, we have invariably dedicated and will continue to dedicate all our forces to strengthening the friendship with the fraternal neighboring countries, strengthening the trust, and developing sincere long-term cooperation and mutual aid based on the principles of reciprocal total equality, respect for independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity, and non-intervention in domestic affairs.

Relations between the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the People's Democratic Republic of Laos are developing successfully. The visits which the CPB Central Committee general secretary and other Vietnamese leaders paid to Laos and those which the general secretary of the People's Revolutionary Party of Laos and other Laotian leaders paid to Vietnam were a clear confirmation of the fraternal unity existing between the parties and peoples of Vietnam and Laos and contributed to the further successful development of the friendly relations linking them. The Friendship and Cooperation Treaty and the Treaty on the Demarkation of National Boundaries concluded on 18 July 1977 marked a new step forward in the comprehensive development of their relations in the interest of defending the national independence and building socialism in each country in accordance with the profound expectations and vital interests of each of their nations. The Treaty on the Demarkation of National Boundaries confirmed the resolve of both parties to turn for a long time the border between Vietnam and Laos into a friendship border. It was a splendid example of the solution of problems effecting national interests, in the spirit of the skillful combination of true patriotism with high proletarian internationalism.

As to democratic Cambodia it is regrettable that, encroaching upon our territory, the Pnompenh leadership unleashed a border war against Vietnam and committed numerous barbaric crimes against the Vietnamese people. At the same time, they are constantly slandering Vietnam, accusing it of aggression against Cambodia, and trying to promote national hostility between the Cambodian and Vietnamese peoples. Through such criminal actions the Cambodian leaders are undermining the traditional unity between the two peoples and working against the interests of the Cambodian people themselves and the desire of the countries in Southeast Asia to engage in peaceful construction, friendship, and good cooperation in the area, serving only the sinister intentions of imperialists and international reaction.

The firm position of the government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and of the Vietnamese people is the following: Firmly to defend the independence, freedom, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Vietnam and, at the same time, always respect the independence, freedom, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Cambodia and of the other countries, firmly supporting the line of unity with the people of Cambodia, and making steady efforts to achieve the soonest possible settlement through talks of the problems existing in the relations between the two countries. On 5 February 1978 the government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam formulated its specific proposals on this matter: Immediate termination of all hostile actions in the border areas; the joint conclusion of a document pledging respect for mutual independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity within the current borders, rejection of aggression and the utilization of armed force or the threat of its utilization in reciprocal relations, non-intervention in reciprocal domestic affairs, and abandonment of subversive activities against each other. Our restrained position and logical offers earned the acknowledgment and support of the broad international public. However, as before, the Cambodian leaders are refusing to answer while continuing to provoke conflicts and undermining the peaceful work of our people in the border areas.

The imperialists and those who provoked the major complications in Vietnamese-Cambodian relations hoped to hinder the building of socialism in Vietnam and prevent the development of relations between the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the Southeast Asian countries. However, they hope in vain. Vietnam is one of the countries of Southeast Asia and we clearly realize that this area is of particular importance to ensuring our country's security and building of socialism. The Vietnamese people have invariably expressed their solidarity with and energetically supported the struggle of the peoples of Southeast Asia against imperialism and colonialism for the sake of gaining and preserving their national independence. The great victory of the Vietnamese people and the total defeat of the United States provided a powerful incentive to strengthening in Southeast Asia the trends toward independence, peace, and neutrality. These trends are consistent with the expectations and interests of the peoples of the area. In July 1976 the Socialist Republic of Vietnam publicly announced its policy toward the countries of Southeast Asia, consisting of the following four points:

1. Respect for independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity, repudiation of mutual aggression, non-intervention in mutual affairs, equality, mutual benefits, and peaceful coexistence.
2. Non-admission of the use by any country of the territory of one or another country as a base for aggression and for direct or indirect intervention in the affairs of one or another country in the area.
3. Establishment of friendship and good neighborly relations, economic cooperation, and cultural exchanges based on equality and mutual advantages. Solution of controversial problems arising among countries in the area through talks conducted in a spirit of equality, mutual understanding, and mutual respect.
4. Developing cooperation among the countries in the area with a view to their prospering in accordance with the specific conditions of the individual countries and in the interests of independence, peace, and true neutrality in Southeast Asia and making a contribution to the cause of peace throughout the world.

This proper policy was approved by public opinion in the area and throughout the world. Following it, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam normalized diplomatic relations with all countries in Southeast Asia. The initial steps have been taken to broaden comprehensive cooperation with them. During recent visits paid to five countries in Southeast Asia (Laos, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Thailand), and in the course of our contacts with the leaders of these countries, we became even more convinced that the four point policy of the Vietnamese government is fully consistent with the common interests of the countries in the area and that it had met with a positive response among the political circles of these countries. We have all the proper reasons to believe that relations between Vietnam and the countries of Southeast Asia will develop successfully and make a contribution to maintaining and strengthening the peace and friendship and cooperation in the area despite all the intrigues of imperialism and international relations and their tremendous claims regarding this part of the world.

As a sincere combat comrade of the national-liberation movement, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam fully supports the struggle waged by the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America against imperialism, old and new colonialism, racism, and Zionism, for peace, national independence, democracy, and social progress. As a whole, the developing countries, the non-aligned ones in particular, are playing an ever more important role in the world arena. As an active member of the non-alignment movement, Vietnam is strengthening its solidarity, friendship, and cooperation with non-aligned and other developing countries, making its active contribution to the struggle against the imperialist policy of aggression and dictate and to the cause of unity with the forces of socialism, democracy, and progress throughout the world, to the defense of independence and freedom, to ensuring forever sovereignty over natural resources, and to the establishment of a new economic order based on respect for national sovereignty.

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam fully supports the just cause of the working class and working people in the capitalist countries. Directing their actions against monopoly capitalism within one or another country and abroad, they are actively creating a broad united front in the struggle for their vital rights, democracy, social progress, defense of national independence, and peace throughout the world, achieving one success after another, and advancing toward the victory of socialism.

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam favors the establishment and development of normal relations with countries belonging to different social systems, based on respect for reciprocal independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity, repudiation of aggression, non-intervention in domestic affairs, in equality, and reciprocal advantages. Such a principled policy provided an impulse to the development of relations in the fields of economics, culture, science, technology, and other areas between Vietnam and many developed capitalist countries. This yielded certain results. We are ready to normalize relations with the United States as well on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence and proper solution of the problems remaining between the two countries.

The foreign policy of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam--a policy of peace, friendship, and international cooperation--was convincingly proved at the United Nations, various international organizations, and major international conferences. Relations between the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and international and regional organizations are developing successfully.

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the USSR are two fraternal socialist countries jointly struggling for the victory of socialism and communism. In the revolutionary struggle for common ideals, the parties and peoples of the two countries maintain close relations of friendship and great combat solidarity, based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Our beloved President Ho Chi Minh acquainted the Vietnamese people with Marxism-Leninism and the valuable experience of the October Revolution, and laid the foundations of relations between Vietnam and the Soviet Union. The Vietnamese people always feel most warmly toward the Soviet Union, the country of the great Lenin and the homeland of the October Revolution which raised the brave Soviet soldiers who rescued mankind from the fascist yoke, for the country which opened to mankind the path to socialism and is laying a road to communism--the splendid objective of the working class and the working people the world over. The Vietnamese people profoundly realized that the victory of the revolution in Vietnam was inseparable from the support and the aid of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries.

The Vietnamese people are profoundly touched by the splendid manifestations of the internationalism of the Soviet people, expressed in the most warm statement by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev: "Solidarity with Vietnam was, and remains, a command of the heart and the mind . . ." The Vietnamese people are deeply grateful to the CPSU, the USSR government, and the Soviet people

for the great, valuable, and effective aid and support which the Soviet Union has rendered and renders our revolutionary struggle in the past and the present--in the stage of the building and defense of socialism on the scale of the entire Vietnam.

The Communist Party of Vietnam and the Vietnamese people are fully resolved comprehensively to strengthen and steadily to develop the solid and inflexible friendship and combat solidarity between the CPSU and the CPV and between the peoples of the two countries; shoulder to shoulder with the CPSU and the fraternal Soviet people and with all revolutionary forces of the world they are fighting for peace, national independence, democracy, and socialism.

Confident of the beautiful future of fraternal relations between our countries, I use this opportunity to wish through KOMMUNIST all Soviet communists and the entire Soviet people the successful implementation of the important tasks earmarked at the 25th CPSU Congress and develop even further the building of the material and technical foundations for communism, thus making a worthy contribution to the revolutionary cause of the peoples of the world.

5003

CSO: 1802

VICISSITUDES OF THE CAPITALIST CYCLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 pp 91-103

[Article by E. Pletnev, doctor of economic sciences]

[Text] The 25th CPSU Congress noted the unusual nature of the crisis which shook up the world capitalist economy in the mid-1970's. It is equally hard and necessary to reveal in the interwoven economic crises of different origins the role of the cyclical movement of capitalism--the material foundation for the development of the economy of the bourgeois society.

Whereas in the past sequentially alternating four phases in the cycle could be distinguished more or less clearly in the cyclical dynamics of capitalist production--crisis, stagnation, animation, and upsurge, preceding a new crisis--a situation was developed in the second half of the 1970's of a kind of simultaneous coexistence of all these phases. Huge production capacities are idle and millions of hired hands are vainly seeking work as in a crisis. Expansion of capital investments has been stopped nearly comprehensively as in stagnation. Prices are rising as in the enlivenment phase. The pre-crisis production peak has been narrowly surpassed, something which has always characterized the phase of its cyclical upsurge. The various directions taken by the dropping and rising trends in the capitalist economy give its dynamics a certain feverish nature resembling efforts to run up a down escalator.

The combination of such processes poses a number of most grave problems. First, to what extent have objective conditions for a transition from the preceding to the next cyclical spiral in the dynamics of the capitalist economy develop? Secondly, what type combination of state-monopoly stimulation of capital investments with measures to restrain the demands of the working class is of interest to big capital in its attempts to restore the mass capitalization of its profits? Finally, and thirdly, what will determine in the immediate future state-monopoly strategy in capitalization--the requirements of mass civilian production requiring the growth of new domestic and foreign markets (consistent, precisely, with conditions of detente) or feeding (more frankly stated, fattening) enterprises within the military-industrial complex, aimed at making money by producing mass

destruction weapons? Here again we must bear in mind that monopoly capital, hoping for maximum future returns from a suitable channeling of capital investments, fears that such funds may be redirected under the pressure of the working class. As the saying goes, in its wish to repair omissions, it is afraid of omitting repairs . . .

Incompleteness of the Cyclical Crisis

One century ago, in his "Anti-Duhring," F. Engels compared the movement of the capitalist economy with riding a horse which begins with pacing, switches to trotting, then to galloping and, finally, turning to full gallop falls into the precipice. Within that century this "horse" has had a dozen of such starts all of which have inevitably ended with a fall to the bottom of the crisis pit. True, in the final third of the century the capitalist economy has not plunged into its crises suddenly but has crawled to them with breathing spaces. However, it has also found it more difficult to climb back. The incompleteness of the preceding cycle hinders the start of the new.

When the 1974-1975 crisis broke out many of its aspects resembled "classical" cycles. However, its subsequent development was unusual. "Ironically," wrote the leading journal of the American entrepreneurs with concern, "the stubborn unwillingness of business to invest capital in new plants became obvious precisely when the majority of the people making investment decisions ignore the threat of a worldwide crisis of capital investments" (BUSINESS WEEK, 13 September 1976, p 65). BUSINESS WEEK saw the danger of the situation in the fact that real capital formation dried out despite the abundance of low-cost capital loans. "The crisis of capital formation is one of the principal events of decade," the journal concluded, predicting that "the darkest pages of this scenario have not been performed yet" (ibid).

From the very beginning the fact that the main function of the decisive phase of the cyclical process--the crisis itself--could not be fully achieved was the main obstacle on the way to the resumption of capital investment cycle. Even though the crisis blows of cyclical origin repeatedly hit the world's capitalist economy at the end of the 1960's and beginning of the 1970's, so far capitalism has been unable to throw off the burden of capital "overproduction" and thus clear the way for the expansion of capital investments on a new technological basis. A very typical complaint was voiced in that same weekly of the American business circles, in the article "The Economics of Sickly Investments," stating that in the United States, as in the entire capitalist world, investments in basic sectors are not rising, is quite typical: "Capital investments in basic sectors merely suffice to replace equipment written off because of obsolescence. Very few funds are invested in the creation of new capacities" (BUSINESS WEEK, 17 October 1977, p 61). This dark assessment was shared by the influential French journal PERSPECTIVES, according to which, following the crisis of the 1970's, "production stagnation was accompanied throughout by a stagnation of production capital investments. Private production capital

investments remain currently below the 1973 peak" (PERSPECTIVES, 1 December 1977, p 17). Such admissions were made in 1978 as well, voiced particularly sharply in the economic report submitted by the U. S. President to the congress complaining of the comprehensive absence of the growth of investments in capital equipment. The United States was not alone in this. Pierre Calan, former vice-president of the Council of French Entrepreneurs, sadly asked: "What chances for a long life does private capitalism have if deprived of reinforcements of capital and capitalists?" (PARIS-MATCH, 28 April 1978, p 146). However, new investments call for clearing the grounds, something the capitalist society would rather ignore, for this offers a decisive proof of its waste.

The point is that the scale of the capital "overaccumulation" reached is so high that the elimination of its "surpluses" would require a tremendous and length upheaval of the entire reproduction process so that, once and for all, discard equipment still physically adequate. The capitalist state which props the foundations of contemporary bourgeois society fears to undertake this. From time to time the state-monopoly machine itself fabricates partial intermediary crises. However, they do not resolve the problem of eliminating capital considered surplus in terms of the profit norm.

Until World War Two periodically recurring capital overproduction was manifested primarily in its market aspect. That is why the "forcible repair of the broken unity," i.e., making conditions governing the production of added value consistent with marketing conditions, was achieved through the elimination of "overstocking--the elimination of huge masses of "overproduced" market capital.

In the post-war cycles the forms of capital overproduction changed substantially. The experience acquired in adapting the volumes of production programs to the fluctuations of market demand facilitated the modern concerns' task of preventing in good time the excessive overloading of the marketing network. However, since the monopolies, urged on by competition, could not abandon the expansion of production capacities, overproduction assumed primarily the form of overaccumulation of basic capital without saving the market from a glut yet noticeably lightening its load.

In the inordinately complex economic crisis of the first half of the 1970's, the unprecedented overaccumulation of production capital was the result of the entire course of the lengthy cyclical upsurge of the preceding decade. Let us single out, above all, in the length of this upsurge the role of the comprehensively legitimized state-monopoly practice of accelerated formation of amortization funds. The premature write-off of tremendous financial resources, stimulated by state taxation, for the amortization of corporate capital assets did not bring about, paradoxical though this might seem, a faster factual turnover, i.e., the replacement of installed equipment. Conversely, it motivated big business to acquire greater amounts of modern and most modern equipment added to the still not obsolete equipment.

By the turn of the 1970's basic capital in the United States had become rejuvenated by an average of up to 10 years while the active part of capital assets was no more than 6 years old. One-third of this equipment was not even five years old. In the FRG the average age of productive capital did not exceed eight while in Japan even six years. Over half of the productive capacity in the private sector of Japan's industry had been in operation for less than five years (see "Urovni i Tendentsii Razvitiya Glavnykh Kapitalisticheskikh Stran" [Development Levels and Trends in the Main Capitalist Countries], Nauka, Moscow, 1977, pp 160-161). The artificially created conditions for the rejuvenation of the production apparatus led to an overproduction of fixed capital. Under its pressure the corporations barely managed to exclude from fulfilling orders the old production capacities. In years of cyclical upsurge such withdrawals accounted for up to 15-20 percent of the overall industrial potential! Nevertheless, capitalism had to pay for such a Faustian passion for rejuvenation when the processes leading to the appearance of additional (alread "surplus") output, urged on by the competition between late and latest equipment, began to dry out ubiquitously, caused by the hopeless lagging of solvent demand. The 1974-1975 economic crisis reduced the load of productive capacities in industry by 36 percent in the United States and approximately 30 percent in Western Europe and Japan.

Thus, the avalanche of the accelerated rejuvenation of productive capital (on the market this process was accompanied by a reduction in the "time of tolerance" of a popular commodity model to 2.5-3 years) extended the upsurge phase and postponed the appearance of the overproduction phenomenon itself by widening the arena for this ripe crisis. After the lowest point of the crisis drop of capital investments and output was reached in 1975, the very youth of capital assets became the reason for delaying the revival of the economy and, even more so, the advent of the regular cyclical upsurge. The "surplus" of rejuvenated equipment had a paralyzing effect on the internal forces which could ensure the turn to the ascending stages of the capitalist cycle. This was clearly manifested in the dampening of entrepreneurial incentives to engage in the further improvement of the production apparatus without which the regular cyclical growth of output is impossible. The mass replacement of equipment, neither morally nor physically obsolete as yet, and the construction of new plants without even partially exhausting the possibilities of recently built plants and installed equipment, were so clearly unprofitable that this paralyzed for a long while the initiative of even the most financially powerful competitors to invest.

The crisis which did not leave the capitalist economy erected equally powerful obstacles to the efforts to surmount the effect of the depressing forces of the cycle and, on the other extreme, the "overaccumulation" of productive capital--in the area of the concentration of "surplus" hired manpower. In the old "classical" cycles capitalism "resolved" the problem of forced idleness of surpluses of fixed and working capital with barbaric simplicity: During crises, as Marx said, like a noble slave owner it took

with itself to the grave "entire hecatombs of workers" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch" [Works], Vol 6, p 459). Now, when the power of the labor movement deprives capitalism of the possibility to hurl "surplus" proletarian families under its merciless juggernaut, the destructive power of the retained crisis continues to strike at the most sensitive facets of the life of the contemporary proletariat and its most important gains--qualifications, professional skills and, above all, knowledge. It was not without reason that K. Marx considered the time invested in the development of a worker as "production of fixed capital, such fixed capital being man himself" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch," Vol 46, Part II, p 221).

Naturally, we speak of such capital "surplus," i.e., of the general knowledge and technical culture of the exploited manpower, not in the sense of absolute "excessiveness" of expenditures for education or "excessive" knowledge and skills acquired by higher labor. The real problem lies in the disparity between the nature and level of training of millions of physical and mental workers and the need of business to exploit them. True, in the course of the crisis of the 1970's, i.e., in the course of the really serious upheaval, a classical solution was found for the "forceful restoration of the broken unity": The sudden sagging of millions of people from their jobs. In a single year--from 1973 to 1974--the army of unemployed in all the old capitalist countries doubled, rising from 7-8 million to 15-16 million, with a still continuing ascending rather than descending trend (18 million at the beginning of 1978). Along with the United States, whose "relative overpopulation" today covers the nearly total number of unemployed in all industrially developed capitalist countries at the beginning of the 1970's, today the unemployment "millionaires" club has been firmly joined by Great Britain, France, Italy, the FRG, and Japan.

Yet, the withdrawal of productive capital represented by millions of hired workers delays the upswing in hiring not only in connection with the inability of business to provide the appropriate number of jobs. The main thing is that unemployment today means a waste of acquired knowledge and skills, dequalification and lowering of the abilities of manpower to engage in complex work consistent with the scientific and technical revolution, i.e., work requiring the application of general knowledge, computations, memorization, and professional skills. Unemployment represents the moral wearout of the labor and creative potential of millions of workers, and the withering away of capital invested in the shaping of a complex manpower which alone can move on the scientific and technical revolution.

However, private business is frankly indifferent to the fate of demoralized cadres destroyed by unemployment--the most valuable feature in the capitalist world, for it is obsessed with the salvation of the material elements of wealth, by frozen capital values (could we fail to see here the economic base for the passionate attraction displayed by the imperialist bourgeoisie for the neutron bomb which promises to destroy the human "factor" "alone," while retaining the material elements of capital in which the modern bourgeois superstitiously includes himself!).

True, the remaining unemployment and, particularly, the growth within its ranks of the share of recently trained young people or dropouts (up to one-half of all job seekers in the main capitalist countries) has energized the public and can not fail to alarm the state organs for the simple reason that it is precisely these millions of trained but as yet unemployed job seekers will require, above all, additional capital investments for their retraining and, perhaps, further studies. However, such a not completely definite possibility is not as yet pressing and is sometimes even used to make the young people openly expressing their discontent with the violation of their right to work or "obedient."

Finally, we can not ignore yet another reason which hinders the removal of the depressing forces of the unfinished cycle. It is a question of the outflow of considerable capital from material production which fully determined the course of the old reproduction cycles to sectors which ensure the shaping and reproduction of contemporary hired labor: Education, health care, social insurance, services, information, mass recreation, tourism, housing, and others. Suffice it to recall that by the end of the 1950's the overall value of fixed capital in U.S. industry was one-half that of capital assets in the home (\$400 billion compared with \$600 billion). However, that which, under the conditions of a cyclical upsurge, could have acted as its "additional material base"--those same household capital assets and, in general, all capital equipment in this area, customarily described as non-productive--now had to be considered as yet another, previously underdeveloped while currently obviously "overdeveloped" factor which delayed the surmounting of the depressing trends in the cycle. The "overaccumulation" of capital assets frozen in this "non-production" sphere is largely explained, for example, by the fact that the investment process in it can not assume in the least the reanimation effect provided by capital formation in the processing sectors of U.S. industry. The chain remains broken and the cycle incomplete.

It is no accident that frequently words of caution are heard in the business circles of the capitalist world on the advent of yet another crisis upheaval stemming from that same unfinished cycle and lasting through 1980. "Starting with the middle of 1977, ever more frequently the fear has been expressed that the Western industrial countries are facing a new crisis. Do we not find ourselves, after two and a half years of the most acute post-war crisis at the beginning of a new decline?" asked toward the end of last year the West German journal WIRTSCHAFTSDIENST, citing as reasons for such a gloomy prospect the weakness of the investment process and the low level of employment (WIRTSCHAFTSDIENST, No 11, 1977, pp 566-567). However, the following question arises: Are such predictions not an attempt to justify in advance the approaching time when the equipment installed on the eve of the cyclical crisis will be 12 to 13 years old and, along with all jobs it has provided within the cycle, be considered ready for a mass discard?

Limits of Production Growth with Stagnating Capital Investments

The retention of chronically underused yet, frequently, still not obsolete capital equipment, and the lack of interest displayed by the monopoly entrepreneurs in getting rid of capital asset "surpluses" have given the dynamics of the world capitalist economy an extremely unstable and sluggish nature after the 1973-1975 crisis breakdown. For quite some time the masses of underused capacities firmly blocked the path of additional investments for the creation of a new production potential. For this reason the planned expansion of output and trade turned out, from the very beginning, deprived of a nutritive source such as the former increase of capital investments. On the contrary, the surplus of accumulated capacities encourages the temptation of the entrepreneurs to reuse them and recover with interest the capital advanced long ago for their purchase. Therefore, starting with the second half of the 1970's, increasing output and marketing by going back to the fulfillment of orders precisely with this same productive capital and with the gradually written off equipment and technological systems, has been characteristic of big business in all continents. It was precisely the increased level of their utilization that laid the uncertain yet principal foundation for the slow and irregular increase in the volumes of capitalist output in 1976-1978. The load of productive capacities of the unretooled U.S. industry barely exceeded 80 percent while that of Western Europe has stood at the 75-80 percent level.

Capitalism which is hindering new capital investments for the sake of extracting profits from every single invested penny, has proved, more clearly than ever before, that it is directly opposed to a society engaged in long-term planning. Furthermore, hindering additional investments in order to increase the load of installed capacities, it is trying to lower yet once again the load of the installed productive potential in order to obtain maximum profits with minimum operating capacities. Both trends--toward maximizing and minimizing--in the loading of productive capital are competing, alternately assuming the upper hand in the absence of competition on the part of new capital formations. This is the reason of the uneven "broken" rhythm in the dynamics of output with a clearly manifested growth dampening trend which became apparent at the end of 1977 (six percent in the FRG and Italy, four percent in France, three percent in Japan, and two percent in the United States).

The United States presents an interesting aspect of this dragged out "incompatibility" (maintaining a pace of increased output in the old technological base while allowing additional capital investments for its renovation). Essentially, it is only in American industry that a certain energizing of capital investments was noted in 1976-1977, particularly through additional investments for replacing equipment in the processing industries and, to a lesser extent, for new construction as well as, partially, as a result of foreign capital investments (see SURVEY OF CURRENT BUSINESS, August 1977, S-1). However, it was precisely in 1977 that the expansion pace in the overall volume of industrial output in the United States dropped by one-half compared with the previous year; in the third quarter it dropped by over one-half compared with the second quarter and, in the fourth quarter by yet another half, compared with the third.

The instability of such dynamics of external market indicators conceals the true depth of the stagnation and triggers irrational concepts on the development of the cycle. Vulgar political economy began to adopt the idea of the "shortened" cycle--initially a four-year one, followed by a drastically shortened two-year term, now reduced to an annual term. In the case of the Western European economy the following system of cyclical fluctuations is suggested: 1975 < 1976 > 1977 < 1978 > 1979!

Starting with the factually apparent dynamics of output, the bourgeois economists also proceed from the clearly utopian and unprovable postulate that in the course of a year all the inevitable phases of the economic cycle are covered: Destruction and rejection of "overaccumulated" capital (function of the crisis phase); forceful elimination of disproportions through the price-setting mechanism and the choice of new technology promising a reduction of "social" production costs (depression phase function); orders for new equipment and its utilization in production (energizing phase function); and utilization of the bulk of renovated capital (cyclical upsurge function). The need for all these complex functions is explained, as we know, with the transition of the capitalist cycle from one phase to another--its autonomous movement. Leaving aside the question of how all such tasks could take place in the course of the year, the bourgeois economists convert into a "benefit" the increased frequency of cycles within an annual amplitude. "The increased frequency of the fluctuations make them less all-embracing," recently claimed the French business journal L'EXPANSION (November 1977, p 22), referring to the fact that the lowering of the growth rates "moderates" the entrepreneurs and softens the impact of unexpected crisis shocks while, at the same time, teaches the consumer and the investor "to react more flexibly to temporary influences."

The desire which business expresses through this view of avoiding dangerous ups and downs related to "excessively ambitious" programs brings us closely to a general question related to the capitalist economy: Why is it today that monopoly business prefers a way for maximizing profits other than that of increasing new capital investments?

The perspicacious leader would surmise that this represents, above all, a problem of the limits of the growth of the cost of living and the running out (or permanency) of the inflation. In fact, does the systematic use of inflation, particularly the raising of prices as a source of enrichment for the capitalist monopolies confirm the continuous inexhaustibility of this process? Let us recall that in the past 25 years prices in the capitalist world have been rising almost continuously even during economic crises. For the past 20 years the share of wages in the price of commodities has been declining. Conversely, the share of the added value in the sale price has been essentially rising, while an absolute reduction in profits per unit of physical volume of output has not occurred even at the peak of the crisis.

On the surface nothing seems to hinder the inflationary mechanism of the redistribution in favor of the monopolies of the newly created value, thus continuing to enrich big capitalism. Yet, this is only a surface view. In reality, the link between the abundant offer of bank credit, far exceeding cash availability which has become inflated with the price increases, and the wilting investment demand has broken. The comprehensive reduction of company orders eloquently proved the weakening of the inflation booster of capital investments. Such shrinking of the orders portfolio, as though made of the shagreen leather mentioned by Balzac, largely predetermines the dampening of the pace of economic development in the capitalist world in the immediate future. "A slow down in the economic growth rates is foreseen for 1978-1979," concluded the informed FINANCIAL TIMES, referring to the most developed Western countries (FINANCIAL TIMES, 21 December 1977, p 7). In this connection, any future reliance on inflation as an instrument which merely redistributes the increased output produced at a slowing pace, reveals its growing material unreliability. To this we must add the ever clearer not only economic but socio-political ineffectiveness of inflationary methods for controlling the capitalist economy, for, considered from its socio-political aspect, the aggravation of inflation and the class struggle for the redistribution of the national income do not strengthen in the least the common positions held by the industrial corporations or the bourgeois state.

True, it was hoped in entrepreneurial circles that inflation would be stopped by the overproduction crisis itself, thus opening the way to the installation of more economical equipment and the lowering of production costs. Indeed, the rate of inflation in a number of leading industrial capitalist countries weakened. However, here again the function of the crisis remained clearly underfulfilled and currently the inflationary process is becoming reintensified.

The other "non-investment" method for increasing the profits--by redistributing foreign markets as areas for the dumping of "surpluses" of marketable capital--has also rapidly exhausted its possibilities. Not entirely unexpectedly, under the circumstances of an intensified competitive struggle for markets the most capacious marketing reservoir--the domestic American market--became the principal arena in the conflict. Yet, the scale and depth of its penetration by Japanese and West German monopolies were totally unexpected. Over one-half of the huge U.S. trade deficit totalling \$34 billion in 1977, was the result of the surplus of commodities imported from the FRG and Japan compared with American exports.

Nevertheless, trade wars waged in recent years have provided no impetus whatever to the expansion of capital investments. What such clashes triggered on the foreign markets were the instability of exchange rates and the spreading of inflation from one country to another.

"In the course of the year to come the instability of monetary markets will make decision making related to capital investments even more difficult," noted BUSINESS WEEK on the eve of 1978, authoritatively concluding that

inflation remains the main reason for killing the hopes of bourgeois governments for economic growth. This leads to the dissemination among investors of a "philosophy of caution," and, hence, "the search by investors of a combination of safety and potential profit and markets such as real estate, works of art, antiques, and gold" (BUSINESS WEEK, 26 December 1977, pp 63, 66). Exceeding the national frameworks of individual countries and spreading over the world's finances and international credit and payment instruments, inflation itself has become an internationally linked process which has blocked over a number of years the way of new capital investments in countries choking from the "overaccumulation" of obsolete capital equipment.

Factors requiring a strictly selective approach to capital investments, such as structural changes in the fuel and energy balance, transportation and power carrier networks, environmental protection systems, and other infrastructural programs, have equally revealed their short-lived nature.

The determination of the limited or inevitable nature of the drying out of non-investment production stimulators directs us, again and again, to the question of the fate of the reproduction cycle itself, not only in the sense of the likelihood of its retention but the inevitability of changes in this process. To put it more specifically, what type of "model" of the forthcoming capitalist economic cycle is developing?

The Class Interests Are Focused on the Cycle's Outlines

No answer to this question is possible without taking into consideration the role which the bourgeois state plays in the capitalist economy. Under conditions governed by the irreversible combination of monopoly forces with those of the state in a highly developed mechanism for the exploitation and plundering of the working people, the state's seeming "non-interference" means merely a shift in the ways used by contemporary bourgeois society in adapting itself to the situation created by the unusual nature of the crisis.

Let us begin with the fact that even prior to the full development of the cyclical overproduction crisis of 1973-1975 the very system of state-monopoly economic control was hit by its own crisis triggered by the aggravated disparity between the rates of the investment and consumer demand as a result of their inflationary financing (for more details see KOMMUNIST, No 5, 1973). Therefore, the influence of the superstructure intensified the basic capitalist contradiction. Subsequently, when this was followed by the shock of capital overaccumulations (i.e., stemming from the base), the power and scale of the crisis became unprecedented. All national systems, programs, and "plans" for state-monopoly control without exception failed, while the "controllers" themselves, i.e., the government organs and their theoretical inspirers are in a state of profound and lengthy shock during the most dramatic twists of the cycle, or to use the old Russian word, they are "adrift."

Since the main manifestations of the crisis in the state-monopoly system for controlling the capitalist economy was the simultaneous growth of both inflation and unemployment, either both or in sequence they were proclaimed by the ruling circles as "danger number one." Correspondingly, means either to fight inflation or unemployment were extracted from the disturbed arsenal of "anti-crisis" tools, all of them equally ineffective. To this day the "controllers" of the Western European economy look with indifference (rather encouragingly) at the beginning outflow of their domestic capital going overseas, flegmatically formulating rather modest programs for the "improvement" of economic circumstances, tax benefits to enterprises employing young people, and other half-way measures.

The scale of unrestrained inflation and chronic unemployment, nevertheless, made bourgeois politicians and business circles realize that superficial measures for the "self-repair" of the state-monopoly regulating apparatus would be unable to reset the national economy, overburdened by idle capital, to the tracks of an upswing (even though cyclical).

At the beginning of this year the leading financial-oligarchic groups of U.S. monopoly capitalism frankly proclaimed their intention to put an end to the economic "confusion" in international capital formation and to recreate a favorable investments climate in the country and abroad. These stipulations were expressed in a concentrated, even though not always intelligible manner, at the January series of program reports and messages delivered by the American administration to Congress on the situation and the future of the national and the world's economy.

Unquestionably, the suggested course of "healing" the capitalist economy or, more specifically, the mobilization of the efforts of state-monopoly capitalism for surmounting the consequences of the preceding crisis and ensuring a cyclical upsurge, should be considered the core of such programs. It is precisely such state-monopoly modeling of the cycle, so far emphasized only in the United States, aspiring for the role of "cornerstone" of the economic strategy of the capital magnates, that awaits the principled assessment of the international workers' movement.

As the programmatic statements of the American administration indicate, it is no longer a question of individual measures to curtail either inflation or unemployment, or both, but of increasing new capital investments. The growth of real capital formation has been recognized as the only reliable source for reducing production costs (and, therefore, inflation) and increasing demand for manpower (reducing unemployment). Yet, what type of capital formation should this be?

The objective of the cycle modeling, initiated by state-monopoly capitalism not exceeding the limits of accelerated return to a well-trodden (or, thoroughly broken up) way of cyclical upsurge, heavily fraught with the danger of a future crisis, is supplemented by the desire to travel along this way in an old fashioned cart, i.e., to impose upon capital investments

the old structure characteristic of investment cycles of so-called "pre-revolutionary times"--the period preceding the scientific and technical revolution. "A fast growth of productive capacities is needed to prevent the development of shortages of some types of commodities even before we have restored high employment conditions," stated the U.S. President in his economic message to Congress. One could confidently say that promises of a return to "high employment" are needed, above all, in order to prevent the formulation of demands for higher wages. The full extent of the class meaning of this intention could be determined by recalling, yet once again, that the application of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution in production has required the exploitation no longer of simple physical labor but of complex, skilled labor. The training of huge masses of hard labor to do such complex work has redirected most capital investments toward the human factor, triggering a trend toward reducing the organic structure of capital in the course of the entire number of cycles (thus, from the end of the 1920's to the beginning of the 1970's the organic structure of capital in U.S. industry declined from 8:1 to 3.5:1).

The proposed return to the growth of investments in fixed capital to the detriment of working capital, and the emphasis on the most capital and material intensive economic areas proclaim, essentially, the offensive which the working class is preparing to mount along the entire front. Under conditions of stimulating the growth of the organic capital structure, demand for manpower rises more slowly while its expulsion from the production by labor-saving devices is accelerated. It was not without reason that in the President's message to Congress the annual rate of reduction of the six percent unemployment level was limited to 0.5 percent per year while the inevitable expansion of the pace at which new equipment eliminates jobs was totally ignored.

Shifting the emphasis of the investment program to the aspects of the technical evolution traditional in capitalism would restore a trend toward primitivism and the splintering of labor operations and, therefore, the reduction of the working people holding jobs to the role of machine appendages. It is not astounding that the desire to ascribe the future cycle an obviously old-fashioned aspect related to giving priority to capital accumulation stimulants, is equally not shining with innovations: Freezing wages while encouraging capital investments through tax benefits.

The state-monopoly modelers of the forthcoming capitalist reproduction cycle have openly proclaimed the inacceptability of the very idea of the likelihood of raising wages. In their semi-appeals or semi-threats addressed to the working people (the economic message to the U.S. Congress alone contains nine rather meaningful paragraphs rejecting the very right to demand higher wages) the ruling bourgeois circles present the growth of earnings as the reason for higher prices and taxes. It is claimed that hired labor, opposing the pressure of the monopolies, imposes upon itself the burden of higher costs and taxation. Hence the old and quasi-polite "advice," rejected by the proletariat: Tighten your belts and do not strike.

Unlike the vague appeals to the working people, business is being promised quite clearly a lowering of taxes for new investments in fixed capital \$25 billion.

The hopes of the military-industrial concerns for swelling the auriferous vein of militaristic orders are being revived with the orientation toward capital intensive economic sectors, for the purpose of the proclaimed priority of capital investments in the heavy industry of world's capitalism is to conceal the arms race. Should the Western ruling circles succeed in thinking the stimulation of capital investments in heavy industry with increased expenditures for the arms race, from the viewpoint of the currently ruling big capitalist circles the cycle would be completed. It would be based on combining the next cyclical round with a new round of ubiquitous militarization.

However, something else is noteworthy as well. Even though the thus "planned" combination of the forthcoming reproduction cycle with a development of the arms race clearly expresses its class intent, the suggested model for the cycle has not met with unanimous support among the most influential big business circles. This is caused, above all, by the still existing reason which is described in Lenin's theory of imperialism as the "inerradicable conflict of economic interests" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 42, p 94).

The point is that in the course of an entire series of reproduction cycles in the industrially developed capitalist countries a considerable, if not predominating, share of capitals have been redirected not toward the areas of heavy industry on whose priority the plan for the projected cycle relies. Sectors related to the training of skilled manpower, with its new requirements and forms of consumer activities, have proved to be the most profitable and promising. In the case of such cycles which developed in the course of the scientific and technical revolution, surmounting the consequences of the cyclical crisis and raising labor productivity to a new level could be accomplished only on the basis of increased investments in "human capital," i.e., imparting to the manpower employed in these areas an additional cycle of knowledge. Raising the educational standard and retraining the hired personnel, while not converting such knowledge and skills into capital benefiting the working people in the least, nevertheless promises incomparably higher profits for the monopolies which have fastened themselves to the scientific and technical revolution. For this reason, the choice of the state and the monopolies (in the heavy and military industries) of the capital intensive variant of the forthcoming cycle is equivalent, in the case of a certain share of business, to a return to the reproduction structure and, in some cases, to a direct pull out of investments and of "corrosion" of capital assets in sectors oriented toward mass markets. Even the message to Congress, calling for a return to the capital intensive cycle, contains the admission that between 1945 and 1965, when labor intensive investments were emphasized, along with the saturation of the American economy with trained manpower the growth of labor productivity averaged three percent annually. Over the past 10 years, as capital investments were directed toward technology, the annual increase of U.S. labor productivity failed to exceed two percent.

Hence the appearance of ever larger number of investment counter projects formulated by business circles interested in protecting such mass markets and increasing the superiority of a contemporary skilled manpower in the scientific organization of labor.

The most vulnerable spot of all state-monopoly cycle models is the fact that all of them ignore the interests and objectives of the factual production subject--the working man--and the demands of the international working class. While the various bourgeois factions are clashing on the subject of the variants and outlines of the future cycle, through its growing activity the working class proclaims the inacceptability of any course based on inviolable cyclical frames of development of social production outlined by capitalist greed. The international proletariat formulates and supports demands aimed at the elimination of periodical crises. Its anti-cyclical class orientation has been deliberately formulated in the programs of the communist parties and of the progressive and mass trade unions in the capitalist countries.

Its basic interests include an end to the arms race and improvements in the structural economic ratios, an orientation toward saturating all realms of life with ever better educated workers, extending universal schooling as an effective means to fight youth unemployment, and upgrading production standards as the basis of the struggle against higher production costs and, therefore, against inflation, increasing the acceptance of orders from the socialist world which is unfamiliar with cyclical crises, and others.

In the course of the development of this multiple-level struggle, the international proletariat is becoming ever more profoundly aware of the fact that its current requirements and daily interests, and its struggle for improving the ratios between the production sphere and the volume of solvent demand are closely interwoven with the struggle for final class objectives. The struggle for softening the cyclical breakdowns in the capitalist economy and their consequences would be justified only by developing into a struggle for the establishment of a social system which would exclude crises by virtue of its very nature. The problem of the vicissitudes of the cycle is turning into the problem of the fate of capitalism itself.

5003

CSO: 1802

LOYAL SON OF THE LENINIST PARTY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 pp 104-111

[Article by G. Sharapov, corresponding member, USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences]

[Text] The names of the inflexible fighters, those who stormed the old world in October 1917 under the banner of the Leninist party, will be forever remembered by the people. Nikolay Mikhaylovich Shvern timer, a revolutionary, and a noted party and state leader who dedicated his entire life to the assertion of the ideals of communism, was one such loyal fighter in the Leninist guard.

N. M. Shvern timer, hereditary Petersburg proletarian, was born in May 1888. He was exposed to need and privation since childhood and experienced the entire burden and cruelty of autocratic oppression. At the age of 14 he went to work at the electrical engineering plant on Aptekarskiy Island, on the Petersburg side. Here the young worker attended his first course in the class struggle participating in demonstrations and strikes.

On 9 January 1905 Shvern timer saw the tragic events of Bloody Sunday--the fire which the Tsarist troops opened at a peaceful workers' march. He remembered that day throughout his life.

"The working class learned a great lesson in the civil war," V. I. Lenin wrote on the subject of the January 1905 events. "In one day the revolutionary education of the proletariat covered grounds which would have taken months and years of monotonous, uneventful, downtrodden life" ("Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 9, pp 201-202). This statement is confirmed by the thousands of biographies of Russian workers who became revolutionaries in 1905. One of them was Nikolay Shvern timer, a young turner at the Dyuf lon Plant. That memorable year he was 17 years old. Bloody Sunday changed Nikolay Mikhaylovich's entire life, asserting his resolve to engage in the revolutionary struggle. He joined the ranks of the Bolshevik Party at the end of 1905.

Since youth Shvernik tried to expand his knowledge. He studied profoundly the works of the founders of scientific communism and was interested in the history of the revolutionary workers' movement. He read particularly thoroughly Lenin's works, finding in them the answer to the question of how the working class should fight for the victory of the socialist revolution.

Becoming a professional revolutionary, Shvernik engaged in clandestine work, initially in Vyborgskiy Rayon, in the capital, as member of the Petersburg RSDWP Committee and, subsequently, in Nikolayev, Tula, and other cities. Everywhere he promoted Marxist ideas and participated in the organization of strikes and political demonstrations. Shvernik's inordinate organizational talent was manifested already then. Local party groups and trade unions were established with his active participation.

Tsarist security was soon able to track down the fearless revolutionary. He was arrested. Nikolay Mikhaylovich used the long months spent in jail for self-education. Along with political writings, secretly received from comrades, he read Belinskiy with interest, along with books and articles by other revolutionary democrats.

The February Revolutionary found Shvernik in Samara as worker at the Pipes Plant. A strike broke out here in February 1917, on Bolshevik initiative. The plant's chief appeared at a workers' meeting with cossacks and demanded that the meeting break up. At that point Shvernik rose to the rostrum and called upon the participants not to retreat but firmly to defend their demands. Fearing the anger of the workers and their unity, the cossacks did not dare to open fire. The meeting went on.

After the overthrow of Tsarism Nikolay Mikhaylovich, having earned prestige and respect among the workers of Samara, was elected chairman of the Trubochenny RSDWP(b) Rayon Party Committee. Soon afterwards he became member of the committee of the All-Russian Association of Factory-Plant Workers of Artillery Plants and, subsequently, its chairman.

After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution Shvernik headed the party organization at the Pipes Plant and, subsequently, the Samara City Soviet. He actively implemented the initial decrees of the Soviet system. An eight hour work day was established at the city's enterprises and the big plants and factories were taken over by the state. The local soviet resettled the workers' families from basements and huts to private homes previously belonging to the bourgeoisie. The construction of new housing for the working people was started on Shvernik's initiative. Homes for abandoned children were set up in the city.

In the difficult times of the civil war the party directed its best sons to the front, to the most important sectors. Nikolay Mikhaylovich joined the Red Army from the very beginning. Soon afterwards he became regimental commissar in the legendary 24th Simbirsk Iron Infantry Division.

As recalled by fellow servicemen, Shvernik was always in the leading ranks of attacking Red Army men. During times of brief respite he talked with the troops. During halts he delivered lectures and reports. On the approaches to a settlement near Simbirsk the White Guards were resisting particularly fiercely. Enemy machine guns prevented any advance. The Red Army men were forced to lie down. It was then that political commissar Shvernik rose. "Communists, forward!" With these words he was the first to attack the enemy. The troops followed their commissar, the enemy was forced to abandon his positions and was routed. The regiment whose commissar Shvernik was was the first to reach Simbirsk for which it was awarded the honor flag of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

The Red Army men attending a meeting chaired by V. V. Kuybyshev passed a resolution to send the following telegram to Lenin: "Dear Vladimir Il'ich! The capture of your native city is the answer to your first wound; Samara will be the answer to the second!" The warm words expressed by Il'ich in his answering telegram were transmitted from one soldier to another: "The seizure of Simbirsk--my native city--is the most healing, the best dressing for my wounds. I feel an unparalleled flow of cheerfulness and strength. I congratulate the Red Army men for their victory and, on behalf of all working people, thank them for all their sacrifices" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 37, p 95).

The Iron Division covered a glorious combat path. It nurtured many heroes for the country. However, neither the veterans nor the young troops of the Samara-Ul'yanovsk, Berdichev, Iron, Thrice Red Army, and orders of Suvorov and Bogdan Khmel'nitskiy Division will forget those who were at its cradle, those who established its combat traditions in the battles against the White Czechs--V. V. Kuybyshev, G. D. Gay, and N. M. Shvernik. During the Patriotic War the Iron Division fought within the 18th Army, covering itself with unfading glory in the battle for the Caucasus, the storming of Novorossiysk, and the liberation of the Ukraine. In his "Malaya Zemlya" memoirs Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev highly rated the difficult military toil of the political workers of the 18th Army who worthily perpetuated the best traditions of the political commissars of the civil war.

After the defeat of the interventionists and the White Guards the party directed Shvernik to a new front--the economic front. He actively participated in the rebuilding of the Donbass, heading the metal workers' trade union.

The party entrusted the old worker, the Bolshevik tempered in the crucible of the revolutionary struggle and front line fire, with most responsible positions.

In February 1924 Shvernik became people's commissar in the RSFSR Workers-Peasants Inspectorate. Subsequently, during the period of the struggle for industrialization, he became secretary of the Leningrad Guberniya Party Committee, and of the Ural'skaya Oblast Committee of the VKP(b). In all

his positions he was helped by his tireless energy, experience in party work, and ability rapidly to establish contacts with the workers' mass. Nikolay Mikhaylovich disseminated the great ideas of Leninism and paid constant attention to problems of efficient national economic management, strict savings, and growth of labor productivity in the course of his addresses delivered at party conferences, meetings, and gatherings of the economic and trade union activists, and during his meetings with workers, peasants, and intellectuals. He emphasized that the development of public production must be based on the achievements of science and the creative activeness and initiative of the broad toiling masses. Shvernik's speeches were always distinguished by their imagery and inordinate simplicity. He was able to present any complex problem in a manner understood by any type of audience. He fired his audience with his enthusiasm, strengthening in it confidence in the victory of socialism and readiness to defend the homeland and the gains of the October Revolution.

Involved in party work, Shvernik did a great deal to unite the party members and to increase their influence among the masses. Efficient contacts with outstanding party leaders such as A. A. Andreyev, A. Ye. Badayev, M. I. Kalinin, S. M. Kirov, S. V. Kosior, and V. V. Kuybyshev gave him an excellent training. It was precisely from them--the members of Lenin's guard--that Shvernik learned the Bolshevik style and methods of party work.

Shvernik played a great role in the struggle against Trotskiyism and other groups hostile to the party. He passionately defended the purity of Marxism-Leninism and firmly rebuffed the members of the "workers' opposition" and the rightwing opportunistic elements.

In 1929 the party assigned Shvernik to work in the central trade unions organs. He was elected chairman of the Central Committee of the Metal Workers Trade Union and, subsequently, secretary of the AUCCTU. In this position he vividly showed his ability to work with people and to mobilize their efforts for the solution of the problems formulated by the party.

During the First Five-Year Plan the broad toiling masses responded with great enthusiasm to the party's appeal of launching a socialist competition. At the end of April 1929 the competition already involved two million workers and employees in the leading industrial sectors. Shvernik actively participated in summing up and disseminating leading experience. With his help the trade unions organized everywhere public production reviews, production exchanges, competitions for the title of best enterprise and best worker, and so on. It was precisely then that the basic forms of the organization of the competition and the methods for summing up its results were being developed. Nikolay Mikhaylovich attentively followed the new initiatives developing in the workers' collectives aimed at upgrading labor productivity and quality and increasing output. Addressing the Congress of Shock Brigades, in December 1929, Shvernik emphasized that the socialist competition is not a seasonal campaign but a new method of organization of labor, a new, communist method of work at the enterprise.

Shvernik's thoughts and practical experience in the development of the socialist competition remain topical to this day. Today, when the struggle for upgrading public production effectiveness has become the focal point of the party's economic strategy, socialist competition continues to play an ever growing role in the solution of the economic, political, and social problems facing the country.

The movement of the working class for mastering new technology assumed a tremendous scope during the Second Five-Year Plan. The party assigned the trade unions an important role in this sector of the building of socialism. Shvernik dedicated a great deal of work to the organization of the various forms of technical and general educational training of the workers. On his initiative the trade unions actively participated in the creation of technical circles, machine tool courses, and courses for foremen and brigade leaders. They systematically supervised technical training at enterprises, summed up and disseminated progressive experience, and organized conferences and debates on scientific and technical problems.

"The problem of training skilled workers," Shvernik noted, "is one of the main problems in the reconstruction of the national economy . . . the implementation of this most complex task within the entire building of socialism is exceptionally alleviated by the existence of a tremendous upsurge which we note among the broadest possible workers' masses who have firmly undertaken to master technical, political, and general educational knowledge."

In June 1933, with a view to satisfying the material and living requirements of the working people, by joint decision of the USSR Central Executive Committee, USSR Sovnarkom, and AUCCTU, the trade unions assumed the functions related to social insurance and labor safety from the USSR People's Commissariat of Labor which was abolished. They also assumed jurisdiction over the network of sanatoriums and rest homes of all-union importance. This decision had a great political meaning. The administration of social insurance and labor safety became the function of the most widespread social organization. Thanks to the extensive work done by the trade unions to improve social insurance, it became an effective means for the upsurge of labor productivity and for strengthening the labor discipline. On Shvernik's initiative maximum benefits and advantages in social insurance were granted to workers in the leading industrial sectors, cadre workers, and leading production workers.

The AUCCTU always kept within its field of vision problems of upgrading the material prosperity of the people, increasing social consumption funds, improving the supply of the working people with food and objects of prime necessity, and expanding state and cooperative trade. All of Shvernik's trade union activities were focused on making them, as metaphorically stated by Lenin, a school for administration, a school for economic management, a school for communism.

In his public addresses, books, and articles Nikolay Mikhaylovich repeatedly discussed the question of the place and role of the trade unions in the socialist society. He frequently pointed out that the trade unions are the support of the party and the promoter of its policy among the masses. They are one of the links connecting the party with all working people, directing their energy and efforts to the successful implementation of the party's plans. Shvernik deserves great credit for formulating in the 1930's the slogan which called upon the trade unions to "face production."

Such a turn on the part of the trade unions, Shvernik explained, means guiding the movement of millions of workers toward active participation in the building of socialism. It means the further development of the socialist competition and shock work which are the basic methods of trade union work in involving the broad masses in production management and the implementation by the trade unions of their role as a school for administration. In order successfully to implement their functions, Nikolay Mikhaylovich said, under the party's leadership the trade unions must participate ever more fully and energetically in the state, economic, cultural, and political life of society.

These ideas have a particularly topical ring. "In our society production is not pitted against the working people," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 16th Trade Union Congress. "The twin task of the trade unions is to be concerned with the development of the national economy and production upsurge, and concern for the rights and interests of the working people and for their working and living conditions. It is a twin task, precisely, for the growth and qualitatively improvement of the economy is the direct and true way to improving the living conditions of the working people and their families, and of all citizens."

In the Great Patriotic War, led by the party, the trade unions did extensive work to mobilize the working people to help the front, promote universal training, train reserves, and organize the sponsorship of military units by labor collectives. They also assumed the care for war invalids and for consumer services to rear workers and Red Army men.

Remaining in his leading position within the AUCCTU, during that difficult time for the country Shvernik carried out a number of important party and government assignments. In 1941 he was appointed chairman of the Evacuation Council which was entrusted with the relocation of industrial and agricultural enterprises, schools, and scientific institutions. The council undertook the placement of people in the eastern parts of the country. Deputy council chairman M. G. Pervukhin recalls that, "appointing the AUCCTU secretary chairman of the Evacuation Council, the Central Committee Politburo thus emphasized the most important role of the trade unions in mobilizing the forces of the working class and all working people in the country for the relocation of production forces in the deep rear. N. M. Shvernik was assigned a very difficult and important project requiring Leninist training and good knowledge of the country and the people. N. M. Shvernik had all this . . . Work with him was pleasant and easy. He assessed calmly and

soberly the circumstances which had developed in the country in the first period of the war which was adverse to us. Even in the most difficult days he was never depressed and he firmly believed in the victory of our great Red Army . . . " (see "Sovetskiy Tyl v Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voiny" [The Soviet Rear in the Great Patriotic War], Vol 2, Moscow, 1974, pp 16-17).

During the Patriotic War headed the Extraordinary Commission for the Establishment and Investigation of Crimes Committed by the German-Fascist Aggressors. Together with the commission members he visited the liberated Gzhatsk, Rzhev, and other towns and villages.

The picture he saw in the snow-covered cities around Moscow shook up Shvernik deeply. Rzhev was a terrible sight. The city had been destroyed by the fascists to its foundations. Tortured and mutilated corpses of women and children were piled up in ditches. Nikolay Mikhaylovich told his friends that even many years later he found the recollection of this painful.

In the course of its work the extraordinary commission drew up about four million cases of crimes committed by the Hitlerite aggressors on Soviet soil.

Shvernik made a great contribution to strengthening international cooperation with the working people abroad. In 1941 the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee was set up with his active participation, a committee which played a major role in mobilizing the forces of the world's proletariat in the struggle against Hitlerite fascism. The struggle waged by the Soviet trade unions for unity of action among all working people was successful. For the first time in the history of international trade union movement, an organization was set up rallying within its ranks trade unions of different persuasions--the World Federation of Trade Unions. In 1953, at the Third World Congress of Trade Unions, Shvernik was elected one of its vice-presidents. In his speech he called upon the workers the world over to strengthen international solidarity and firmly to promote peace, social progress, and democracy. Explaining the peace-loving policy of the Soviet state, Nikolay Mikhaylovich emphasized that "this policy is based on the firm conviction that a way can be found to settle disputes and unresolved problems peacefully, on the basis of reciprocal agreements by interested countries. The Soviet people and Soviet government proceed, in this case, from the possibility for a peaceful coexistence between the two systems--capitalist and socialist."

In 1944, the USSR Supreme Soviet Session elected Shvernik first deputy chairman; in 1946 he was elected chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Heading the supreme organ of the Soviet system, he dedicated a great deal of efforts and energy to improving the work of the local soviets and to the rapid restoration of the national economy destroyed by the war.

The country was successfully healing the wounds inflicted by Hitlerite fascism. The pre-war production level was reached as a result of the fulfillment of the Fourth Five-Year Plan. The national income rose considerably. Shvernik drafted and signed the Ukases of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium related to the victorious end of the Patriotic War with a feeling of great pride in his country and its people: On the demobilization of Soviet Army troops, granting benefits to former military servicemen in obtaining housing and schooling, improving the working and living conditions of war invalids, and ratification of peace treaties with Italy, Finland, and other countries. He presented the high awards of the homeland to outstanding military leaders such as Marshalls of the Soviet Union G. K. Zhukov, I. S. Konev, K. K. Rokossoskiy, and R. Ya. Malinovskiy, and others.

Nikolay Mikhaylovich considered his meetings with workers, kolkhoz members, and employees--those who entered his reception room on Mokhova (today Prospekt Marksa) his most honorable and main obligation as chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. He became acquainted with many human lives and tried to help everyone.

Shvernik possessed the enviable ability to listen attentively to people who have come to him, according to A. F. Gorkin, who worked for many years with him as secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. He demanded strict accounting for assignments yet, at the same time, was infinitely responsive to his comrades. Shvernik was sincerely pleased with their efforts and saddened by their failures. Engaged in important state work, he found time to read a new book, visit an exhibit, and see a new show. A worker or kolkhoz member describing his work, a painter, a writer, or a scientist sharing with him creative plans could be frequently seen in Shvernik's office. He was able to encourage the people, giving them confidence in themselves, contaminating them with cheerfulness and optimism. Amazing modesty was one of Nikolay Mikhaylovich's characteristic features. He did not like to speak of himself. Yet, he always became enthusiastic when it was a question of people with whom he worked or had met in the course of his trips or during his meetings and talks in his reception room.

Once again, in 1953 the party directed Shvernik to work with the AUCCTU. As its chairman he paid great attention to the further development of socialist competition and to its conversion into a truly mass movement of the working people of town and country. Nikolay Mikhaylovich did a great deal to promote the technical creativity of the working class, comprehensively supporting innovators and production rationalizers, displaying constant concern with the protection of the health of the working people and the further development of the network of treatment installations. He worked on problems of communist education. Shvernik repeatedly emphasized that the all-round development of the individual is possible only through socially useful labor. Comprehensively improving their work, the Soviet trade unions have now become an influential force. Their high role and place in Soviet society are guaranteed by the new USSR Constitution. Under the party's leadership the trade unions play a tremendous role in protecting

the rights and interests of the working people. They actively participate in all realms of life in our country, in production upsurge and upgrading the prosperity of the Soviet people, in national economic management, and in the further development of socialist democracy.

In February 1956 the CPSU Central Committee Plenum elected Shvernik chairman of the Central Committee Party Control Committee. He plunged into this new work with his entire passion: He actively fought for the assertion of the Leninist work style and was intolerant of manifestations of bureaucracy, whitewashing, boastfulness, conceit, and scornful attitude toward people. He was concerned with the observance of socialist legality and firmly fought those who tried to violate the norms of party life, defraud the party, and engage in grubbing.

Whatever his positions, Nikolay Mikhaylovich was always noted for his inordinately attentive attitude toward people. He possessed an amazing memory. He knew personally all his associates and was concerned with their lives. Nikolay Mikhaylovich spent a considerable amount of his time among workers and kolkhoz members, studying in detail the work of enterprises and giving them effective assistance.

The party and the government rated highly N. M. Shvernik's merits, awarding him the title of Hero of Socialist Labor, five Orders of Lenin, and other orders and metals of the Soviet Union. He was a deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in all its sessions, CPSU Central Committee member, candidate presidium member since 1953 and, subsequently, Central Committee Presidium member.

Nikolay Mikhaylovich Shvernik passed away on 24 December 1970 as a result of a severe illness. His dust was buried on Red Square in the Kremlin Wall.

Nikolay Mikhaylovich dedicated his entire life to the great cause of liberating the working people, and the struggle for building a new society. He organically combined within himself a profound knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory with the ability to use it in resolving the specific problems of the building of socialism. In his last article, "Lenin Is Always with Us," written in 1968, Shvernik pointed out that "today as well it would be very useful for the trade union aktiv to turn to Lenin and to study his theoretical legacy more profoundly . . . Il'ich is always with us and his ideas illuminate our path to the building of a communist society" (see OKHRANA TRUDA I SOTSIAL'NOYE STRAKHOVANIYE, No 4, 1968, p 6).

The country sacredly reveres the memory of Nikolay Mikhaylovich Shvernik. Streets in the cities where he worked, plants, schools, and higher educational institutions have been named after him. The growing generation is studying his biography with great interest, for the life and activities of Shvernik--that great son of the working class and loyal communist-Leninist--are a model of selfless struggle for the interests of the working people and the victory of communism.

CLANDESTINE ADDRESSES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 pp 112-117

[Review by N. Mor of the book "Perepiska V. I. Lenina i Rukovodimyykh im Uchrezhdeniy RSDRP s Partiynimi Organizatsiyami. 1903-1905 gg." [Correspondence between V. I. Lenin and the RSDWP Institutions under His Leadership with the Party Organizations, 1903-1905]. A collection of documents in three volumes. Mysl', Moscow, Volume 1, 1974, 501 pages; Volume 2, 1955, 575 pages; Volume 3, 1977, 633 pages]

[Text] "He knew how to read workers' letters. I recall a letter written by the workers in a stone quarry in Odessa. It was a collective letter consisting of several different scrawls, without subjects and predicates, without comas and periods. However, it projected inexhaustible energy and readiness to fight to the end, to victory. It was a colorful letter, every word of it, naive and convinced, inflexible. I no longer remember its content but I remember its appearance, paper, and rusty ink. Il'ich reread the letter several times, deeply thinking, pacing the room." The above is an excerpt from N. K. Krupskaya's memoirs on V. I. Lenin (see the chapter "After the Second Congress" in the book "Vospominaniya o Vladimire Il'iche Lenine" [Recollections of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin], in five volumes. Volume 1, Moscow, 1968, pp 289-290).

At that time the RSDWP was going through an exceptionally difficult period. With the help of the conciliationists the Mensheviks had gradually taken over the central party organs elected by the congress--the ISKRA editorial staff, and the RSDWP Central Committee.

With the loss of ISKRA the Bolsheviks lost the rostrum from which they could defend the decrees of the Second RSDWP Congress and promote a policy aimed at building and strengthening a party of a new type.

Lenin expressed the slogan of the time as follows: ". . . More light, let the party know all, let it be presented with all, absolutely all data in order to assess all and any disputes, returns to revisionism, disciplinary violations, and so so." Lenin, clearly displaying his democratic way of

thinking, called for the following: "Greater trust in the independent judgment of the entire mass of party workers . . . Extensive publicity is the truest and the only reliable means for avoiding a split . . ." ("Poln Sobr Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 8, pp 94-95).

It was only at the very end of 1904 that the Bolsheviks were able to publish the newspaper VPERED, their printed organ. Until then, i.e., during almost one and a half years, contacts with party organizations and individual comrades could be maintained two ways: Through talks with workers coming to Geneva to see Lenin and who, as a rule, soon afterwards returned to Russia clandestinely, and, above all, through correspondence.

Yet, what effort, what tremendous work was involved in organizing the regular correspondence! We can gain a clear idea of this from this recently completed major work.

The three thick volumes, prepared for printing by associates of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism, the Central State Archives of the October Revolution, Superior Organs of the State System, and Organs of the USSR State Administration (TsGAOR SSSR), and the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of USSR History, contain 1,025 documents. The bulk of them have been previously unpublished and, consequently, it is only with this work that they are put into scientific circulation. Chronologically, the work covers about 17 months, from August 1903 to January 1905.

Much of the material in this connection directly correlates with the content of the volumes of Lenin's complete collected works covering the same period of time. This circumstance alone supports the claim that the deeper study of Vladimir Il'ich's works written within the 18 months considered here, as well as a more profound study of the history of the CPSU covering the same period would be inconceivable without the "Perepiska" This collection will become an important aid in the study of the Leninist style of party work and party leadership as well. It enables us clearly to see Il'ich's cast of mind, his phenomenal capacity for work, analytical mind, and emotionality, combined with sober thinking, principle-mindedness, straightforward judgment, tactfulness, friendliness and understanding in his contacts with like-minded people, comradely exchange of views and collective adoption of decisions, intolerance of revisionists and political opponents, and loathing of the squabbles, intrigues, and rows to which the opportunists resorted shamelessly. He pointed out that the revolutionary must be honest with himself and his comrades in the class struggle. It was no accident that at the very peak of intraparty discord Lenin wrote that one of the positive qualities of a Marxist should be the moral right to have our trust--the trust of the collective earned through word and deed. This is no slip of the tongue. In his letter to Krupskaya, who was in Russia, we find the same idea: "We need an atmosphere of comradely trust . . ." ("Perepiska", Vol 2, p 226).

The work also includes Lenin's letters familiar to the reader from his complete collected works. Their inclusion in this three volume work is entirely legitimate, for the majority of the other letters as well sent to different people from Geneva were written on Lenin's instructions (this fact is stipulated for each separate case).

Analyzing the style of Lenin's articles, A. V. Lunacharskiy reached the conclusion that each one of them was a kind of a lecture, report, or essay. The arguments they contain leave definite traces in the readers' minds, changing their moods, conclusions, and opinions. Lenin's articles are written in a convincing style. "While persuading, Lenin fought . . . that is why his favorite way was to persuade so that, at the same time, he could dissuade . . ." (see "Lenin--Zhurnal'ist i Redaktor" [Lenin--Journalist and Editor], Moscow, 1960, p 334). This accurate observation could be applied to Lenin's letters as well. This includes letters addressed to Bolsheviks who had slid to the positions of conciliationism. The same approach is used in these letters: Persuading-dissuading, and dissuading-persuading. Frequently this approach brought about positive results. For example, under the influence of Lenin's articles and letters, and taking into consideration practical experience, and through self-criticism, by the time of the Third RSDWP Congress L. B. Krasin had rejected recent errors and delusions and assumed a consistent party position.

Initially, the same method was used by Lenin in his polemics with the Mensheviks. As Vladimir Il'ich wrote subsequently, surveying the evolution of the Mensheviks in the direction of opportunism and dissidence, "the party majority, in an effort to protect at all cost the party's unity and organizational ties, used only party-loyal means in its struggle and, frequently, granted concessions for the sake of peace-making" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 9, p 16). However, the Mensheviks continued to deepen the split and were factually wrecking the party. They turned its bylaws into a rag and disgraced the organization. At that point Lenin demanded of the majority to answer the pressure of Martov's supporters with pressure. The struggle against the opportunists had to be uncompromising (see "Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 46, pp 354-356).

The collection makes it clear that Lenin read all letters reaching Geneva. He answered personally the ones he considered the most important. Several documents were written jointly by Vladimir Il'ich and Nadezhda Konstantinovna. In the edition Lenin's handwritten inserts and corrections are in thick print which makes them easily identifiable.

One of the unquestionable merits of the three volume work is the extensive and comprehensive scientific-referential material: Notes, indexes, and various addenda. One of them is "tables showing letters sent and received between December 1904 and January 1905 recorded by N. K. Krupskaya."

To use a contemporary term, the "machinery" which helped Lenin to organize and, subsequently, engage in intensive correspondence, consisted of a single person, specifically, the tireless Krupskaya. At different short periods

she was helped by F. V. Lengnik, M. N. Lyadov, M. I. Ul'yanova, and L. A. Fotiyeva, and later on, by Ye. D. Stasova. Gradually, correspondence with Russia and foreign countries rose to 300 letters monthly.

Three hundred letters monthly--was this much or little? The answer to the question is found in Stasova's memoirs. The figure 300, she said, should be multiplied by six. Nadezhda Konstantinovna had to do the following:

1. Write the letter; 2. Underline everything to be coded; 3. Code the underlined; 4. Check the code thus preventing any type of omission or error; 5. Write a "surface" entirely innocuous letter in order not to draw the attention of the censorship; 6. Describe the essence of the topic between the lines of the "surface" letter using chemical ink. This would be the proper place to enter Lyadov's testimony. He recalled that Vladimir Il'ich wrote most of the answers. "Our work was only to code and transcribe using chemical inks."¹ We know from Stasova's words the meaning of this harmless "only" . . .

The decoding of letters reaching Geneva was complex, frequently extremely so. That same Lyadov said subsequently that he was amazed at Nadezhda Konstantinovna's memory: "She had memorized the memberships of all committees. She recalled all conspiratorial names and remembered all figures" (M. Lyadov, "Iz Zhizni Partii v 1903-1907 Godakh. Vospominaniya" [From the Party's Life in 1903-1907. Memoirs]. Moscow, 1956, p 25). Some of the letters could not be decoded at all (there are sections still not entirely deciphered as indicated in the work). This is not astounding, for some comrades wrote in haste, wherever they happened to spend the night, in a state of extreme fatigue caused either by the trip or running from the security organs. The clandestine workers had a difficult and uncertain life. For example, following our lines from the letter of M. M. Litvinov, Central Committee representative for the northwestern area (dated Vil'no, 27 April 1904);² "I have not only been short of time for writing but have a place . . . You go somewhere and you thank fate if you find a place to spend the night"; V. S. Bobrovskiy (dated Tiflis, 16 July): "It is very late. Please do not mind my perhaps unclear writing. I am just as tired today as yesterday and the day before" ("Peripiska . . .", Vol 2, pp 253, 381).

"I am tired . . ." is no slip of the pen. For conspiratorial considerations, in their letters men frequently referred to themselves in the feminine while women in the masculine. For the same conspiratorial considerations the party congress was referred to in the correspondence as Baryna (or marriage), the RSDWP Central Committee was Crane (or Faustus); the Petersburg RSDWP Committee was Kolya; the Tversk was Tanya; the Riga was Romual'd; the Moscow, Starukha; and the Kiev was Inza. The code name for passport was shoe (women's shoes, boots, and so on).

In January Krupskaya asked the people of Kiev: What code was Mitrofan using? He had written that he was using the "Starik Code," but "we went through all the codes and found nothing" (ibid, p 47). Starik was Lenin's code

name while Mitrofan was F. V. Gusarov's pseudonym (he was also known as doctor, Koz'ma, Kuz'ma, Mitrofanov, or Mitrosha); in the correspondence V. V. Vorovskiy was referred to Adamovich, Zhozefina, Orlovsky, Pan, or Shvarts; L. M. Knipovich was Dyaden'ka, Dyadya, Tetya, or Chukhna; B. M. Knunyants was Asya, Kavkazets, or Ruben; N. K. Krupskaya was Yekaterina, Katerina, Katya, Minoga, Sablina, Aunt Katya or Sharko; M. M. Essen (at one point Central Committee member) was Zverev, Zvereva, Zverka, Zverushka, Zver, Mina, Nina L'vovna, Sokol, or Sokolov. Decoding difficulties were increased by the fact that there were a number of "keys." Thus, Stasova memorized "her" key--Krylov's fable "The Oak and the Reed" which contained all the letters of the alphabet.

The broad circle of readers of Lenin's works are familiar with his article "Time to Put an End," which appeared in the first issue of VPERED. It discussed the most disgraceful withdrawal of the Mensheviks who wrecked the participation of the workers in the 28 November 1904 demonstration in Petersburg. The article begins with seemingly specific questions which, in reality, were of major basic significance: Why was it that after such hard clandestine work the demonstration failed? Why did the Petersburg fail to take to the streets? "The answer to these questions," the article states, "is found in the following letter by a worker, committee member, whose main content we publish here" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 9, p 144).

For understandable reasons the worker's name was not given. The letter, excerpts of which Vladimir Il'ich published, has been preserved and its full text has been included in the collection (Document No 911). It carries Lenin's note: "Letter received on 25 December 1904 addressed to 10a." The signature reads: "N (ikolay) N (ikol'skiy). The Nikolskiy name is among those of other members of the Geneva Bolshevik group who signed, in June 1904, a protest against the "street scandals" provoked by the Mensheviks (Document No 631) and the open letter to G. V. Plekhanov of the same group (Document No 638). However, who Nikol'skiy, was what was his real name, remained a real mystery. Now, thanks to the studies of the compilers of the collection, a comparison of handwritings and direct and indirect data, and, in general, the use of methods improved by Soviet archives workers, the mystery has been solved. N. Nikol'skiy (also All., Lev, Leva, Proletariy, or 222) was V. V. Lipshits. He was a joiner, a professional revolutionary since 1901, and a Bolshevik after the Second RSDWP Congress.

The "Peripiska . . ." contains a number of examples showing the attention and thoughtfulness with which Lenin read the received correspondence and the way it kept him in touch with practical matters.

"Received 17 December '03," Vladimir Il'ich noted on the left corner of a letter received from Makeyevka, sent by the Bolshevik worker N. Ye. Vilonov. The author expressed his deep concern on the subject that the divisive activities of the Mensheviks who hindered the positive work done by the Marxists among the working class the main task may remain unfulfilled--the "dissemination among the masses of social democratic ideas, for, forgetting this, we thereby terribly weaken our party" ("Perepiska . . ." Vol 1, p 346).

After making minor corrections to Vilonov's letter, Lenin published it as a postscriptum to his article reprinted soon afterwards, "Letter to a Comrade on Our Organizational Tasks." In the complete collected works, the Vilonov document, so completely expressing the thoughts of an unusual worker who had dedicated his entire life to the cause of the proletariat covers two full small print pages. With the new preface and postscriptum, this "Letter to a Comrade . . . ," which was, essentially, programmatic, accurately hit the opportunists who opposed the organizational foundations of the RSDWP.

Vladimir Il'ich did not limit himself to including Vilonov's letter in his work. He also answered its author. The answer opened with words Lenin frequently repeated to the revolutionaries, promoting in them initiative, independent thinking, the ability to weigh circumstances soberly and objectively, and critically to assess past and present accomplishments: "Your letter pleased me very much, for here, abroad, we hear very few frank and independent voices of those who do the work locally." Vladimir Il'ich further stated that soon "probably in a week or two weeks at most," the minutes of the Second Party Congress would be issued, as "an entire book of over 300 pages," after which he, Lenin, "would have yet to write a pamphlet" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 46, pp 331-332).

That is how Lenin shared his plan for writing "One Step Forward and Two Steps Backward" (crisis in our party)."

In "Perepiska . . ." this work is mentioned so frequently for a variety of reasons that it is as though the reader himself is taken to the laboratory of Lenin's creative thinking. We find an initial mention of the future work in Lenin's letter to Kiev (4 November 1903): "I will do everything and publish a pamphlet on the struggle waged by the hysterical scandal mongers or rejected ministers" ("Perepiska . . . ," Vol 1, p 253).

The Bolsheviks awaited this book with rising impatience. Krupskaya, in an effort to satisfy the curiosity displayed in the work undertaken by Vladimir Il'ich, spoke of it in a variety of letters written during those months. In March 1904 she wrote to V. P. Nogin and V. A. Radus-Zen'kovich, in Nikolayev, that "Lenin's pamphlet on the congress is progressing slowly and will be between eight and ten printers' sheets." In April she wrote to the Nizhegorodskiy RSDWP Committee that "by the end of this month Lenin's pamphlet will be ready. It will be weighty (eight to nine printer's sheets). It will deal with the congress and the state of affairs in the party. We think that it will entirely clarify the position of the majority and I even hope that it would eliminate somewhat the theoretical confusion which is now reigning in the party." Another letter reveals that in the course of the writing of the pamphlet the initial intent was changed. The topic was broadened and the author reached new conclusions. Here is what Krupskaya wrote to L. M. Knipovich in Tver', that same April, on the subject: In the course of the work Vladimir Il'ich realized ever more clearly that "defeated in the fields of theory and practice, opportunism will blossom in the field of organization . . ." ("Perepiska . . . ," Vol 2, pp 199, 227, 242).

When was this work published? The collective works state: "Printed in May 1904 in Geneva as a separate volume" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 8, p 185). Yet, the precise day of the book's publication is known: On 18 May Krupskaya wrote to Stasova in Moscow: "Finally, Lenin's pamphlet will be published tomorrow . . ." The next day, on 19 May, in a letter to the Central Committee Southern Bureau, in Odessa, she wrote: "Finally, Lenin's pamphlet was published today" ("Perepiska . . . ," Vol 2, pp 274-279).

The need to study as soon as possible Lenin's analysis of the crisis within the party and the ways to surmount it was so great that, initially, the local committees, those of Odessa and Saratov, for example, were sent separate parts of the pamphlet from Geneva. "Please notify the printer's sheets received," requested Krupskaya in a 6 May letter to the Saratov comrades. By the summer the shipping of pamphlets to Russia had been adequately organized. In June Nadezhda Konstantinova asked the Petersburg Bolsheviks: "Do you have a large number of Lenin's pamphlets? Could you share with other cities?" In August Litvinov, who not only coordinated the work of the committees of the northwestern area but was also in charge of crossing the border reported to Lenin and Krupskaya from Riga that a shipment of publications, including "One Step Forward," had been received recently. Litvinov wrote with satisfaction that "in a word, now the Russians can already understand the differences completely" ("Perepiska . . . ," Vol 2, pp 268, 331, 460).

The struggle against the opportunists took a great deal of Lenin's time and physical and spiritual effort. Nevertheless, he was able to keep track of publications, be aware of current political events, weigh and analyze them, and react to the most important among them. The Russo-Japanese War is an indicative example. Only several days after its outbreak Lenin wrote his appeal "To the Russian Proletariat." He explained that the war which had broken out in the Far East was criminal, triggered by capitalist greed and suiting the interests of the bourgeoisie. "The war promises new difficulties to the Russian worker and peasant, the loss of endless human lives, the ruination of masses of families, and new burdens and taxes." The only solution was to rise against Tsarist autocracy. "You reap what you sow!" ("Poln Sobr Soch," Vol 8, pp 173-174).

The Bolsheviks had no newspapers of their own and the appeal was published in a separate leaflet. Krupskaya notified Krasin in advance, as he had a well-organized clandestine press in Baku (in this correspondence she used the name Nina): "The old man will write about the war and send the writing straight to you." Several days later, together with M. M. Essen, she wrote to N. E. Bauman in Moscow: "We are sending you a leaflet on the subject of the war. Try to print as many of them as possible and distribute among the committees both for printing and distribution" ("Perepiska . . . ," Vol 2, pp 127, 133).

Clandestine work was accompanied by constant risk, not to speak of an irregular life and material need. "People are being detained . . ." (followed by the names of the detained), came a report from Petersburg in November 1903. From Yaroslavl' the RSDWP Northern Committee wrote (March 1904): Arrests are more frequent. Some people were arrested and the behavior toward the inmates "has become impossible," impudent and provocative. "Recently a mutiny broke out in the jail," after which "some of the inmates were transferred to another, stricter jail." A report from Moscow arrived almost at the same time: "Immediately close all secret meeting places. We shall soon inform you of the new ones" (ibid, Vol 1, p 324; Vol 2, pp 194, 183).

Such communications are frequently found in the collection. It would be no exaggeration to say that night and day the clandestine Bolsheviks had to be on guard to throw off police shadowing, identify provocateurs, and always observe conspiracy rules. On top of that there were the divisive machinations of the opportunists. Going through "Perepiska . . .," we can not but admire the most intensive work of the Bolsheviks, their idea-mindedness and belief, and their real, seemingly commonplace, heroism. However complex or dangerous the daily work of the party officials in Russia might have been they continued their very difficult work.

Unquestionably, Lenin must have been glad to read P. G. Smidovich's letter (Yekaterinburg Autumn of 1903). The author wrote: ". . . we are strengthening and broadening our influence. Here I feel useful. There is a great deal of work, work that is very needed!" ("Perepiska . . .," Vol 1, p 332).

A nearly entire year separates this document from another one drafted by V. V. Adoratskiy. It is a report on the work of the Kazan' Social Democrats from the end of 1903 to the autumn of 1904 (first published). The report stated that at that time the committee "was hardly alive": Its entire membership was arrested in December and was replaced by inexperienced comrades who failed soon afterwards. The situation turned for the better with the arrival of an organizer whose alias was Misha Zavodskoy. His views were closer to those of the Bolsheviks, and with his advent the committee "entered a new stage in its activities." Its structure was the following: Organizer (clandestine), propagandist (with legal training), treasurer (a student), and a technician; yet another worker would be added to the committee soon. The compilers of the collection have found out the names of the organizer, propagandist, student, and technician: N. Ye. Vilonov (Misha Zavodskoy), V. V. Adoratskiy, N. I. Damperov, and L. V. Popov (see "Perepiska . . .," Vol 3, pp 65-68).

Lenin was exceptionally interested in the forms and content of party construction. The letters he wrote or had written to Russia invariably repeated: Write us more frequently, teach the workers as well to write us, write about everything and in as great detail as possible.

In addition to the report submitted by the Kazan' Committee which provided a description, even though incomplete, of the work then conducted by the party committees, let us consider a noteworthy letter written by Krupskaya to N. N. Mandel'shtam. It is sent to Riga from where it was readdressed to Yekaterinoslav, the city of metallurgical workers.

A new place, new circumstances, new difficulties . . . Krupskaya perfectly realized the difficulties to be encountered by the addressee and deemed it necessary to give him some advice. Judging by its style, the letter to Mandel'shtam was not a letter or, even less so, an "instruction," as we would have said today. It is rather a conversation between two party comrades-- a senior with a junior (in terms of age and, consequently, experience), a friendly, open, confiding, and sincere conversation, in the Leninist manner.

Krupskaya advised the comrade to choose a "secretary," and put him in charge of correspondence with the center. What to write about? On the composition of the committee and changes within it, problems discussed and arising differences, types of leaflets printed and number of copies, and the impression they made. Also provide information on the availability to the committee of political publications, and what precisely, the number of organizers and what work they are doing, the number of propagandists, the nature of the propaganda, meetings held, topics discussed at such meetings, and so on.

Anticipating Mandel'shtam's possible perplexity, Krupskaya states: You are probably annoyed by reading this, thinking that, here are bureaucrats for you! They demand letters and more letters, obviously forgetting what working in clandestinity is. "No," Krupskaya answers. "We have not forgotten but the point is describing all this in letters is as urgent a project as any other." She goes on to say: We receive complaints on the scarcity of popular pamphlets and of the lack of active ties between readers and writers and the poor coverage of problems of organization and propaganda. Tell me how to eliminate such shortcomings without a steady flow of letters from Russia? Letters should be written not by the "secretary" alone but by the party organizers and propagandists as well. Workers must be absolutely involved through the writing of letters. Teach them to write not only about strikes and demonstrations, let us say, but about their situation at their plants, unemployment, books they have read, pamphlets they have distributed, the zemstvos, and many other topics which, in fact, constitute life itself. It is precisely this type of letters from Russia that "will provide a vivid material" which will help enforce the party journalists and writers to "live the life of the worker" ("Perepiska," Vol 3, p 239).

The letter is dated 5 December 1904, a time when the first issue of VPERED, the Bolshevik newspaper, was already taking shape.

Noteworthy events, prominently presented in the collection's document, had occurred in the previous month.

A Bolshevik council met in August, not far from Geneva. It unanimously adopted Lenin's suggested appeal entitled "What Are We Striving For? (To the Party)." It was signed by 22 people and entered history as "Appeal of the Twenty-Two." The appeal called for fighting the Mensheviks, for party unity, and for convening the Third RSDWP Congress.

Here is yet another August event. The V. Bonch-Bruyevich and N. Lenin Publishing House for Social Democratic Party Literature was set up in Geneva. By December it had published a number of works written by Lenin, V. V. Vorovskiy, A. A. Bogdanov, M. S. Ol'minskiy, and others.

Between October and December three deeply clandestine party conferences were held in Russia. The "Appeal of the Twenty-Two" became their platform. The delegates to the conferences set up a bureau of majority committees (BKB), headed by Lenin. The bureau's functions were to organize preparations for and convene a new party congress. The first issue of VPERED, the Bolshevik newspaper, was published on 22 December. As we know the Third Congress met in April 1905. However, this date exceeds the chronological framework of the collection. Its last document was written in Petersburg on 21-22 January 1905. It described "Bloody Sunday," and the shooting at a peaceful demonstration of the workers, the sound of which was heard throughout the country and the world. The first Russian Revolution broke out.

The Bolsheviks had been preparing for it. They had consolidated their forces. This consolidation pleased and cheered Lenin immeasurably. As early as October Krupskaya wrote to Tver' that "there is very lively correspondence with Russia" and that "the mood is good" ("Perepiska . . . , " Vol 3, p 39).

Lenin's authority and influence grew in the course of the struggle for a party of a new type and for preparing it for revolutionary battles. This is clearly revealed in the documents contained in the three volume work. In 1903, following his detention, I. I. Radchenko, who had become relatively recently an active agent for the revolutionary Leninist ISKRA, was sent to remote East Siberian exile. In August 1904 he wrote to Lenin from Trifonovo Village, Yeniseyskaya Guberniya (first publication) that the sad news concerning the situation within the party is reaching him as well. He yearned for escaping from his exile and "be a worker," join the ranks of the fighting majority! "At this time I have no idea at all as to when this piece of paper will reach you and how it will reach you. Yet, I very much want to tell you this: Hello, friend, be always hail and hearty. Let your strength not give up in these difficult times." Here is another document: A letter by R. S. Zemlyachki, dated Petersburg 8 January 1905. She reported to Lenin of some meetings with A. M. Gor'kiy, and counceled that "the old man engage in personal correspondence with him," noting in particular that in his talks with her, Gor'kiy said that he considers Lenin "the only political leader" ("Perepiska . . . , " Vol 3, pp 386-387).

Many years later, Lenin wrote that, as a current of political thinking and political party, Bolshevism had existed since 1903. The publication of these three volumes (thoroughly compiled and tastefully presented) is a major historical source. It is also a tribute of gratitude and respect to the heroic cohort of the originators of Bolshevism--Lenin and his supporters. These three volumes of documents are the sequel of the three other volumes already published on correspondence during the period of Lenin's ISKRA. They are the sequel but not the end. In their introduction to this edition, its compilers and editors indicate that a third issue is being prepared: Documents and materials covering the period of the 1905-1907 Revolution. Understandably, a basic work requires painstaking labor and time, sometimes a great deal of both. However, let us express the wish that its publication will not be long delayed.

FOOTNOTES

1. Lenin too was familiar with "chemistry." He found this knowledge useful in 1917, when, following the July events, he had to go into clandestinity one last time. When the nights became cold, Vladimir Il'ich left Razliv and clandestinely reached Helsingfors. Observing strict conspiratorial rules, Krupskaya joined him. We read in her memoirs that, "... Il'ich sent a book which contained in invisible ink the description of a plan on how to come from the station, not to ask anyone the way to the house, how to go up the stairs, and on what door to knock" ("Vospominaniya o Vladimire Il'iche Lenine," Vol 1, p 475).

2. Here and subsequently according to the Gregorian calendar.

5003

CSO: 1802

LIFE OF A BOLSHEVIK-INTERNATIONALIST

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 pp 117-119

[Review by F. Makarov of the book "Samoye Dorogoye" [The Most Precious] by A. V. Yustus, Lenizdat, 1977, 126 pages]

[Text] Recently the Leningrad Publishing House published a book on a person whose name is inseparably linked with the class struggle of the proletariat. Since his early years Vladimir Bogdanovich Yustus, a worker-Bolshevik, dedicated himself to revolutionary activities. He participated in the first Russian Revolution of 1905-1907 and attended the Fifth (London) RSDWP Congress as a delegate. He met with V. I. Lenin repeatedly. He was arrested a number of times and spent 11 years in jail and exile. In order to avoid a hard labor sentence to be meted out by the Tsarist court, in 1909 he emigrated from Russia. The years which Yustus and his wife, Anna Grigor'yevna, spent as emigres were also filled with tireless party work. Frequently, now with three children already, they were sent to jail and forced to endure infinite pains and privations. However, nothing broke their will to fight for the cause of the working class.

The most memorable feature in Yustus' life is his meetings with Lenin and many years of active contacts with Lenin's sisters and other members of the Ul'yanov family. This is the main feature which determined the ideological and political training of Yustus Senior--a brave revolutionary fighter-internationalist, and which helped to shape his outlook and character since childhood. "Acquaintanceship and, subsequently, friendship with Anna Il'inichna and Mariya Il'inichna . . . subsequently played a great role in the destinies of our entire family and of my own life," writes the author, one of V. V. Yustus' sons (pp 19-20). The first part of the book entitled "Courage Is Tempered in the Struggle," leaves an indelible impression. Here the author describes the joint, selfless and heroic struggle waged by Hungarian and Russian communists and progressive proletarians for a Soviet Russia and a Soviet Hungary.

During the imperialist war a large number of Russian prisoners of war found themselves on the territory of the former Austria-Hungary. The Bolsheviks Yustus, Urasov, Shugayev, Tabazhnikov, Timofeyev, Yakovlev, and others

rallied around themselves the revolutionary minded soldiers, explained to them the predatory nature of the war, and acquainted them with Lenin's articles which called for turning the imperialist war into civil war. They established contacts with the Budapest revolutionary organizations and, together with them, engaged in clandestine political work. The Bolshevik group published the newspaper VPERED in Russian and Hungarian. Leaflets calling for a decisive struggle against the imperialist war were printed in Yustus' Budapest apartment.

Light from revolutionary Russia entered Hungary. One of the oldest members of the labor movement in Hungary, Yolan Kelen recalls that, ". . . when the burning wind of the proletarian revolution blew to us from Russia we rallied our ranks and were given a target and direction. . . . Our instructor was . . . a Russian Bolshevik--Vladimir Yustus. He knew what to do better than anyone else. He was a simple soldier of the revolution, a soldier of Lenin. He found us as naturally as a magnet finds iron" (p 24).

The Hungarian working people joyfully welcomed the news of the great victory of the Russian working class which had overthrown the power of landowners and capitalists, and warmly expressed their fraternal solidarity with the heroic Russian proletariat. "Never before," the author writes, "had there been in Budapest such powerful demonstrations as the one held on 25 November 1917." The following was heard at a 100,000 strong meeting: "We extend our hand to the Russians so that they may return to mankind its faith in socialism, confidence, and hope." "May the Hungarian workers learn from the Russians!" (pp 27-28).

In the book happy and exciting events alternate with dramatic occurrences. Frightened by meetings, demonstrations, and protest strikes at plants, the authorities launched police terrorism. Together with many Hungarians the Yustus's--the entire family--were thrown in jail. However, the military tribunal was unable to sentence them, for, under the pressure of the popular masses, the scrappy Austro-Hungarian Empire crumbled. The authorities were forced to release all political prisoners.

We read excitedly about the meeting between Yustus and Urasov, the Russian Bolsheviks, and Bela Kuhn, who had returned from Soviet Russia. He said to his collocutors: "You must fight for Soviet power in Hungary the way we, Hungarian internationalists, helped the Russian working class to defend the Soviet system. This is international proletarian brotherhood in action. It is the most precious of all things!" (p 33).

Since that unforgettable meeting the Russian Bolsheviks acted hand in hand with the outstanding Hungarian revolutionary and his combat fellow workers. The author describes the creation of the Communist Party of Hungary, whose nucleus consisted of the Hungarian internationalists who, as Lenin said, had fully covered the practical path of Bolshevism in Russia; he writes of the victory of the socialist revolution in Hungary on 21 March 1919 and the proclamation of Soviet power. The Budapest group of the RKP(b) launched

extensive organizational and agitational-propaganda work among the Russian war prisoners and actively participated in the activities of the Hungarian Communist Party. It published in the Hungarian capital the Russian newspaper PRAVDA, which carried appeals to defend the people's revolution of Hungarian workers and peasants. Appealing to all Russian prisoners of war in Hungary, G. V. Chicherin, people's commissar for foreign affairs of the Russian Soviet Republic launched the following appeal: " . . . The way our brothers--the Hungarian workers and peasants in Russia, do not spare themselves for the sake of the common revolutionary cause, fighting in our ranks, it is precisely your duty to join the ranks of the Hungarian Red forces fighting for the salvation of their revolutionary and universal-national cause" (pp 38-39).

On 6 April 1919 the first parade of the troops of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, accepted by Bela Kuhn and the people's commissars of Soviet Hungary, was held in Budapest. The battalion of Russian internationalists, raised by Vladimir Yustus and other Budapest group of the RKP(b) marched in the parade. Several days later the Russian battalion received its baptism under fire. The author describes in detail the combat operations of the Russian soldiers-internationalists. Together with other units of the Hungarian Red Army it fought bravely and staunchly against the forces of the Entente launched to suppress the Hungarian Soviet Republic. Like all the troops of the Hungarian Red Army, the battalion forces were inspired to exploit by Lenin's words addressed to the workers of Soviet Hungary. In the front line trenches they read Lenin's article "Greetings to the Hungarian Workers," published in Budapest's PRAVDA: "You are waging the only legitimate, just, and true revolutionary war, the war of the oppressed against the oppressors, the war of the working people against the exploiters, the war for the victory of socialism. Every honest element in the working class throughout the world is on your side," Vladimir Il'ich wrote. The forces of the Russian battalion defending the young Hungarian Soviet Republic were the embodiment of international proletarian solidarity of the working class.

The Hungarian Soviet Republic was suppressed on 1 August 1919. After lasting 133 days it was suppressed by the armed forces of the Entente and the domestic counter-revolution. Welcoming the Russian troops on Csepel Island, in the proletarian section of Budapest, the workers helped them to hide the weapons from the enemy: "The Russian internationalists received weapons from the Hungarian proletariat and it was to the Hungarian proletariat that they returned them" (p 50).

The author describes the dark reactionary days which started in August 1919. Bloody reprisals against the communists and against anyone who had defended the Soviet system were launched with the entry of the Entente forces into Budapest, followed by the gangs of the Hungarian Admiral Horty. "The executioners threw over 70,000 people in jails and concentration camps and 5,000 fighters for Soviet Hungary were shot or tortured" (p 50).

Yustus was among those sentenced to death in absentia. He was able to escape this fate with the help of Hungarian friends. They hid the Russian Bolshevik escaping arrest and helped him to cross the Austrian border. The Hungarian friends thought of his family as well, helping its release from police jails and departure to Austria.

The book describes the thorny road of the Hungarian and Russian communists from Austria to Soviet Russia. He describes the way they, loyal to their international duty, protected one another, and blocked the impudent attempts of the Entente gangs to detain Bela Kuhn and Vladimir Yustus in order to deliver them subsequently to the Hungarian counter-revolutionaries. Thanks to the effective measures of the Soviet government and proletarian solidarity the reaction failed in its intentions. Petrograd and Moscow enthusiastically welcomed the Hungarian and Russian internationalists . . .

The second part of the book is entitled "On Soviet Soil."

Returning to the homeland Vladimir Bogdanovich studied at the Communist University imeni Ya. M. Sverdlov and totally dedicated himself to active economic and organizational work. He "tirelessly raised . . . to a high level the output of plants to which he was appointed as Red director," wrote A. I. Ul'yanova-Yelizarova in PRAVDA. ". . . Taking over very small . . . plants he left them already 2.5-3 times bigger" (p 79). The workers respected him both as director and deputy to the Moscow Soviet and member of the VKP(b) uyezd committee. He remained a fiery internationalist. He as the founder of the joint Russian-Hungarian society of revolutionaries who had fought for a Soviet Republic in Hungary.

The long combat traditions of proletarian internationalism linking the working people of the Soviet Union and Hungary, are still alive in the inviolable fraternal friendship between the peoples of our country and in their joint struggle for peace and socialism.

The torch of proletarian solidarity can not be extinguished! This is the thought imbuing the entire book based on the author's recollections, materials from Soviet and Hungarian archives, valuable family relics, photographs and documents.

5003

CSO: 1802

LENINGRAD'S VALUABLE EXPERIENCE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 pp 119-120

[Review by T. Bolesavskiy of the book "Partiynoye Rukovodstvo--na Uroven' Sovremennykh Trebovaniy" [The Party's Leadership on the Level of Contemporary Requirements], Lenizdat, 1978, 444 pages]

[Text] The practical experience of the Leningrad Party Organization is described in this recently published collective monograph. Its authors are G. V. Romanov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and first secretary of the Leningrad Oblast Party Committee, Yu. F. Solov'yev, B. S. Andreyev, R. S. Bobovikov, and V. I. Pimenov, Leningrad Oblast Party Committee secretaries, gorkom and raykom secretaries, and senior party apparatus personnel. The authors speak of the way, guided by the decisions of the 24th and 25th CPSU Congresses, Central Committee plenums, and other party documents, including the special Central Committee decrees passed on of the greatest importance to Leningrad and its oblast, the party organs and organizations are achieving the successful solution of current long-term problems of the building of communism.

The book begins with the Appeal of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers to the Working People of Leningrad on the Occasion of the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Revolution. The appeal states that the great revolutionary, combat, and labor traditions of the people of Leningrad live in their new outstanding accomplishments. It expresses the deep conviction that they will continue to dedicate their efforts, knowledge, and experience to the implementation of the great Lenin's behests. In the introductory article "The Leninist Party Course" G. V. Romanov convincingly proves the way this legacy is implemented. In the past decade an extensive program for production concentration and specialization and combination with science has been implemented. A truly comprehensive approach is being followed in the implementation of the most important national economic tasks in order to ensure the most effective utilization of the tremendous scientific and technical potential available to the people of Leningrad, improving working and living conditions, and strengthening discipline and organization

in all production sectors. The plan for the economic and social development of Leningrad and Leningrad Oblast, drafted in accordance with Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's instructions, is helping to achieve new successes along this way.

The monograph describes the increased role of the CPSU in the life of society and clearly earmarks the ways to improving party work at the present stage. It describes the way they have been concretized on the obkom, gor-kom, and raykom party levels and on the level of the primary party organizations. The development of big industrial complexes and of production and scientific-production associations, and improved work with party and economic cadres led, on the one hand, to the consolidation of the party organizations and, on the other, the all-round improvement of their activities and growth of their authoritativeness among the masses.

The book consists of three sections. The materials of the first section cover most important aspects of the party's economic management such as the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, intensification of industrial and agricultural production, application of the systems approach to quality problems, improving party control over economic activities, and intensifying the party's influence on all aspects of life of labor collectives. The second section deals with problems of ideological and educational work among the various categories of working people, including working youth, party guidance of creative unions and cultural institutions, and improving the organization of party training. Finally, the third section contains articles on different aspects of organizational-party work. This includes the work of the party committees with primary party organizations, control and investigation of execution of decisions, problems of improving activities within the party apparatus, cadre problems, and others.

As a whole, the authors describe profoundly and specifically the experience of Leningrad's party members in various matters. The book offers the reader and his party organization a great deal of valuable and instructive topics worthy of support and dissemination. He will rate properly the scientific approach to party work inherent in the people of Leningrad, their developed feeling for the new and their revolutionary spirit, enthusiasm, and purposefulness.

5003

CSO: 1802

PARTY GORKOM AND RAYKOM: WAYS AND MEANS OF WORK

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 pp 120-122

[Review by I. Yudin, doctor of historical sciences, of the book "Gorkom, Raykom, Partii: Opit, Formy i Metody Raboty" [Party Gorkom and Raykom: Ways and Means of Work]. Compiled by M. I. Khaldeyev and G. I. Krivoshein. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 463 pages]

[Text] In 1977 Politizdat published a collection based on the content of PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN', the CPSU Central Committee journal. The articles by secretaries of party committees and materials on consultations cover a broad range of problems related to the activities of party gorkoms and raykoms for the implementation of the decisions of the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses. "In general party matters," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, emphasized at the 25th Congress, "the activities of the republic, kray, oblast, okrug, city, and rayon party organizations are of tremendous importance."

The book shows how adamantly and purposefully the CPSU gorkoms and raykoms are working on the implementation of the party's policy and their many faceted great role in economic and cultural construction, the development of mass popular initiative, and improvements in social relations and intra-party life.

The party's leadership is political. It is directly linked with the implementation of the Communist Party's policy. The party committees influence the development of the economy, culture, and other social processes through their specific methods of political, organizational, and educational work. The nature and essence of their activities are described in the introductory article which deals in particular with the activities of gorkoms and raykoms as organs of political management, and in other articles describing their experience in managing specific realms of social life. As the reader will see, the party organizations are purposefully engaged in the further search for types of party leadership which would be most consistent with contemporary requirements and the level of the country's and party's development.

One such recent form is the elaboration and implementation of comprehensive plans for the economic and social development of collectives of enterprises and associations, and of rayons, cities, and regions. As we know, the party ascribes tremendous importance to such plans and calls for the all-round improvement of comprehensive planning. This requirement is created by the expanding scale of the building of communism, the ability of developed socialist society to ensure the coordinated and dynamic development of all realms of society, and the need for the effective solution of current and long-range problems. Taking as examples Vyborgskiy Rayon in Leningrad and Neklinovskiy Rayon, Rostovskaya Oblast, the articles in the collection describe the organizing and guiding role of the party raykoms in the formulation and implementation of plans for economic and social development.

Considerable coverage has been allocated to the implementation of the party's economic policy and strategy. The activities of party gorkoms and raykoms are described in resolving problems of the development and of upgrading the effectiveness of industrial and agricultural output, and improving trade and services. The authors describe the greatness of the problems to be resolved by the party and organizations in the field of economic construction and the variety of ways, means, and methods of party influence on the development of the economy, upgrading the creative initiative and activeness of the working people, and improving the organization of the socialist competition. They emphasize that this influence must be based on the strict observance of the Leninist norms of party life and principles of party management. It is important to improve the work among the masses, the selection and placement of cadres, and control of execution; progressive experience must be summed up and disseminated promptly. Comprehensive scientific-critical studies must be made of the reasons for the lagging of individual enterprises or economic sectors.

The collection also describes the work of the local party organs in implementing the instructions of the 25th CPSU Congress on the need to ensure the unity of the ideological-political, labor, and moral education of party members and all working people. The authors describe the role and specific experience of gorkoms and raykoms in organizing and upgrading the effectiveness of political and economic education, agitation, political information, cultural and educational work, and the development of a socialist labor discipline. The materials describe the way, controlling the content of ideological work, they provide constant help to lecturers, speakers, propagandists, agitators, and political informants in mastering the materials and method for holding classes and talks. The coordination of the activities of institutions and organizations and the elaboration and implementation of integrated long-range plans for ideological and educational work within the labor collectives and at home play a considerable role in the party organs. In this area they are assisted by the voluntary coordination-method councils.

A number of articles convincingly prove the importance of the differentiated approach to the organization of educational work among the various categories of working people, the creative intelligentsia in particular, the youth, the specialists, and the non-working population.

We believe that the readers may be interested in the study offered by the collection of the activities of gorkoms and raykoms in managing the primary party organizations of different national economic units such as industrial enterprises, production associations, kolkhozes, sovkhoses, scientific institutions, or schools. The gorkoms and raykoms are doing extensive work to implement the instructions of party congresses and the Central Committee decree "On the Guidance of the Primary Party Organizations of Enterprises by the Zlatust City Party Committee." Their main attention is focused on steadily enhancing the role of the primary organizations in the life of labor collectives and giving a new content to all their activities, making them more significant and effective. This is achieved through a variety of ways which include the attentive study of local circumstances, the systematic consideration of problems related to the activities of primary organizations at bureau plenums and sessions, the organization of exchange of experience in party work at seminars and practical science conferences, and the more specific organization of intraparty information.

The collection also describes the experience of gorkom and raykom work with secretaries of primary party organizations, party group organizers, and the aktiv.

A number of articles describe the way, on the basis of the instructions of the 23rd, 24th, and 25th CPSU Congresses, the gorkoms and raykoms are adamantly improving the quality of leading cadres, seeing to it that managers at all levels meet contemporary requirements. This is greatly helped by work with the cadre reserve and by paying constant attention to problems of upgrading the skills and ideological-political training of the workers and the creation of the necessary conditions for helping people to acquire specialized and higher education. The efforts to strengthen the structure of middle-level management is described.

One of the articles discusses the specific ways and means through which the Nesvizskiy Rayon Party Committee (Minskaya Oblast) is working for the strict implementation of the Leninist norms of party life, the stipulations of the CPSU bylaws on the observance of intraparty democracy, collective leadership, and personal responsibility, and the electiveness and accountability of leading organs in all party organization activities. The raykom tries to promote the high level activeness and principled and efficient discussion of problems so that each party meeting, bureau session, or plenum may turn into a school for the ideological and political training of the party members and the elective aktiv. The raykom, the article states, displays a strict attitude toward problems of strengthening party discipline, seeing to it that an atmosphere of intolerance toward violators of the bylaws be created in all party organizations.

As we know, state and public organizations play a tremendous role in the life of our country. Their activities, the work emphasizes, are largely determined by the extent to which the party organs can distinguish among the specific functions of each organization while coordinating and rallying

their efforts in the solution of common problems. The collection shows that attentiveness with which the party organs analyze and discuss at bureau sessions and party committee plenums the work of such organizations and contribute to the dissemination of their best experience. The role of personal contacts between secretaries, bureau members, and the personnel of party committee apparatus, on the one hand, and heads and activists of soviets, trade unions, and the Komsomol, on the other, has been enhanced considerably.

The adoption of a scientific approach is the main requirement in practical party work. The implementation of such an approach means the utilization of the entire variety of ways and means for the study and comprehensive analysis and summation of processes occurring in the socioeconomic and spiritual areas, and purposefully effect the situation in the most important sectors of communist construction. One of the elements of the scientific approach used by the party committees is that of specific sociological studies. The collection described the instructive experience gained in their organization, and methods for their implementation and practical utilization by the Khimki Gorkom (Moscow Oblast). The studies are conducted by a special group set up on a voluntary basis by the party gorkom. It includes sections on problems of ideological-party and ideological work and party management of the economy.

In our view the compilers have properly allocated substantial space to consultations. Specifically, the readers become informed of the practical experience in preparing for and conducting plenums and bureau meetings, and auditing commission sessions. Consultations on organizing the work of the party committee apparatus are included. They describe the basic directions and ways and means of activities of the apparatus as a whole and of its individual departments, and the place and role of the party committee instructor and the requirements he must meet. Also covered is the important problem of the content and criteria used in assessing the standard of the apparatus' work. The reader will find a great deal of useful advice in consultations on long-term and current planning of activities of party committees, organization of control of execution, intraparty information, work with the aktiv, new party membership, and the upbringing of young party members.

The collection has shortcomings as well. Some of its articles are too general and descriptive, insufficiently describing practical experience. Not all authors have focused their attention on the new aspects developed by life and the practice of the building of communism at the present stage, thereby requiring the particular attention and creative refraction in the work of party committees and organizations. As a whole, however, this is a useful publication of interest to anyone studying the theory and practice of party construction and participating in the comprehensive activities of party organs and organizations.

5003
CSO: 1802

FROM THE BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 p 123

[List of books received]

[Text] Marx, K., Engels, F., and Lenin, V. I. "O Diktature Proletariata" [On the Dictatorship of the Proletariat] Collection. Compiled by V. T. Kaltakhchyn, Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 320 pages.

"Kommunisticheskaya Partiya Sovetskogo Soyuz v Resolyutsiyakh i Resheniyakh S"yezdov, Konferentsiy i Plenumov TsK" [The Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences, and Central Committee Plenums]. Eight expanded edition. Editors in chief, K. U. Chernenko and A. G. Yegorov. Volume 11, 1972-1975, Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 552 pages.

"Konstitutsiya Obshchenarodnogo Gosudarstva" [Constitution of the State of the Whole People]. General editors M. S. Smirnyukov and K. M. Bogolyubov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 248 pages.

"Privetstviya Kommunisticheskoy Partii Sovetskogo Soyuz v Svyazi s 60-Letiym Velikogo Oktyabrya" [Greetings to the CPSU on the Occasion of the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Revolution], Collection, Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 544 pages.

Kunayev, D. A., "Sovetskiy Kazakhstan" [Soviet Kazakhstan], Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 150 pages (Soviet Republics).

Solomentsev, M. S., "Leninizm--Nauka Revolyutsionnoy Bor'by i Kommunisticheskogo Sozidaniya" [Leninism--the Science of Revolutionary Struggle and Building of Communism]. Report at the ceremonious session in Moscow on the occasion of the 108th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth, 21 1978. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 32 pages.

Volodin, A. I., "Anti-Dyuring F. Engel'sa i Obshchestvennaya Mysl' Rossii XIV Veka" [F. Engels' Anti-Duhring and 19th Century Russian Thought] (Historical-philosophical essays), Mysl', Moscow, 1978, 252 pages.

Hegel, G. V. F., "Politicheskiye Proizvedeniya" [Political Works]. Editorial group, B. M. Kedrov, chairman. Nauka, Moscow, 1978, 440 pages.

Gordeyev, V. B. and Pletnikov, V. I., "Anti-Kommunizm--Glavnoye Ideyno-Politicheskoye Oruzhiye Imperializma" [Anti-Communism--the Main Ideological-Political Weapon of Imperialism], Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 184 pages.

Grishkyavichus, P. P., "Sovetskaya Litva" [Soviet Lithuania], Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 112 pages (Soviet Republics).

"XXV S'yezd Kommunisticheskoy Partii Danii" [25th Congress of the Communist Party of Denmark], Copenhagen, 23-26 September 1976. Translated from the Danish, Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 160 pages (documents and materials of foreign communist and workers parties).

"Istoricheskiy Opyt KPSS v Bor'be za Ukrepleniye Mira i Druzhby Mezhdunarodami" [Historical Experience of the CPSU in the Struggle for Strengthening the Peace and Friendship among the Peoples]. Materials of the 1-3 June 1977 Alma-Ata All-Union Scientific-Theoretical Conference. Editorial collegium. Editor in chief A. L. Narochitskiy. R. B. Suleymenov in charge of publication. Alma-Ata, Kazakh SSR Nauka, 1978, 602 pages.

"Istoriya Moskvi" [History of Moscow]. Brief outline. Third corrected and expanded edition. Editor in chief S. S. Khromov, Nauka, Moscow, 1978, 543 pages.

"Klassy i Klassovaya Bor'ba v FRG" [Classes and the Class Struggle in the FRG]. Editor in chief I. N. Undasynov, Nauka, Moscow, 1978, 295 pages.

Kuznetsov, G. and Polyakovskiy, V., "Illyuzii Svobod i Gor'kaya Deystvitel'nost'" [Illusions of Freedom and Bitter Reality], Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 350 pages ("Imperialism, Events, Facts, Documents").

"V. I. Lenin i 'Soyuzы Bor'by'" [V. I. Lenin and the "Freedom Associations"]. Collective monograph, A. F. Kostin head of the authors' collective, Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 304 pages.

"Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya na Dal'nem Vostoke v Poslevoyennyye Gody" [International Relations in the Far East in the Post-War Years]. In two volumes. Editors: Ye. M. Zhukov, et al. Volume 1, 1945-1957. Volume 2, 1958-1976. Mysl', Moscow, 1978. Volume 1, 279 pages; Volume 2, 286 pages.

"Osnovnoy Zakon Nashey Zhizni" [The Fundamental Law of Our Life]. General editor P. N. Fedoseyev, Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 416 pages.

"Osobennosti Vosproizvodstva Rabocheго Klassa Razvitykh Kapitalisticheskikh Stran" [Characteristics of Working Class Reproduction in the Developed Capitalist Countries]. Collective monograph. Editor in chief A. A. Galkin, Nauka, Moscow, 1978, 304 pages.

Parygin, B. D., "Nauchno-Tekhnicheskaya Revolyutsia i Lichnost". Sotsial'no-Psikhologicheskiye Problemy" [The Scientific and Technical Revolution and the Individual. Socio-Psychological Problems], Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 240 pages.

"Problemy Kompleksnogo Osushchestvleniya Zadach Kommunisticheskogo Vospitaniya v Svete Resheniy XXV S"yezda KPSS" [Problems of the Comprehensive Implementation of Communist Education Tasks in the Light of the Decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress]. Based on the materials of the December 1977 Moscow All-Union Practical Science Conference. Compiled by L. P. Bel'yanskiy and P. I. Zhilin. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 384 pages.

"Proletarskiy Sotsialisticheskiy Internatsionalizm" [Proletarian Socialist Internationalism]. Traditions, contemporary experience, creative development. Editor in chief F. I. Basmanov, Mysl', M, 1978, 335 pages.

"Sovetskiye Vooruzhennyye Sily" [The Soviet Armed Forces]. History of their construction. A collective of authors headed by S. A. Tyushkevich. Voenizdat, Moscow, 1978, 516 pages.

"Sotsialisticheskaya Ekonomicheskaya Integratsiya" [Socialist Economic Integration]. Theoretical and practical problems. Collective monograph by Hungarian, GDR, Polish, and Soviet scientists, Ekonomika, Moscow, 1978, 183 pages.

"Sotsialisticheskiy Obraz Zhizni i Novyy Chelovek" [The Socialist Way of Life and the New Person]. A. I. Arnol'dov and E. A. Orlova general editors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 208 pages.

"SSSR v Tsifrakh v 1977 Godu" [The USSR in Figures in 1977]. Brief statistical collection. L. A. Umanskiy in charge of publication. Statistika, Moscow, 1978, 239 pages.

Tetyushev, V. I., "Sotsialisticheskoye Preobrazovaniye Ekonomiki SSSR i Burzhuanizatsiya 'Kritiki'" [The Socialist Reorganization of the USSR Economy and the Bourgeois "Critics"] Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, 216 pages.

5003

CSO: 1802

FOLLOWING THE ARTICLE IN KOMMUNIST

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 78 pp 124-128

[Answers to "On the Responsibility of the Printed Word"]

[Text] The USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses made a careful study of the critical remarks related to a number of domestic and translated publications contained in the letters by K. Mokhov, "Thinking of the 'Left System of Coordinates . . .'," Yu. Subbotin, "On the 'Vulnerability of Truth' in Some Popular Publications," and V. Gabchenko, "As a Game . . .," published in KOMMUNIST No 4.

It is a view of the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses that the editors of KOMMUNIST have drawn reasonably and timely the attention of the authors of books, reviewers, and publishing workers to the need for adopting a more responsible attitude toward the ideological and scientific content of publications.

In turn, the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses has repeatedly drawn the attention of publishing houses to major shortcomings of an ideological and scientific nature found in some books. At meetings of the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses collegium sessions, decisions, and reviews ideological errors found in the studies of some authors, and a scholastic and objectivistic approach of some authors adopted in considering important theoretical problems have been criticized sharply.

Presently we have earmarked a number of measures to increase our control over the ideological and scientific level of produced publications. Thus, the Chief Editorial Board for Socio-Political Literature alone has planned to draw up 10 topic literature surveys on most important problems such as the Soviet socialist way of life, dissemination of the new Soviet Constitution, criticism of bourgeois ideology, patriotic and international education of the working people, and so on. Along with the topic surveys, the main editorial board is planning to prepare and discuss quarterly combined reviews of socio-political publications. Preparations are being made for holding a joint session by the collegium of the USSR State Committee for

Publishing Houses and the Presidium of the USSR Philosophical Society to discuss the ideological and scientific content of philosophical publications. A preliminary agreement has been reached on the participation in this session of the USSR Academy of Sciences social sciences section.

The USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses is planning the submission of systematic reports by publishing houses at collegium meetings on their work to upgrade the ideological and scientific content of publications. The publishing houses have been instructed to discuss the materials published in issue No 4 of your journal and take the necessary measures considerably to improve the work of upgrading the ideological and scientific level of publications.

By I. Chkhikvishvili, first deputy chairman, USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses.

The RSFSR State Committee for Publishing Houses considered at the collegium meeting the article in KOMMUNIST (No 4, "Thinking of the 'Left System of Coordinates . . .',") on the occasion of the book by Yu. G. Antomonov "Razmyshleniya ob Evolyutsii Materii" [Considerations on the Evolution of Matter], published by Sovetskaya Rossiya in 1976.

The collegium admitted the criticism of this publication just and substantiated.

An investigation established that the publishing house violated the basic procedure of work with the manuscript. The warnings of the reviewer--N. M. Amosov, USSR Academy of Medical Sciences corresponding member--were ignored. The manuscript was not reviewed a second time.

The collegium of the RSFSR State Committee for Publishing Houses drew the attention of the management of Sovetskaya Rossiya Publishing House on the publication of a substandard book and demanded a decisive upgrading of responsibility on the part of the entire editorial and publishing apparatus for the ideological and political level of each publication.

The RSFSR State Committee for Publishing Houses has been informed that the management of the Sovetskaya Rossiya Publishing House has taken measures to exclude the recurrence of such facts.

The RSFSR State Committee for Publishing Houses has recommended to all publishing houses to approach more strictly the choice of manuscripts, review them thoroughly, and take fully into consideration specialists' remarks and recommendations.

By N. Sviridov, chairman of the RSFSR State Committee for Publishing Houses.

As chairman of the Scientific Council on the Comprehensive Problem of "Cybernetics" of the USSR Academy of Sciences which has had, for nearly 20 years, a section on methodological problems of cybernetics, engaged with the development of philosophical-cybernetic problems, and as a steady reader of KOMMUNIST, I would like to express my view on the question raised by the editors in issue No 4 on the responsibility of the printed word. It seems to me that paying greater attention to upgrading the philosophical level of publications which discuss the methodological problems of the individual sciences would be quite timely. Scientists working in the various branches of cybernetics and related sciences face problems of upgrading the quality and effectiveness of their research whose results determine the successful solution of many topical problems of our economic and cultural construction. We realize that these problems are related to the proper philosophical interpretation of the corresponding scientific problems. That is why the inaccuracies, errors, and sometimes, stupidities found in the interpretation of individual problems of cybernetics and the natural sciences (such as, for example, the justifiably noted assertion in one of the letters that "the biosystem uses the laws of preservation and violates them skillfully" (!) or "excerpts" from the book by Yu. G. Antomonov cited in that same letter) should be condemned and criticized. Such omissions do not contribute to the intensification of the interaction between the natural and social sciences which is a necessary condition for the further expansion and intensification of theoretical research.

Naturally, the reader's letters carried by the journal express, above all, the views of their authors. Therefore, I shall not get into the details of the problems raised in the letters, the more so since they pertain to certain complex problems on which specialists do not agree. I would like to discuss the essential aspect of the matter.

The collective of scientists within the section on methodological problems of cybernetics of our scientific council, headed by A. G. Spirkin, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, have formulated clear concepts on the dialectical-materialistic foundations of cybernetics and its significance as a separate science which does not claim to "replace" either a scientific outlook or a philosophical methodology. These concepts were expressed, for example, in the article "Cybernetics" in Volume 2 of the "Filosofskaya Entsiklopediya" [Philosophical Encyclopedia] (Moscow, 1962), and in the survey entitled "Philosophical Problems of Cybernetics," in Volume five of the continuing edition of the work "Kibernetika--Sluzhbu Kommunizmu" [Cybernetics on the Service of Communism] (Moscow, 1967), and the collective monograph "Upravleniye, Informatsiya, Intellect" [Management, Information, Intellect] (Moscow, 1976). Switching to extremes is never useful and attempts to treat cybernetics as a some kind of super science are no less groundless than its consideration as a pseudo-science.

In the light of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress it is very important to bring to light the significance of progress made in modern mathematics, cybernetics, and electronics in terms of scientific knowledge and

the practice of the socialist society. This also applies to the development of the logical apparatus of cybernetics, the creation of contemporary powerful computer networks, the study of the "man-machine" system, the elaboration of algorithmic languages close to the natural ones, to progress in the field of languages for interaction between man and computer, research aimed at the automation of experimentation and designing, the creation of mathematical-economic models at various levels of community and closeness to factual economic activities, and so on. The intensified study of relations between artificial symbol systems used in cybernetics and the rich and powerful languages of human communications and understanding is very important. All this can be achieved only by properly resolving the philosophical problems formulated by cybernetics as a comprehensive trend of theoretical research and technical practice.

I note with satisfaction that KOMMUNIST has emphasized over many years the significance of cybernetics, pointing out the impressive successes of this field of knowledge which substantially influences the scientific outlook, not to mention its revolutionizing impact on production, technical control facilities, and information activities. It would be a great error to underestimate cybernetics and its mathematical-logical base (including machine modeling and structuring of formalized theories serving as a starting point for the performance of certain logical processes by automatic machines). However, the basic interpretation of the difficulties arising on the path of cybernetic modeling of certain functions of the human mind is no less important (formal-logical conclusions, formulation of algorithms of proofs of theorems in formal theories, recognition of images, automatic analysis and synthesis of texts, solution of non-specifically defined problems, robot making, and others), for it is precisely in this respect that we note the greatest discrepancy of views and the appearance of frequently hasty philosophical assertions. In my view, on the gnosiological level, these difficulties are related to the impossibility of approaching exclusively through cybernetics and formal logic the phenomena of understanding, awareness, and self-phenomena inherent in human beings--phenomena organically linked with the entire system of human needs and determined by the social nature of man.

No question, as the science of the processes of data control and processing in complex dynamic systems, studied through the methods of mathematics and logic and modelled on systems of modern electronic automation, cybernetics is inseparable from the concept of purposeful functioning: There is no control without control targets. This was realized at the very dawn of cybernetic research in our country. For example, the article by the now deceased USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member A. A. Lyapunov with two co-authors, published in MORSKOY SBORNIK (no 12, 1959, p 33) states the following: "Cybernetics determines the general principles and laws according to which both living organisms and some machines perform purposeful actions on the basis of processes of data transmittal, reorganization, and utilization." This provides no reasons for identifying the functioning of computers programmed by man with human thought. Target

setting, target implementation, requirements, and value guidelines are inherent in the reflective activities of man and social groups. It would be senseless to extend them to the "machine world," not to speak of all nature; such an approach could only discredit cybernetic methods. In the elaboration of cybernetic ideas and the application to one or another field of models created within it we must take into consideration the abstractions, idealizations, and simplifying assumptions without which cybernetics, formal logic, or mathematics would be simply unable to exist and which determine the possibilities of such sciences at any given level of development of knowledge and practice. Ignoring the totally clear boundaries of the applicability of models created within such sciences could harm the study of specific systems, particularly in the social area. The fact that systems of a different nature are studied in cybernetics under a specific viewpoint-- machines, living organisms, social and economic structures, and so on-- should not be a reason for rejecting the quality differences between such systems. The ideas and methods of cybernetics should not be pitted against data gathered by other sciences on nature and society, not to speak of dialectical-materialistic methodology, or the Marxist-Leninist theory of man. Studying the supercomplex systems in the biosphere and sociosphere, philosophers and cybernetists, psychologists and mathematicians, neuro-physiologists and sociologists and biologists and logicians must work in close cooperation, multiplying the "action potential" of scientific thinking.

I have already had the occasion to write that machines do not think and would hardly ever think as would man, as a sensible being living in society, with intellectual requirements, using a natural language to exchange thoughts with other sensible beings. Yet, it is unquestionable that a person working in "cooperation" with an electronic machine thinks better and differently compared with a person forced to limit himself merely to primitive tools for the mechanization of his mental work (see the article written by me jointly with Doctor of Philosophical Sciences B. V. Biryukov in the book "Lenin i Sovremennoye Estestvoznaniye" [Lenin and the Contemporary Natural Sciences], Moscow, 1969, p 371). I consider the specific study of the gnosiological consequences of this new development to the "tree of human knowledge" an important phenomenon in our philosophical studies.

I believe that the journal should display initiative and launch a broad discussion of the contemporary aspects of the philosophical problems of cybernetics, for in recent years there has been a shift in emphasis in cybernetics related to an awareness of the complex nature of what is alive, thinking, and social. In any case, the section on methodological problems of cybernetics of our scientific council and I myself are ready to participate most actively in such a discussion.

By Academician A. Berg, chairman of the Scientific Council for the Cybernetics Complex Problem, USSR Academy of Sciences.

3
In connection with the publication of the letter by K. Mokhov, Yu. Subbotin, and V. Gabchenko in KOMMUNIST No 4, the editors received also official answers from the Nauka, Sovetskaya Rossiya, Visshaya Shkola, Mir, and Naukova Dumka publishing houses and minutes of the meetings of the editors of the journal FILOSOFSKIYE NAUKI, and the sectors of philosophical problems of cybernetics and logic of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy. Letters to the editors are continuing to arrive.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1978.

5003

CSO: 1802

- END -