

# N. S. KHRUSHCHOV

Report of the  
Central Committee

20<sup>th</sup>  
CONGRESS  
OF THE  
COMMUNIST  
PARTY  
OF THE  
SOVIET  
UNION

Feb. 14th 1956



4<sup>D</sup>

SOVIET NEWS BOOKLET NO. 4

84

**Scanned / Transcribed by**  
**The Socialist Truth In Cyprus**  
**Web: <http://www.KibristaSosyalistGercek.net>**  
**<http://www.kibristasosyalistgercek.net/intro.htm>**  
**E-mail: [info@KibristaSosyalistGercek.net](mailto:info@KibristaSosyalistGercek.net)**



**N. S. KHRUSHCHOV**

---

**Report of the Central Committee  
of the C.P.S.U.**

*REVIEW COPY*

**P.T.O.**

● *We have pleasure in  
sending you this*

**VOUCHER COPY**

**FOR FAVOUR OF REVIEW**

Supplies may be obtained from booksellers and  
stationers, or direct from SOVIET NEWS,  
3 ROSARY GARDENS, S.W.7

.....  
To SOVIET NEWS, 3 Rosary Gardens, S.W.7

Please send me ..... copies of the booklet  
“N. S. Khrushchov, Report of the Central Committee.”

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....  
.....

ENCLOSED .....s.....d.

# N. S. Khrushchov

---

## REPORT

of the

## CENTRAL COMMITTEE

to the

**20th Congress of the**

**Communist Party**

**Moscow . Feb. 14, 1956**

---

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction .. .. .	7
I. THE INTERNATIONAL POSITION OF THE SOVIET UNION .. .. .	8-32
1. The Steady Economic Advance in the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies .. .. .	8
2. The Economic Situation in the Capitalist Countries and the Further Aggravation of the Contradictions of Capitalism ..	11
3. The Imperialist Policy of Lining Up Aggressive Blocs and Fanning the "Cold War". The Struggle of the Peoples for Relaxation of International Tension .. .. .	15
4. Disintegration of the Imperialist Colonial System .. ..	18
5. The Soviet Union in the Struggle to Strengthen Peace and International Security .. .. .	21
6. Some Fundamental Questions of Present-Day International Development .. .. .	26
II. THE INTERNAL SITUATION OF THE U.S.S.R. ..	33-77
INDUSTRY AND TRANSPORT	
1. The Basic Results of the Fifth Five-Year Plan in Industry ..	33
2. Speeding Up Technical Progress in Industry .. .. .	36
3. Improvement of Transport and Telecommunication Equipment	38
4. The Proper Distribution of Productive Forces.. .. .	40
5. Productivity of Labour, Cost of Industrial Production, and Capital Construction .. .. .	41
AGRICULTURE	
1. Grain Farming—Foundation of All Agriculture .. ..	43
2. The Tasks of Further Advancing Livestock Farming.. ..	47
3. Mechanisation of Agriculture .. .. .	50
4. Development of State Farms .. .. .	52
5. Seed Production—an Important Element in the Progress of Agriculture .. .. .	52
6. Construction on the Collective Farms .. .. .	53



7. For Better Guidance of Agriculture .. .. .	PAGE 54
THE RISE IN THE MATERIAL AND CULTURAL STANDARDS OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE	
1. The Fuller Satisfaction of the People's Growing Material Requirements .. .. .	57
2. Towards a New Flowering of Soviet Culture and Science ..	63
THE FURTHER CONSOLIDATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOVIET SOCIAL AND STATE SYSTEM	
1. Some Questions of Our National Policy .. .. .	68
2. The Development of Socialist Democracy. The Improvement of the State Apparatus. The Strengthening of Soviet Law ..	71
III. THE PARTY .. .. .	78-95
1. Consolidating the Communist Party's Ranks and Strengthening Its Leading Role in the Soviet State .. .. .	78
2. Party Organisational Work .. .. .	81
3. Questions of Ideological Work .. .. .	88
Conclusion .. .. .	94

## Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 20th Party Congress

Delivered by Comrade N. S. Khrushchov, First  
Secretary of the Central Committee  
of the C.P.S.U.

14 February 1956

COMRADES, the period separating us from the 19th Party Congress is not a very long one—only three years and four months. But the amount of work the party has done, and the significance of the events that have taken place during this time both at home and abroad make it one of the important periods in the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its efforts to increase the strength of our country, build a communist society and ensure world peace.

In home policy, they were years during which the party, guided by the interests of the whole people, made a critical appraisal of the situation in agriculture and industry, and, on the basis of the successes already achieved, adopted a number of important measures designed to ensure a great new advance in the country's socialist development. In so doing it boldly uncovered shortcomings in different fields of economic, governmental and party activity, broke down outdated conceptions, resolutely sweeping aside everything that had become outmoded and was hindering our advance.

It is now clear to all that the measures adopted by the party were correct and timely. They ensured steady development of the socialist economy and a further improvement in the Soviet people's material and cultural standards.

There have also been important developments in world affairs during the period under review. Thanks to the consistent peaceful foreign policy of the socialist countries the state of international tension, which was fraught with great danger, has been replaced by a certain détente. It was because the Soviet Union and its friends—the People's Republic of China and the other people's democracies—promptly undertook a number of successive diplomatic steps, supported by all peaceloving forces, that real prospects for improvement opened up in the international arena.

All this shows that our party takes due account of the urgent needs of both home and foreign policy and prepares prompt measures appropriate to these needs. This clearly indicates our party's close, unbreakable ties with the people, the wisdom of its Leninist collective leadership, and the all-conquering power of the Marxist-Leninist teaching upon which it bases its activity. Throughout these years the party has held high the great banner of immortal Lenin. Fidelity to Leninism is the source of all our party's successes.

Let us now examine our country's international position and its domestic situation during the period under review.

## The International Position of the Soviet Union

THE emergence of socialism from within the bounds of a single country and its transformation into a world system is the main feature of our era. Capitalism has proved powerless to prevent this process of world-wide historic significance. The simultaneous existence of two opposite world economic systems, the capitalist and the socialist, developing according to different laws and in opposite directions, has become an indisputable fact.

Socialist economy is developing towards the ever-increasing satisfaction of the material and cultural requirements of all members of society, the continuous expansion and improvement of production on the basis of advanced technology, and closer co-operation and mutual assistance among the socialist countries.

The trend of capitalist economy is that of the ever-increasing enrichment of the monopolies; the further intensification of exploitation and cuts in the living standards of millions of working people, particularly in the colonial and dependent countries; of increased militarisation of the economy; the exacerbation of the competitive struggle among the capitalist countries; and the maturing of new economic crises and upheavals.

### 1. The Steady Economic Advance in the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies

THE period under review was marked by a great expansion in the national economy of the U.S.S.R. and also in those of the People's Republic of China, the Polish People's Republic, the Czechoslovak Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the People's Republic of Albania, the German Democratic Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic and the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam.

The rates at which industrial output has increased in the Soviet Union and in capitalist countries from 1929 to 1955 can be seen from the following table:

VOLUME OF INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT IN U.S.S.R. AND CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

	1929 = 100						
	1929	1937	1943	1946	1949	1950	1952
U.S.S.R. ...	100	429	573	466	870	1,082	1,421
All capitalist countries ...	100	104	—	107	130	148	164
Of which:							
United States ...	100	103	215	153	164	190	210
Britain ...	100	124	No data		144	153	153
France ...	100	82	pub-	63	92	92	108
Italy ...	100	99	lished	72	108	124	148
Western Germany ...	100	114	—	35	93	117	150
Japan ...	100	169	231*	51	101	115	173

\* Data for 1944.

These statistics show that in a quarter of a century, or, to be more exact, in twenty-six years, the Soviet Union increased its industrial output more than twenty times over, in spite of the tremendous damage done to its national economy by the war. Meanwhile, the United States, which enjoyed exceptionally favourable conditions, was only able to do slightly more than double its production, while industry in the capitalist world as a whole failed to register even that growth.

The people's democracies have also considerably surpassed the capitalist countries in rate of growth of industrial production. Last year the prewar level of industrial output was exceeded in Poland more than four times over, in Bulgaria more than five times over, in Czechoslovakia more than twice, in Hungary three and a half times, in Rumania almost three times, in Albania more than eleven times, and in the German Democratic Republic more than twice.

The People's Republic of China, which began to build socialism later than the others, has made outstanding progress: its industrial output has more than doubled the prewar maximum and more than quadrupled the 1949 figure.

Much has been achieved in building socialism in Yugoslavia. In 1955 its industrial output was 180 per cent above the pre-war level.

Socialism's industrial base is gaining increasing strength. The socialist countries' share in the world's industrial production is steadily increasing. This fact is a material expression of a progressive historical process: the contraction of the sphere of capitalist exploitation and capitalism's world positions, and the expansion of socialism's world positions.

High rates of development of industrial production are a guarantee of new successes for socialism in its economic competition with capitalism. The U.S.S.R. now holds second place in the world in total volume of industrial output. In the production of pig iron, steel, aluminium, copper, machinery, electricity, cement, and coal, the Soviet Union long ago outstripped France, Western Germany and Britain, and is steadily catching up with the United States.

The distinctive feature of the Soviet economy and of that of all the socialist countries is their all-round development and general peaceful trend. The socialist countries are giving unremitting attention to the development, above all, of heavy industry, which is the foundation for the continuous expansion of social production as a whole. At the same time they are giving great attention to the growth of agriculture and the light industries. The people's living conditions are steadily improving; culture is flowering.

Still more impressive are the prospects opening up before our peoples. The time is not far distant when in the U.S.S.R. atomic energy and other achievements of modern science and technology will be placed at the service of man on a large scale, when mineral wealth will be utilised still more fully, when mighty rivers will be tamed and vast new tracts of land developed, which will ensure an abundance of foodstuffs and other consumer goods. We are confident that within a short time, historically speaking, great China will become an industrial country and its agricultural production will, on the basis of co-operatives, reach a high level. All the people's democracies will make considerable progress along the path of socialism.

The socialist countries' development is distinguished by their complete independence, both political and economic. At the same time, the further strengthening of the economic ties and the extension of co-operation among them is a highly important achievement of the period under review. The socialist countries have established commercial relations based on equality and mutual advantage. They are exchanging technical experience, giving all-round mutual assistance, and efficiently co-ordinating their national economic plans.

Close economic co-operation gives exceptional opportunities for the best possible utilisation of productive and raw-material resources and successfully combines the interests of each country with those of the socialist camp as a whole. The development of specialisation and co-operation is of great importance here. Today it is no longer necessary for each socialist country to develop all branches of heavy industry, as had to be done by the Soviet Union, which for a long time was the only socialist country, and existed in a capitalist encirclement. Now, when there is a powerful community of socialist countries whose defence potential and security is based on the industrial might of the entire socialist camp, each European people's democracy can specialise in developing those industries and producing those goods for which it has the most favourable natural and economic conditions. This at the same time creates the necessary prerequisites for releasing considerable resources to develop agriculture and the light industries, and on this basis to satisfy more and more fully the material and cultural requirements of the peoples.

In strengthening their fraternal co-operation, the socialist countries are giving each other disinterested aid in economic development. The relations among the socialist countries differ fundamentally from those in the capitalist world. Under treaties which it has concluded, the Soviet Union is now helping the people's democracies to build 391 enterprises and more than ninety separate workshops and installations. We have granted the people's democracies long-term credits totalling 21,000 million roubles on the most favourable terms. The Soviet Union is also helping friendly countries to organise the production and peaceful use of atomic energy.

We note China's achievements in socialist industrialisation with great satisfaction. Never before in history has a highly industrialised country voluntarily helped other countries to become industrialised. On the contrary, the small group of highly developed countries which emerged in the capitalist world have always hindered the industrialisation of other countries, particularly colonies and semi-colonies. That is why the bulk of the countries in Asia, South America and Africa have no large-scale industry of their own. The Soviet Union, to which such purposes are alien, is doing everything to help the fraternal people of China establish a powerful industry of their own. Our country is helping the People's Republic of China to build, within one five-year period alone, 156 enterprises and twenty-one separate workshops, supplying industrial plant to a total value of about 5,600 million roubles.

In exchange for these deliveries the Soviet Union is receiving products from China and other people's democracies in which it is interested—materials and consumer goods customarily exported by these countries.

We shall continue to give one another all-round assistance in economic, technological, scientific and cultural development. We regard this as our fraternal duty to the camp of socialism. The stronger the entire socialist camp, the more reliable will be the guarantee of the freedom, independence and economic and cultural progress of each of the countries making up this great camp.

The socialist system is marching forward triumphantly, without crises or upheavals. It is bringing great benefits to the peoples of the socialist countries, demonstrating its decisive advantages over the capitalist system.

## 2. The Economic Situation in the Capitalist Countries and the Further Aggravation of the Contradictions of Capitalism

FROM the table quoted it is clear that in 1955 industrial output in the capitalist world as a whole was 93 per cent greater than in 1929.

Does this mean that capitalism has succeeded in overcoming its internal contradictions, and in acquiring stability? No, it does not. The capitalist world economy is developing extremely unevenly and has become still more unstable.

In the postwar decade, old capitalist countries like Britain and France increased their industrial output, but this growth is proceeding slowly and contradictorily. Of the defeated countries, Western Germany and Italy regained their prewar level of production only in 1949-50, while Japan's industrial output is on the 1944 level. Since the war, the United States, the chief capitalist country, has experienced three substantial cut-backs in production; a serious economic crisis began in 1948 but was subsequently stopped by an intensified arms drive arising from the war in Korea.

Instability in industrial production is supplemented by financial instability in most capitalist countries, by the issuing of an immense amount of paper money and the depreciation of currency. To this should be added the agrarian crisis in a number of countries, and also the stagnation in world trade that has been observed in recent years on the capitalist market.

The general crisis of capitalism continues to deepen. Capitalism's insoluble contradiction—the contradiction between the modern productive forces and capitalist relations of production—has become still more acute. The rapid development of present-day technology does not remove this contradiction but only emphasises it.

It should be said that the idea that the general crisis of capitalism means complete stagnation, a halt in production and technical progress, has always been alien to Marxist-Leninists. Lenin pointed out that capitalism's general trend to degeneration did not exclude technical progress or an increase in production in one period or another. "It would be a mistake to believe", he wrote, "that this tendency to decay precludes the rapid growth of capitalism. It does not. In the epoch of imperialism, certain branches of industry, certain strata of the bourgeoisie and certain countries betray to a greater or lesser degree, now one and now another of these tendencies" [*Works*, Russian Edition, Vol. 22, p. 286]. Therefore we must study the capitalist economy attentively and not take an over-simplified view of Lenin's thesis on the decay of imperialism, but study the best that the capitalist countries' science and technology have to offer, so as to use the achievements of world technological progress in the interests of socialism.

It cannot be said that the growth of production in the capitalist countries during the period under review took place on a sound economic foundation. It was due to the operation of the following basic factors:

First, the militarisation of the economy and the arms drive. By no means all industries have been affected by the upswing. The consumer goods industry is lagging seriously, while some of its branches are stagnating. Only the industries connected in some way with the manufacture of armaments are expanding. In the five years from 1950 to 1954, government expenditure on arms orders increased 300 per cent in the United States, more than



300 per cent in Britain, and 200 per cent in France. It is clear that the unusually high level of arms manufacture influenced the general level of industrial output in these countries.

Second, greater economic expansion by the main capitalist countries contributed to the growth in production. A favourable situation was temporarily created on the capitalist world market for the United States and to some extent for Britain and France. Germany, Japan and Italy fell out of the group of competing countries for several years. The postwar ruin in the West European countries created an acute demand for food and other staple commodities. The United States took the maximum advantage of this, setting the Marshall plan and other machinery in motion.

Third, a big part was played by the renewal of fixed capital. Owing to the crises and depressions of the thirties, and then to the war, the basic industrial plant in the European capitalist countries had not been renewed, in effect, for fifteen to twenty years. Modernisation of capital equipment, which had seriously depreciated and been damaged during the war, really began only during 1951-4. This made it possible to increase considerably the manufacture of capital goods.

Fourth and last, the capitalist countries were able to increase their industrial output by sharply intensifying the exploitation of the working class and reducing the living standard of the working people. In the past four years the average annual output per industrial worker in the main capitalist countries increased from 10 to 25 per cent. But in a number of capitalist countries real wages are lower than before the war, owing to a great increase in prices, rent and other items of expenditure.

The heavy arms burden thrust upon the shoulders of the working people should also be taken into account here. In the United States, *per capita* arms expenditure was \$3.50 in the 1913-14 fiscal year, \$7 in 1929-30, and \$250 in 1954-5—a more than seventy-fold increase. In Britain, *per capita* arms expenditure increased from £1 14s. in 1913-14 to £2 10s. in 1929-30 and £29 6s. in 1954-5. This tremendous expenditure is being covered by steadily mounting taxes, direct and indirect.

Unemployment is exerting a strong pressure on the position of the working people. In 1955, in a period which bourgeois economists hailed as one of "steady boom", official statistics gave the number of totally unemployed in the United States to be about 3 million and the number on short time as more than 9 million. There were about a million totally unemployed in the German Federal Republic last year, according to official figures. In Italy, where unemployment became particularly widespread and chronic after the war, in 1955 there were 2 million totally unemployed and a similar number on short time. In 1954 Japan had, according to official statistics, 600,000 totally unemployed and nearly 9 million working short time.

These are the factors which have played a special part in the postwar increase in capitalist production. Today the capitalist world is approaching the point at which the stimulating action of many of the temporary factors is becoming exhausted. Some—for example, the large-scale renewal of fixed capital and the favourable situation in foreign markets—operated only during the period directly following the severe and prolonged war. Others are in general capable of bringing about only a temporary increase in production. The operation of the internal forces of the capitalist economy, on the

basis of which it succeeded in raising production in the past, is becoming weaker and weaker. In order to advance production today capitalism has increasing need of artificial stimulants.

Based on the present conjecture, talk about "prosperity" has again begun in some western circles. They are attempting to prove that the Marxist theory of crises has "become outdated". Bourgeois economists are silent about the fact that only a temporary coincidence of circumstances favourable to capitalism prevented the crisis phenomena developing into a deep economic crisis. Even today, during a revival of the conjuncture, underlying crisis symptoms are evident. Production capacities are by no means being used to the full. In the United States commodity stocks and consumer credit have reached dangerous proportions.

The situation is aggravated by the fact that huge quantities of farm produce which cannot find a market have accumulated in a number of capitalist countries. Governments, particularly that of the United States, are trying to cut crop areas and reduce harvests by every means. This is at a time when millions of people in vast areas of South-East Asia and Africa are starving, and when in the metropolitan countries, too, a large section of the population is seriously undernourished. Increasing production, relative technological progress and intensification of labour coupled with a home market which, far from expanding, is becoming relatively narrower, inevitably give rise to new economic crises and upheavals in the capitalist countries.

The capitalists and the learned defenders of their interests are circulating a "theory" that the uninterrupted expansion of arms manufacture brings salvation from economic crisis. The representatives of Marxist-Leninist science have more than once pointed out that this is a hollow illusion. The arms drive does not cure the disease but drives it deeper. And the more extensive the militarisation of the economy, the graver will be its consequences for capitalism.

The representatives of the capitalist groups repose special hopes in government regulation of the economy. Monopoly capital is establishing direct control over government agencies, sending its representatives to work in them and making the government "regulate" the country's economy in the interests of the monopolies. The government agencies try to sustain business activity, placing orders worth billions of dollars with the corporations, giving them special privileges and subsidies, controlling wages and the prices of many commodities, buying up surpluses, and financing exports. However, the state's intervention in economic activity does not eliminate the fundamental defects of the capitalist system. The state is powerless to do away with the objective laws of capitalist economy, which lead to anarchy of production and economic crises. Crises are inherent in the very nature of capitalism, they are inevitable.

The perspectives of capitalist economy are in many ways determined by the situation in the capitalist world market. Here substantial changes have taken place during recent years. The United States of America is losing the monopoly position it held during the first postwar years. As a result of competition from other countries, the United States' share in world exports, after reaching a peak in 1947 (32.5 per cent), later dropped sharply (to 19 per cent). In 1947-8 the United States accounted for nearly three-fifths of the industrial output of the capitalist world, but today it accounts for

only half. The United States has passed the peak of its postwar economic opportunities; no new markets are in sight. There is therefore no prospect of a further substantial increase in production.

The situation in the capitalist world market has become especially aggravated since the re-appearance in it of Western Germany and Japan. They, like Britain and France, have practically regained their prewar positions in the world market. Today a further increase in each country's exports is possible only as a result of fierce struggle against competitors. Britain does not like the growing activity of Western Germany and Japan, and Western Germany and Japan are dissatisfied because Britain keeps them out of its markets. All have more than sufficient reason to be dissatisfied with the United States, which has disorganised the world market by carrying on unilateral trade, fencing off its market from foreign imports, prohibiting trade with the east, dumping agricultural produce and resorting to other measures which seriously affect other countries. The economic struggle between the capitalist countries is gaining momentum all the time.

As before, the main conflict is that between the United States and Britain. Anglo-American antagonism embraces a wide range of questions. Under the slogan of "Atlantic co-operation" the Transatlantic competitors are grabbing the principal strategic and economic positions of the British Empire, they are working to obtain a footing on the imperial lines of communication, to smother the system of preferential tariffs and to gain control of the sterling area. It is not surprising, therefore, that in Britain, and in France too, there is a growing desire to put an end to the situation in which "Atlantic co-operation" is of advantage only to one partner.

The revival of Western Germany's economic power is especially aggravating the situation in the world market. The experience of two world wars has shown that, in their struggle for markets, the German monopolists will stop at nothing. As a result the situation in Western Europe is also becoming acute, for the emergence of a rapidly developing German competitor bodes no good for France or Britain, especially if in addition it is being pushed further along the path of militarisation. Within Western Germany too the situation is becoming acute, since the resurgence of the trusts and monopolies enhances the danger of a revival of the forces which once brought fascism to power.

The problem of markets is becoming all the more acute, because the frontiers of the capitalist world market are increasingly contracting as a result of the formation of the new and growing socialist world market. In addition, the underdeveloped countries, on casting off the colonial yoke, begin the development of their own industry, which inevitably leads to a further narrowing of markets for industrial products. All this means that the struggle for markets and spheres of influence will become still sharper within the imperialist camp.

The steady sharpening of social contradictions is also a feature of the present situation in the capitalist countries.

Despite the fact that the capitalist governments have resorted to particularly harsh anti-labour legislation, to government "regulation" of labour conflicts, and to restriction of the rights of trade unions, the strike struggle has assumed much wider proportions during the postwar years than it did before the war. Official figures—of course understated—for eleven countries

the United States, Britain, France, Western Germany, Japan, Canada, Australia, Sweden, Belgium, Holland and Argentina) show that, comparing the ten prewar years (1930-9) with the ten postwar years (1945-54), we find that the number of strikes rose from 67,000 to 101,000, the number of strikers from 21 million to 73 million and the number of man-days lost as a result of strikes from 240 million to 672 million. As you can see, there were half as many more strikes in the ten postwar years as during the similar period before the war, and the number of strikers and man-days lost increased several times over. This means that the struggle of the working class against capitalist oppression is all the time becoming more vigorous and stubborn. The strike movement has assumed a particularly mass and sharp character in France, Italy, Japan, the United States and Britain, and also in recent years in Western Germany.

A characteristic feature of the postwar period is the increasingly resolute actions by the working class on fundamental political questions. Many large trade unions, regardless of their political complexion, are with increasing vigour calling for the lessening of international tension and an end to the arms drive. Important successes have been won by the French and Italian working class, the French Communist Party, and the Communists and Socialists of Italy in parliamentary elections. These successes show that the working class parties have won the love and trust of wide sections of the population in their countries.

What conclusions should be drawn from an analysis of the situation in the capitalist countries?

The situation in the capitalist world is marked by intensifying profound contradictions. The contradiction between the social character of production and private capitalist appropriation, between the expansion of production and the diminishing effective demand, which leads to economic crises, is becoming greater. The contradictions between the capitalist states are growing and their struggle for markets and spheres of influence is becoming increasingly acute. Social contradictions are deepening, and the struggle of the working class and the broad masses of the people for their vital rights and interests is becoming more vigorous. Thus, capitalism is steadily moving towards new economic and social upheavals.

### 3. The Imperialist Policy of Lining Up Aggressive Blocs and Fanning the "Cold War". The Struggle of the Peoples for Relaxation of International Tension

COMRADES, between the 19th and 20th Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, very important changes have taken place in international relations.

Soon after the Second World War ended, the influence of reactionary and militarist groups began to be increasingly evident in the policy of the United States of America, Britain and France. Their desire to enforce their will on other countries by economic and political pressure, threats and military provocation became dominant. This became known as the "positions of strength" policy. It reflects the aspiration of the most aggressive sections of present-day imperialism to win world supremacy, to suppress the working class and the democratic and national liberation movements, and their plans for military adventures against the socialist camp.

The international atmosphere was poisoned by war hysteria. The arms drive began to assume more and more monstrous dimensions. Many big U.S. military bases aimed against the U.S.S.R. and the people's democracies were built in countries thousands of miles from the borders of the United States. So-called "cold war" was begun against the socialist camp. International distrust was artificially kindled, and nations set against one another. A bloody war was launched in Korea; the war in Indo-China dragged on for years.

The inspirers of the "cold war" began to establish military blocs, and many countries found themselves, against the will of their peoples involved in restricted aggressive groupings—the North Atlantic bloc, the Western European Union, S.E.A.T.O. (military bloc for South-East Asia), and the Baghdad Pact.

The organisers of military blocs allege that they have united for defence, for protection against the "Communist threat". But that is sheer hypocrisy. We know from history that when planning a redivision of the world, the imperialist powers have always lined up military blocs. Today the "anti-Communism" slogan is again being used as a smokescreen to cover up the claims of one power for world domination. The new thing here is that the United States wants, by means of all kinds of blocs and pacts, to secure the dominating position in the capitalist world for itself, and to reduce all its partners in the blocs to the status of obedient executors of its will.

The inspirers of the "positions of strength" policy assert that this policy makes another war impossible, because it ensures a "balance of power" in the world arena. This view enjoys wide circulation among western statesmen and it is therefore all the more important to thoroughly expose its real meaning.

Can peace be promoted by an arms drive? It would seem that the very presentation of the question is absurd. Yet the adherents of the "positions of strength" policy offer the arms drive as their main recipe for . . . the preservation of peace! It is perfectly obvious that when nations compete to increase their military might, the danger of war becomes greater, not less.

The arms drive, the "positions of strength" policy, the lining up of aggressive blocs and the "cold war"—all this cannot but worsen the international situation, and indeed it has. This has been one trend of world events during the period under review.

But other processes have also taken place in the international arena during these years, processes showing that in the world today by no means everything is under the thumb of the monopolist circles.

The steady strengthening of the forces of socialism, democracy and peace, and of the forces of the national liberation movement is of decisive significance. The international position of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the other socialist countries has been further strengthened during this period, and their prestige and international ties have grown immeasurably. The international camp of socialism is exerting an ever growing influence on the course of international events.

The forces of peace have been considerably augmented by the emergence in the world arena of a group of peaceloving European and Asian states which have proclaimed non-participation in blocs as a principle of their

foreign policies. The leading political circles of these states rightly hold that to take part in restricted military imperialist groupings would merely increase the danger of their countries being involved in military gambles by the aggressive forces and draw them into the maelstrom of the arms drive.

As a result, a vast Zone of Peace has emerged in the world, including peaceloving states, both socialist and non-socialist, of Europe and Asia. This zone embraces vast areas inhabited by nearly 1,500 million people—that is, the majority of the population of our planet.

The vigorous efforts for peace of the broadest masses of the people have greatly influenced international events. In scale and organisation of the struggle against the war danger waged by the masses of the people, the present period has no comparison in history.

The Communist Parties have proved to be the most active and consistent fighters against the war danger and reaction. Throughout these years, as before, they have been in the very thick of the struggle to preserve peace, to uphold the vital interests of the working people, and the national independence of their countries. The Communists in the capitalist countries have endured many hardships and adversities in recent years. But they have withstood these trials with credit.

At the same time many other sections of society are also opposing war. The effectiveness of their activity would naturally be greater, should the various forces defending peace overcome a certain disunity. Unity of the working class, of its trade unions, the unity of action of its political parties, the Communists, Socialists, and other workers' parties, is acquiring exceptionally great importance.

Not a few of the misfortunes harassing the world today are due to the fact that in many countries the working class has been split for many years and its different groups do not present a united front, which only plays into the hands of the reactionary forces. Yet, today, in our opinion, the prospect of changing this situation is opening up. Life has put on the agenda many questions which not only demand the bringing close together of, and co-operation among all workers' parties, but also create real possibilities for this co-operation. The most important of these problems is that of preventing a new war. If the working class comes out as a united organised force and acts with firm resolution, there will be no war.

All this places a historic responsibility upon all leaders of the labour movement. The interests of the struggle for peace make it imperative to find points of contact and on these grounds to lay the foundations for co-operation, sweeping aside mutual recriminations. Here co-operation with those circles of the socialist movement who have views on the forms of transition to socialism differing from ours is also possible and essential. Among them are not a few people who are honestly mistaken on this question, but this is no obstacle to co-operation. Today many Social Democrats stand for active struggle against the war danger and militarism, for coming closer together with the socialist countries, for unity of the labour movement. We sincerely greet these Social Democrats and are willing to do everything necessary to unite our efforts in the struggle for the noble cause of peace and the interests of the working people.

All international developments in recent years show that big forces of the people have risen to fight to preserve peace. The ruling imperialist circles

cannot but take this factor into account. Their more far-sighted representatives are beginning to admit that the "positions of strength" policy could not put pressure on the countries against which it was directed and that it has failed. At the same time, this policy weighs heavily on the masses of the people in the capitalist world and has increased their dissatisfaction. The overwhelming majority of mankind rejects the "positions of strength" policy as a policy of gambles directed against the people and enhancing the war danger.

Under the impact of these incontestable facts, symptoms of a certain sobering up are appearing among influential western circles. More and more people among these circles are realising what a dangerous gamble war against the socialist countries may prove for the destinies of capitalism. Undoubtedly, the working class and the labouring masses of the capitalist countries, should their rulers dare to precipitate such a war, would draw decisive conclusions regarding the system which periodically plunges the nations into the bloodbath of war. Nor is it a coincidence that prominent leaders of bourgeois countries with increasing frequency frankly admit that "there will be no victor" in a war in which atomic weapons are used. These leaders still do not venture to state that capitalism will find its grave in another world war, should it unleash it, but they are already compelled openly to admit that the socialist camp is invincible!

The position of the imperialist forces is growing weaker not only because their aggressive policy is rejected by the peoples of their countries, but also because in the last ten years imperialism has sustained defeat in the east, where the centuries-old mainstays of colonialism are crumbling and the peoples themselves are with increasing boldness beginning to decide their own destinies.

#### 4. Disintegration of the Imperialist Colonial System

**T**he October Socialist Revolution struck a most powerful blow at the imperialist colonial system. Under the influence of the Great October Revolution, the national liberation struggle of the colonial people developed with particular force; it continued throughout the subsequent years and has led to a deep-going crisis of the entire imperialist colonial system.

The defeat of fascist Germany and imperialist Japan during the Second World War was an important factor stimulating the liberation struggle in the colonies and dependent countries. The democratic forces' victory over fascism instilled faith in the possibility of liberation in the hearts of the oppressed peoples.

The victorious revolution in China struck the next staggering blow at the colonial system; it marked a very grave defeat for imperialism.

India, the country with the world's second biggest population, has won political independence. Independence has been gained by Burma, Indonesia, Egypt, Syria, the Lebanon, the Sudan, and a number of other former colonial countries. More than 1,200 million people, or nearly half of the world's population, have been freed from colonial or semi-colonial dependence during the last ten years.

The disintegration of the imperialist colonial system now taking place is a postwar development of world historic significance. Peoples who for centuries the colonialists have kept off the high road of progress followed by

human society, are now going through a great process of regeneration. People's China and the independent Indian Republic have joined the ranks of the great powers. We are the witnesses of a political and economic upsurge of the peoples of South-East Asia and the Arab East. The awakening of the peoples of Africa has begun. The national liberation movement has gained in strength in Brazil, Chile and other Latin American countries. The outcome of the wars in Korea, Indo-China and Indonesia has demonstrated that the imperialists are unable, even with the help of armed intervention, to crush the peoples who are resolutely fighting for a life of freedom and independence. The complete abolition of the infamous system of colonialism has now been put on the agenda as one of the most acute and pressing problems.

The new period in world history which Lenin predicted has arrived, and the peoples of the East are playing an active part in deciding the destinies of the whole world, are becoming a new mighty factor in international relations. In contrast to the prewar period, most Asian countries now act in the world arena as sovereign states, or states which are resolutely upholding their right to an independent foreign policy. International relations have spread beyond the bounds of relations between the countries inhabited chiefly by peoples of the white race and are beginning to acquire the character of genuinely world-wide relations.

The winning of political freedom by the peoples of the former colonies and semi-colonies is the first and most important prerequisite of their full independence, that is, of the achievement of economic independence. The liberated Asian countries are pursuing a policy of building up their own industry, training their own technicians, raising the living standards of the people, and regenerating and developing their age-old national culture. History-making prospects for a a better future are opening up before the countries which have embarked upon the path of independent development.

These countries, although they do not belong to the socialist world system, can draw on its achievements to build up an independent national economy and to raise the living standards of their peoples. Today they need not go begging for up-to-date equipment to their former oppressors. They can get it in the socialist countries, free of any political or military obligations.

The very fact that the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist camp exist, their readiness to help the underdeveloped countries with their industrial development on terms of equality and mutual benefit, are a major stumbling-block to colonial policy. The imperialists can no longer regard the underdeveloped countries solely as potential sources for the extraction of maximum profits. They are compelled to make concessions to them.

Not all the countries, however, have discarded the colonial yoke. A big part of the African continent, some countries of Asia, of Central and South America continue to remain in colonial or semi-colonial dependence. They are still kept as agrarian raw-material appendages of the imperialist countries. The living standard of the population in the dependent countries remains exceedingly low.

The contradictions and rivalry between the colonial powers for spheres of influence, sources of raw materials, and markets for the sale of goods are growing. The United States is out to grab the colonial possessions of the European powers. South Viet Nam is passing from France to the United States. The American monopolies are waging an offensive against the French,

Belgian and Portuguese possessions in Africa. Once Iran's oil riches were fully controlled by the British, but now they have been compelled to share them with the Americans; moreover, the American monopolists are fighting to oust the British entirely. American influence in Pakistan and Iraq is increasing under the guise of "free enterprise".

The American monopolies, utilising their dominating position in the Central and South American countries, have moulded the economies of many of them in a distorted, one-sided way, extremely disadvantageous for the population. They are hampering their industrial development and shackling them with the heavy chains of economic dependence.

To preserve, and in some places also to re-establish their former domination, the colonial powers are resorting to the suppression of the colonial peoples by force of arms, a method which history has condemned. They also have recourse to new forms of colonial enslavement under the guise of so-called "aid" to underdeveloped countries, which brings colossal profits to the colonialists. Let us take the United States as an example. The United States renders such "aid" above all in the form of deliveries of American weapons to the underdeveloped countries. This enables the American monopolies to load up their industry with arms orders. Then the products of the arms industry, worth billions of dollars and paid for from the budget by the American taxpayers, are sent to the underdeveloped countries. States receiving such "aid" in the form of weapons inevitably fall into dependence; they increase their armies, which leads to higher taxes and a decline in the living standards of the population of the underdeveloped countries.

The monopolists are interested in continuing the "positions of strength" policy; the ending of the "cold war" is to their disadvantage. Why? Because the fanning of war hysteria is used to justify imperialist expansion, to intimidate the masses of the people and to stultify their minds, so as to justify the higher taxes which then go to pay for war orders and flow into the safes of the millionaires. Thus, the "cold war" is a way of maintaining war industry at a high level, and of extracting colossal profits.

Naturally, "aid" to underdeveloped countries is granted on definite political terms, terms providing for their integration into aggressive military blocs, the conclusion of joint military pacts, and support for American foreign policy aimed at world domination, or "world leadership", as the American imperialists themselves call it.

S.E.A.T.O. and the Baghdad Pact are not only aggressive military and political groupings, but also instruments of enslavement, a new form of exploitation, colonial in nature, of the underdeveloped countries. It is obvious that S.E.A.T.O. policy is determined neither by Pakistan nor Thailand, nor that of the Baghdad Pact by Iraq, Iran or Turkey.

The establishment of such blocs and the pitting of some countries against others is also one of the means used to divide the economically underdeveloped countries and to continue the colonialists' long-standing policy of "divide and rule". They are trying to use the Baghdad Pact as a wedge to split the unity of the countries of the Arab East. With the help of S.E.A.T.O. they are seeking to divide the countries of South-East Asia.

The struggle of the peoples of the eastern countries against participation in blocs is a struggle for national independence. It is not by chance that the overwhelming majority of countries in South-East Asia and the Middle

East have rejected the importunate attempts of the western powers to inveigle them into closed military groupings.

In spite of all the efforts to set the peoples of the underdeveloped countries at loggerheads with one another and with the peoples of the socialist camp, their friendship and co-operation is growing ever stronger. The Bandung Conference of twenty-nine Asian and African countries demonstrated in a striking way the growing solidarity of the eastern peoples. Its decisions reflected the will of hundreds of millions of people in the East. It struck a powerful blow against the plans of the colonialists and aggressors.

The friendship and co-operation between the peoples of the East who have thrown off the colonial yoke, and the peoples of the socialist countries is growing and becoming stronger. This was graphically revealed by the visits of the representatives of India and Burma to the Soviet Union and by the visit of the Soviet representatives to India, Burma and Afghanistan. Those visits confirmed the identity of views existing between the Soviet Union and the Republic of India, one of the great powers of the world, and between the Soviet Union, Burma and Afghanistan, on the fundamental international issue of the present day: the preservation and consolidation of universal peace and the national independence of all states.

The exceptionally warm and friendly reception accorded the representatives of the great Soviet people has strikingly demonstrated the deep-rooted confidence and love the broad masses in the eastern countries have for the Soviet Union. Analysing the sources of this confidence, the Egyptian newspaper *Al Akhbar* justly wrote: "Russia does not try to buy the conscience of the peoples, their rights and liberty. Russia has stretched out a hand to the peoples and said that they themselves should decide their own destiny, that she recognises their rights and aspirations and does not demand their adherence to military pacts or blocs." Millions of men and women ardently acclaim our country for its uncompromising struggle against colonialism, for its policy of equality and friendship among all nations and for its consistent peace-loving foreign policy.

## 5. The Soviet Union in the Struggle to Strengthen Peace and International Security

LOYAL to the Leninist principles of peaceful foreign policy, the Soviet Union has worked vigorously to ease international tension and strengthen peace, and has achieved big successes. I will recall the most important directions in which the Soviet Union's initiative for peace has developed.

First, an improvement in relations between the great powers.

Second, the elimination of the breeding grounds of war that existed in the east and the prevention of the development of new breeding grounds of war and conflict in Europe and Asia.

Third, the adjustment of relations with a number of countries in order to ease tension in Europe (the normalisation of relations with fraternal Yugoslavia, the conclusion of the State Treaty with Austria, the establishment of diplomatic relations between the U.S.S.R. and the German Federal Republic etc.).

Fourth, the exploration of new ways to settle such questions as the establishment of a collective security system in Europe, disarmament, prohibition of atomic weapons, the German problem etc.

Fifth, resolute *rapprochement* with all countries desiring to preserve peace.

Sixth, the expansion in every way of international contacts: personal contacts between Soviet statesmen and those of other countries; contacts between representatives of our party and workers' parties of other countries and between trade unions; greater exchange of parliamentary, social and other delegations; the development of trade and other economic ties; and the expansion of tourist travel and increased student exchange.

The peace initiative of the Soviet Union has become one of the most important factors exerting a tremendous influence on international events.

The success of the Soviet Union's peace initiative has been greatly facilitated by the support and joint action of all the peaceloving countries. A particularly important part in this respect has been, and is being played by the great Chinese People's Republic which did so much to end the bloodshed in Korea and Indo-China and has made the well-known proposal for a collective peace pact in Asia. The great Indian Republic has made a big contribution to strengthening peace in Asia and the whole world. Millions of ordinary people in all countries have warmly supported the Soviet steps to put international relations on a healthy basis.

The efforts of the peaceloving states and peoples have not been in vain. For the first time since the war a certain relaxation of international tension has set in. In this atmosphere the Geneva Conference of the heads of government of the four powers became possible. The conference demonstrated the vitality and correctness of the method of negotiation between countries. It confirmed the Soviet view that the most intricate international issues can be settled through negotiation, given a mutual desire for co-operation and agreement.

Some people are now trying to bury the Geneva spirit. The facts show that certain circles in the west have still not given up hope of putting pressure on the Soviet Union and wresting unilateral concessions from it. But it is high time to understand that such calculations are not realistic. The Soviet Union has done much to bring the positions of the great powers closer together. Now it is up to the United States, Britain and France. This of course does not mean that the Soviet Union will refuse to make further efforts to ease international tension and strengthen peace. On the contrary, inasmuch as it has become possible to bring the positions of the powers closer together on a number of major international issues, the Soviet Union will strive with still greater persistence to establish confidence and co-operation among all countries, and above all among the great powers. Equal effort and reciprocal concessions are absolutely indispensable in the relations between the great powers. The method of negotiation must become the sole method of solving international problems.

The achievement of collective security in Europe, the achievement of collective security in Asia, disarmament—these are the three cardinal problems, the solution of which can lay the foundation for firm and lasting peace.

The establishment of a collective security system in Europe would meet the vital interests of all European countries, large and small, and would at the same time serve as a solid guarantee of peace throughout the world. It would at the same time make it possible to settle the German issue as well. The present situation as regards this problem cannot fail to arouse alarm. Germany

still remains divided and the arming of Western Germany is being accelerated. It is no secret that in reviving German militarism each of the three western powers is pursuing its own ends. But who stands to gain from this short-sighted policy? Above all, the imperialist forces of Western Germany. Among the losers, however, the first place should go to France, whom this policy seeks to reduce to the status of a third-rate power. A new Washington-Bonn axis is more and more clearly emerging and worsening the war danger.

The present situation offers real possibilities for solving the German problem in another way, in the interest of peace and the security of the peoples, the German people included. The strength of the peaceloving Soviet Union has increased to an unprecedented extent. The countries of South-East Europe, which in the past supplied raw materials and manpower reserves to Germany, now comprise, together with the U.S.S.R., a strong barrier against possible aggression by the German revenge-seekers. Austria, Germany's ally in the past, has proclaimed a policy of neutrality. Peaceloving forces are at work in all the countries of Western Europe. In Germany herself the alignment of forces is different from what it was in the past. The German Democratic Republic, which is opposed to war, has gained in strength to such a degree that today it is no longer possible to speak of settling the German issue without its participation or at its expense. In the German Federal Republic the working class, many millions strong, together with the other patriotic forces, is increasingly resisting the conversion of Germany into a hotbed of a new war.

A collective security system in Europe, renunciation of the Paris Agreements, *rapprochement* and co-operation between the two German states—this is the right way to settle the German question. Certain circles, of course, want to solve the German problem without the participation of the Germans themselves and to the detriment of the German people's fundamental interests. Such a policy is unquestionably doomed to failure.

The ending of the arms race remains one of mankind's most vital tasks. This, of course, is a complicated question. But its settlement must be explored with all the greater persistence and energy.

No one can say that the Soviet Union has made little effort to break the deadlock on disarmament. The Soviet proposals of 10 May 1955, the reduction of the Soviet armed forces and other Soviet measures are widely known. The same, however, cannot be said of the western powers. No sooner did the Soviet Union accept the proposals of Britain, France and the United States on two stages of disarmament and maximum levels for armed forces than the western powers began to retreat, and not only refused to accept the concrete proposals of the Soviet Union but even disowned their own proposals.

Evidently, this is a result of the influence exerted by the most rabid advocates of the "positions of strength" policy, who seek to take to the offensive again and to scotch the relaxation of international tension that has been noted. The peaceloving states naturally had to draw the appropriate conclusions from this situation and continue reinforcing the security of their countries.

Compelled to pool their forces and resources, our states have concluded the Warsaw Treaty, which is an important stabilising factor in Europe. They are fully resolved to employ all their forces to protect the peaceful life of their peoples and to prevent the outbreak of another conflagration in Europe.



As for disarmament, we shall spare no effort to solve this most important problem.

We shall continue to work to end the arms drive and ban atomic and hydrogen weapons. Prior to agreement on the most important aspects of disarmament, we are willing to take certain partial steps, for example, to stop tests of thermonuclear weapons, to see that the troops stationed in Germany have no atomic weapons, and to cut military budgets. The nations' implementation of such measures could pave the way to understanding on other, more complicated aspects of disarmament.

The Soviet Union is firmly resolved to do everything necessary to safeguard international peace and security.

The establishment of firm friendly relations between the two biggest powers of the world—the Soviet Union and the United States of America—would be of great significance for the strengthening of world peace. We think that if the well-known five principles of peaceful co-existence were to underlie the relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States, that would be of truly great importance for all mankind and would, of course, be no less useful to the people of the United States than to Soviet peoples and all other peoples. These principles—mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in one another's domestic affairs, equality and mutual advantage, peaceful co-existence and economic co-operation—are now subscribed to and supported by a score of states.

We have recently taken new important steps with a view to achieving a fundamental improvement in Soviet-American relations. I have in mind the proposal for the conclusion of a Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation between the U.S.S.R. and the United States, contained in Comrade N. A. Bulganin's letter to President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

We want to be friends with the United States and to co-operate with it for peace and international security and also in the economic and cultural spheres. We propose this with good intentions, without holding a knife behind our back. We have put our proposal forward, not because the Soviet Union cannot live without such a treaty with the United States. The Soviet State existed and developed successfully even when it had no normal diplomatic relations with the United States. We have proposed a treaty to the United States because the conclusion of such a treaty would meet the most profound aspirations of the peoples of both countries to live in peace and friendship.

If good relations between the Soviet Union and the United States are not established and mutual distrust continues, it will lead to an arms race on a still bigger scale and to a still more dangerous build-up of strength on both sides. Is this what the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States want? Of course not.

So far our initiative has not met with due understanding and support in the United States, which shows that the advocates of settling outstanding issues by means of war still hold strong positions there, and that they continue to exert great pressure on the President and the Administration. But we hope that our peaceful aspirations will be more correctly appraised in the United States and that matters will take a turn for the better.

As hitherto, we intend to work for the further improvement of our relations with Great Britain and France. Our countries, as European countries, have

many common interests, and above all, a common interest in preventing another war. Both world wars started in Europe. Militarist Germany was their breeding ground. The peoples of the Soviet Union, France and Britain, together with the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Belgium, Albania and other European countries, shed much blood to defeat the common enemy and to secure peace. We hold that the U.S.S.R., Britain and France, as the European great powers, must cherish as sacred the benefits of peace and do everything possible to prevent another war. It is important to recall this, particularly today, when a revenge-seeking West German Wehrmacht is being created again with all speed, directly endangering the security of all the European peoples. Our countries' interest in the safeguarding of lasting peace and security in Europe is not a transitory one. It creates a reliable foundation for mutual understanding and co-operation, for the development of trade and all-round ties between the U.S.S.R., Britain and France.

The Soviet Union will continue to strive unswervingly for the extension and strengthening of friendship and co-operation with the countries of the East. We can note with satisfaction that good, friendly relations have developed between our country and the Indian Republic and we are confident that these relations have a great future. We acclaim the desire of the peoples of the Arab countries to uphold their national independence. We also believe that Iran, Turkey and Pakistan will realise that normal relations with the U.S.S.R. are in keeping with their vital interests.

It is our immutable principle to develop and strengthen friendly relations with all countries which, like us, desire to preserve peace.

We are of the opinion that even under present conditions, when military groupings exist, the opportunities for improving relations between countries, particularly between neighbours, have by no means been completely exhausted. In this connection the significance of non-aggression treaties or treaties of friendship, the conclusion of which would help remove existing suspicion and mistrust in relations between countries and normalise the international situation, should be emphasised. For its part, the Soviet Union is prepared to conclude such treaties.

The expansion of business and cultural contacts is of great importance for the further improvement of relations between countries. For its part, the Soviet government is doing everything possible for the all-round development of these ties. We can note with satisfaction that business contacts and the exchange of various delegations between the Soviet Union and a number of other countries have substantially expanded of late. Last year Britain was visited by delegations of Soviet workers from light industry, building and agriculture headed by members of the government, representatives of trade union organisations, many workers in the fields of science and culture, and sports groups. The British government helped to extend these contacts. The Soviet delegations were well received in Britain. We assume that British citizens who visited the Soviet Union as members of delegations or individually cannot complain of poor treatment in our country. Relations between the Soviet Union and France, Sweden, Finland, Norway and other countries are developing in the same spirit.

Last year delegations were also exchanged with the United States, and in particular the Soviet agricultural delegation was well received there. Delega-

tions of Soviet journalists, builders and medical workers also visited the United States. The development of contacts with the United States, however, is still insignificant. Many noted American statesmen, public figures and private citizens came to the Soviet Union during this time. American citizens had every opportunity to visit the Soviet Union and were well received here. But at the same time many Soviet engineers, scientists, writers and artists unfortunately could not avail themselves of invitations received from American firms and organisations because they were not given the necessary permission by the American authorities. It is clear that this does not promote contact between our countries. Let us hope that the situation will change for the better.

Trade should play a big part in extending the basis for business-like co-operation between our countries. In contrast to the "Let us arm!" slogan of the North Atlantic bloc, we put forward the slogan: "Let us trade!" Our new Five-Year Plan provides for a substantial extension of trade relations, both with the people's democracies and all other states.

We regard it as our supreme international duty tirelessly to develop and strengthen the fraternal relations between the countries of the socialist camp in the interest of our great common cause—socialism.

## 6. Some Fundamental Questions of Present-Day International Development

COMRADES, I should like to dwell on some fundamental questions concerning present-day international development which determine not only the present course of events, but also the prospects for the future.

These questions are the peaceful co-existence of the two systems, the possibility of preventing wars in the present era, and the forms of transition to socialism in different countries. Let us examine these questions in brief.

**The peaceful co-existence of the two systems.** The Leninist principle of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems has always been and remains the general line of our country's foreign policy.

It has been alleged that the Soviet Union puts forward the principle of peaceful co-existence merely out of tactical considerations, considerations of expediency. Yet it is common knowledge that we have always, from the very first years of Soviet power, stood with equal firmness for peaceful co-existence. Hence, it is not a tactical move, but a fundamental principle of Soviet foreign policy.

This means that if there is indeed a threat to the peaceful co-existence of countries with differing social and political systems, it by no means comes from the Soviet Union or the rest of the socialist camp. Is there a single reason why a socialist state should want to unleash aggressive war? Do we have classes and groups that are interested in war as a means of enrichment? We do not. We abolished them long ago. Or, perhaps, we do not have enough territory or natural wealth, and perhaps we lack sources of raw materials or markets for our goods? No, we have enough and to spare of all those. Why then should we want war? We do not want it, and as a matter of principle we renounce any policy that might lead to millions of people being plunged into war for the sake of the selfish interests of a handful of multi-millionaires. Do those who shout about the "aggressive intentions" of the U.S.S.R. know all this? Of course they do. Why then do they keep up the old monotonous refrain about some imaginary "Communist aggression"?

Only to stir up mud, to conceal their plans for world domination, a "crusade" against peace, democracy and socialism.

To this day the enemies of peace allege that the Soviet Union is out to overthrow capitalism in other countries by "exporting" revolution. It goes without saying that among us Communists there are no supporters of capitalism. But this does not mean that we have interfered, or plan to interfere, in the internal affairs of countries where capitalism still exists. Romain Rolland was right when he said that "freedom is not brought in from abroad in baggage trains like Bourbons". It is ridiculous to think that revolutions are made to order. We often hear representatives of bourgeois countries reasoning thus: "The Soviet leaders claim that they are for peaceful co-existence between the two systems. At the same time they declare that they are fighting for communism, and say that communism is bound to win in all countries. Now if the Soviet Union is fighting for communism, how can there be any peaceful co-existence with it?" This view is the result of bourgeois propaganda. The ideologists of the bourgeoisie distort the facts and deliberately confuse questions of ideological struggle with questions of relations between states, in order to make the Communists of the Soviet Union look like advocates of aggression.

When we say that the socialist system will win in the competition between the two systems—the capitalist and the socialist systems—this by no means signifies that its victory will be achieved through armed interference by the socialist countries in the internal affairs of the capitalist countries. Our certainty of the victory of communism is based on the fact that the socialist mode of production possesses decisive advantages over the capitalist mode of production. Precisely because of this, the ideas of Marxism-Leninism are more and more capturing the minds of the broad masses of the working people in the capitalist countries, just as they have captured the minds of millions of men and women in our country and the people's democracies. We believe that all working men in the world, once they have become convinced of the advantages communism brings, will sooner or later take the road of struggle for the construction of socialist society. Building communism in our country, we are resolutely against war. We have always held and continue to hold that the establishment of a new social system in this or that country is the internal affair of the peoples of the countries concerned. This is our attitude, based on the great Marxist-Leninist teaching.

The principle of peaceful co-existence is gaining ever wider international recognition. This principle is one of the cornerstones of the foreign policy of the Chinese People's Republic and the other people's democracies. It is being actively implemented by the Republic of India, the Union of Burma and a number of other countries. And this is natural, for in present-day conditions there is no other way out. Indeed, there are only two ways: either peaceful co-existence or the most destructive war in history. There is no third way.

We believe that countries with differing social systems can do more than exist side by side. It is necessary to proceed further, to improve relations, strengthen confidence between countries and co-operate. The historical significance of the famous five principles, put forward by the Chinese People's Republic and the Republic of India and supported by the Bandung Conference and the world public in general, lies in the fact that they provide

the best form for relations between countries with differing social systems in present-day conditions. Why not make these principles the foundation for peaceful relations among all countries in all parts of the world? It would meet the vital interests and demands of the peoples if all countries subscribed to these five principles.

**The possibility of preventing war in the present era.**—Millions of people all over the world are asking whether another war is really inevitable, whether mankind, which has already experienced two devastating world wars, must still go through a third one? Marxists must answer this question, taking into consideration the epoch-making changes of the last decades.

There is, of course, a Marxist-Leninist precept that wars are inevitable as long as imperialism exists. This precept was evolved at a time when (i) imperialism was an all-embracing world system, and (ii) the social and political forces which did not want war were weak, poorly organised, and hence unable to compel the imperialists to renounce war.

People usually take only one aspect of the question and examine only the economic basis of wars under imperialism. This is not enough. War is not only an economic phenomenon. Whether there is to be a war or not depends in large measure on the correlation of class, political forces, the degree of organisation and the awareness and determination of the people. Moreover, in certain conditions the struggle waged by progressive social and political forces may play a decisive role. Hitherto the state of affairs was such that the forces that did not want war and opposed it were poorly organised and lacked the means to check the schemes of the war-makers. Thus it was before the First World War, when the main force opposed to the threat of war—the world proletariat—was disorganised by the treachery of the leaders of the Second International. Thus it was on the eve of the Second World War, when the Soviet Union was the only country that pursued an active peace policy, when the other great powers to all intents and purposes encouraged the aggressors, and the right-wing Social-Democratic leaders had split the labour movement in the capitalist countries.

In that period this precept was absolutely correct. At the present time, however, the situation has changed radically. Now there is a world camp of socialism, which has become a mighty force. In this camp the peace forces find not only the moral, but also the material means to prevent aggression. Moreover, there is a large group of other countries with a population running into many hundreds of millions which are actively working to avert war. The labour movement in the capitalist countries has today become a tremendous force. The movement of peace supporters has sprung up and developed into a powerful factor.

In these circumstances certainly the Leninist precept that so long as imperialism exists, the economic basis giving rise to wars will also be preserved, remains in force. That is why we must display the greatest vigilance. As long as capitalism survives in the world, the reactionary forces representing the interests of the capitalist monopolies will continue their drive towards military gambles and aggression, and may try to unleash war. But war is not fatalistically inevitable. Today there are mighty social and political forces possessing formidable means to prevent the imperialists from unleashing war, and if they actually do try to start it, to give a smashing rebuff to the aggressors and frustrate their adventurist plans. In order to be

able to do this, all the anti-war forces must be vigilant and prepared, they must act as a united front and never relax their efforts in the battle for peace. The more actively the peoples defend peace, the greater will be the guarantees that there will be no new war.

**Forms of transition to socialism in different countries.**—In connection with the radical changes in the world arena new prospects are also opening up as regards the transition of countries and nations to socialism.

As long ago as the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Lenin wrote: "All nations will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but not all will do so in exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own in one or another form of democracy, one or another variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, one or another rate at which socialist transformations will be effected in the various aspects of social life. There is nothing more primitive from the viewpoint of theory or more ridiculous from that of practice than to paint, 'in the name of historical materialism', this aspect of the future in a monotonous grey. The result will be nothing more than Suzdal daubing" [*Works*, Russian edition, Vol. 23, p. 58].

The experience of history has fully confirmed Lenin's brilliant precept. Alongside the Soviet form of reconstructing society on socialist lines, we now have the form of people's democracy.

In Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Albania and the other European people's democracies this form sprang up and is being utilised in conformity with the concrete historical, social and economic conditions and peculiarities of each of these countries. It has been thoroughly tried and tested in the course of ten years and has fully proved its worth.

Much that is unique in socialist construction is being contributed by the People's Republic of China, whose economy prior to the victory of the revolution was exceedingly backward, semi-feudal and semi-colonial in character. Having taken over the decisive commanding positions, the people's democratic state is using them in the social revolution to implement a policy of peaceful reorganisation of private industry and trade and their gradual transformation into a component of socialist economy.

The leadership of the great cause of socialist reconstruction by the Communist Party of China and the Communist and Workers' Parties of the other people's democracies, exercised in keeping with the peculiarities and specific features of each country, is creative Marxism in action.

In the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, where state power belongs to the working people, and society is founded on public ownership of the means of production, specific concrete forms of economic management and organisation of the state apparatus are arising in the process of socialist construction.

It is probable that more forms of transition to socialism will appear. Moreover, the implementation of these forms need not be associated with civil war under all circumstances. Our enemies like to depict us Leninists as advocates of violence always and everywhere. True, we recognise the need for the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into socialist society. It is this that distinguishes the revolutionary Marxists from the reformists, the opportunists. There is no doubt that in a number of capitalist countries the violent overthrow of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the sharp aggravation of class struggle connected with this are inevitable.

But the forms of social revolution vary. It is not true that we regard violence and civil war as the only way to remake society.

It will be recalled that in the conditions that arose in April 1917 Lenin granted the possibility that the Russian Revolution might develop peacefully, and that in the spring of 1918, after the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin drew up his famous plan for peaceful socialist construction. It is not our fault that the Russian and international bourgeoisie organised counter-revolution, intervention and civil war against the young Soviet state and forced the workers and peasants to take to arms. It did not come to civil war in the European people's democracies, where the historical situation was different.

Leninism teaches us that the ruling classes will not surrender their power voluntarily. And the greater or lesser degree of intensity which the struggle may assume, the use or the non-use of violence in the transition to socialism, depends on the resistance of the exploiters, on whether the exploiting class itself resorts to violence, rather than on the proletariat.

In this connection the question arises of whether it is possible to go over to socialism by using parliamentary means. No such course was open to the Russian Bolsheviks, who were the first to effect this transition. Lenin showed us another road, that of the establishment of a republic of Soviets—the only correct road in those historical conditions. Following that course, we achieved a victory of world-wide historical significance.

Since then, however, the historical situation has undergone radical changes which make possible a new approach to the question. The forces of socialism and democracy have grown immeasurably throughout the world, and capitalism has become much weaker. The mighty camp of socialism with its population of over 900 million is growing and gaining in strength. Its gigantic internal forces, its decisive advantages over capitalism, are being increasingly revealed from day to day. Socialism has a great power of attraction for the workers, peasants and intellectuals of all countries. The ideas of socialism are indeed coming to dominate the minds of all working mankind.

At the same time the present situation offers the working class in a number of capitalist countries a real opportunity to unite the overwhelming majority of the people under its leadership and to secure the transfer of the basic means of production into the hands of the people. The right-wing bourgeois parties and their governments are suffering bankruptcy with increasing frequency. In these circumstances the working class, by rallying around itself the working peasantry, the intelligentsia, all patriotic forces, and resolutely repulsing the opportunist elements who are incapable of giving up the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords, is in a position to defeat the reactionary forces opposed to the interests of the people, to capture a stable majority in parliament, and transform the latter from an organ of bourgeois democracy into a genuine instrument of the people's will. In such an event this institution, traditional in many highly developed capitalist countries, may become an organ of genuine democracy—democracy for the working people.

The winning of a stable parliamentary majority backed by a mass revolutionary movement of the proletariat and of all the working people could create for the working class of a number of capitalist and former colonial countries the conditions needed to secure fundamental social changes.

In the countries where capitalism is still strong and has a huge military and police apparatus at its disposal, the reactionary forces will, of course, inevitably offer serious resistance. There the transition to socialism will be attended by a sharp class, revolutionary struggle.

Whatever the form of transition to socialism, the decisive and indispensable factor is the political leadership of the working class headed by its vanguard. Without this there can be no transition to socialism.

It must be strongly emphasised that the more favourable conditions for the victory of socialism created in other countries are due to the fact that socialism has won in the Soviet Union and is winning in the people's democracies. Its victory in our country would have been impossible had Lenin and the Bolshevik Party not upheld revolutionary Marxism in battle against the reformists, who broke with Marxism and took the path of opportunism.

Such are the considerations which the central committee of the Party considers it necessary to set out with regard to the forms of transition to socialism in present-day conditions.

\* \* \*

What are the tasks confronting the Party in the sphere of foreign policy? They are:

1. To pursue steadfastly the Leninist policy of peaceful co-existence between different states, irrespective of their social systems. To work vigorously for the cause of peace and the security of the peoples, for the establishment of confidence between states, with a view to transforming the relaxation of international tension achieved up to date into a lasting peace.

2. To strengthen in every way our fraternal relations with the People's Republic of China, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, the German Democratic Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and the Mongolian People's Republic, bearing in mind that the greater the unity and might of the socialist countries the more secure is the cause of peace.

To strengthen in every way friendship and co-operation with the fraternal peoples of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia.

3. To consolidate untiringly the bonds of friendship and co-operation with the Republic of India, Burma, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Egypt, Syria and other countries which stand for peace; to support countries which refuse to be involved in military blocs; to co-operate with all forces seeking to preserve peace.

To develop and strengthen friendly relations with Finland, Austria and other neutral countries.

4. To pursue a vigorous policy of further improving relations with the United States of America, Britain, France, Western Germany, Japan, Italy, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and other countries with a view to strengthening mutual confidence, extending trade, and expanding contacts and co-operation in the sphere of culture and science.

5. To follow vigilantly the intrigues of circles that do not want a relaxation of international tension; to expose in good time the subversive activities of

the enemies of peace and the people's security; to take all measures necessary to further strengthen the defence potential of our socialist state; to maintain our defences at the level demanded by present-day armaments and science, and to ensure the security of our socialist country.

## II

### The Internal Situation of the U.S.S.R.

**C**OMRADES, a feature of the internal situation in the U.S.S.R. during the period under review has been the steady growth of all branches of social production, the further strengthening of the Soviet social and state system, the advancement of the material wellbeing of the people, and the all-round development of Soviet culture.

#### INDUSTRY AND TRANSPORT

**G**UIDED by the behests of the great Lenin, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has always worked steadfastly to ensure the priority development of heavy industry, which is the foundation for the growth of all branches of the socialist economy, the raising of our country's defence potential, and the improvement of the wellbeing of the people.

This is the general line of our party, a line tried and tested throughout the course of the entire history of the Soviet State and corresponding to the vital interests of the people. The Communist Party will also follow this general line with all firmness and consistency in the future.

#### 1. The Basic Results of the Fifth Five-Year Plan in Industry

**D**URING the Fifth Five-Year Plan the Party achieved a further rapid advance of all branches of industry. As we know, the Fifth Five-Year Plan in industry was fulfilled ahead of time, within four years and four months.

The following figures throw light on the increase of industrial production in 1951-55:

	Industrial Output in 1955, in percentages of 1950		Average Annual Rate of Increase in 1951-55 (in percentages)	
	Five-Year Plan Target	Actual Output	Five-Year Plan Target	Actual Increase
Industry as a whole .....	170	185	12	13.1
Production of the means of production .....	180	191	13	13.8
(group A) .....	165	176	11	11.9
Production of consumer goods (group B) .....				

Production of metal, fuel and electricity, and the output of other key branches of heavy industry increased considerably. Here are the figures:

	Production in 1950	Production in 1955	Percentage Increase
Pig Iron (in millions of tons*) .....	19	33	174
Steel (in millions of tons) .....	27	45	166
Rolled Metal (in millions of tons) .....	21	35	169
Coal (in millions of tons) .....	261	391	150
Oil (in millions of tons) .....	38	71	187
Electricity (in thousands of millions of kilowatt-hours) .....	91	170	187
Cement (in millions of tons) .....	10	22	221
Tractors (in thousands) .....	109	163	150
Mineral fertilisers (in millions of tons) .....	5.5	9.6	175

\* These are metric tons. One metric ton equals 2,204.6 lb.

The engineering industry developed at the most rapid pace during the Fifth Five-Year Plan. The volume of production in the engineering

and metal-working industries increased in 1955 to 2.2 times the 1950 figure and 4.7 times the figure for 1940.

Together with the production of the means of production, the output of consumer goods has been mounting from year to year. I shall give some figures to illustrate this:

	Production in 1950	Production in 1955	Percentage Increase
Cotton Fabrics (in millions of metres)*	3,899	5,904	151
Woollen Fabrics (in millions of metres)	155	251	162
Footwear (in millions of pairs)	226	299	132
Granulated Sugar (in millions of tons)	2.5	3.4	136
Meat—output of industrial packing houses of the Ministry of the Meat and Dairy Industry (in millions of tons)	1.3	2.2	168
Butter and other dairy produce in terms of milk (in millions of tons)	8.5	13.5	159
Vegetable Oils (in millions of tons)	0.8	1.1	143
Fish (in millions of tons)	1.7	2.7	156
Bicycles (in millions)	0.6	2.9	444
Clocks and Watches (in millions)	7.6	19.7	260
Radio and TV receivers (in millions)	1.1	4.0	372

\* One metre equals 1.0936 yards.

In its economic competition with capitalism, our country, owing to the advantages of the socialist system of economy, is showing immeasurably higher rates of increase in production than the most advanced capitalist countries. For instance, our average annual rates of increase in industrial output during the past five-year period were more than three times as high as that of the U.S.A. and 3.8 times that of Britain.

*Per capita* output in the U.S.S.R. is steadily increasing. During the Fifth Five-Year Plan *per capita* output of pig iron increased by 60 per cent, of steel by 52 per cent, coal 37 per cent, oil 72 per cent, electric power 71 per cent, cotton textiles 40 per cent, woollen fabrics 48 per cent, and sugar 24 per cent. Nevertheless we are still lagging behind the leading capitalist countries in *per capita* production. No little effort is still required to fulfil our basic economic task—to catch up with and surpass the most advanced capitalist countries in this respect.

During the Fifth Five-Year Plan capital investment in industry increased by 94 per cent compared with the Fourth Five-Year Plan. In construction of electric power stations it increased 3.4 times over, in the oil industry 2.3 times, the iron and steel and non-ferrous metals industry 1.8 times, the chemical industry 1.8 times, engineering 1.7 times, production of building materials, lumber, and paper 2.2 times, and in the light and food industries 1.5 times over.

In 1955 the productivity of labour in industry was nearly double the prewar level. Indeed, higher productivity accounted for more than two-thirds of the total increase of industrial output during the Fifth Five-Year Plan. During the same period the cost of production was reduced by 23 per cent. Quality of output improved and the variety and assortment of the goods turned out increased.

Comrades, as you can see from these data, during the period under review our party and the Soviet people brought about a new and mighty advance in the national economy, developing heavy industry further and, on this basis, achieved an advance in agriculture and the light and food industries. The Soviet Union took a new major step forward in its gradual transition from socialism to communism.

Soviet industry is beginning the Sixth Five-Year Plan with con-

siderably greater potentialities for growth and improvement in production than ever before. Now we can assign to industry bigger and qualitatively new tasks, the implementation of which will make it possible further to enhance the country's economic might and improve the wellbeing of our people.

During the period under review the central committee of the party carried out important measures aimed at further improving of the working of industry, and above all at the introduction of the latest achievements of science and technology in production. Why did the central committee direct the attention of the party and the people precisely to these questions?

The point is that our industrial successes turned the heads of some of our business executives and party workers, made them conceited and complacent, and in a number of cases led to an underestimation of the need for constant modernisation of production by means of the introduction of the latest achievements of both our own and foreign science and technology. We still have a good many such executives who prefer to play safe and tend to steer clear of all that is new and progressive. These hidebound seat-warmers reason thus: "Why should I bother with it? It will just be a lot of trouble and for all I know unpleasantness, too. They talk about modernising production, but is it worthwhile breaking my head over it? Let the chiefs up above worry about it. When a directive comes down we'll see about it." Some, even after receiving the directive, just wave it aside and go through the motions.

Mayakovsky sharply ridiculed "executives" of this type:

"To  
important ranks  
he rose  
and in his office chair  
he stuck—  
sees  
no further  
than his nose.  
Crammed his head  
with sundry 'isms',  
passed his  
party school  
exam,  
but of communism proper  
he's forgotten,  
sure I am.  
Why  
be wiser  
than his betters?  
All he does is  
sit and wait  
for instructions  
and directions,  
leaving thinking to the great."



Unfortunately we still have a good many people who only learn "isms" by rote and fail to see further than their own noses. By their bureaucratic attitude they cause a great deal of harm.

It was necessary to mobilise the party to overcome the shortcomings in the work of our industry, to make more effective use of our tremendous latent potentialities, to work for technical progress. With this in view conferences of leading workers in industry were held. The question was thoroughly examined at the July plenary meeting of the central committee of the C.P.S.U. last year. Since the plenary meeting much has been done, but we must regard this only as a beginning of bigger and more important things to come.

The Draft Directives for the Sixth Five-Year Plan outline a sweeping programme for the development of all branches of the national economy. The primary tasks of the Sixth Five-Year Plan in industry are the further expansion of the iron and steel and non-ferrous metals industry, the fuel and chemical industries, the steady acceleration of electric power station construction, and the rapid development of the engineering industry.

The Draft Directives have been drawn up with a view to raising the level of industrial output in 1960 by approximately 65 per cent compared with that of 1955, with a planned increase of 70 per cent in the means of production, and of 60 per cent in consumer goods. With the fulfilment of the Sixth Five-Year Plan we shall raise the level of industrial output in the U.S.S.R. to more than five times the level of the prewar year of 1940.

In order to carry out the Sixth Five-Year Plan successfully, we must solve a number of fundamental questions relating to industry—questions on which the party must now concentrate its attention and efforts.

## 2. Speeding Up Technical Progress in Industry

THE material base of our industry, the achievements of science, and the higher cultural and technical level of the working class are all factors that open up extensive opportunities for speeding up technical progress. Uninterrupted advance in the technique of production is a task of prime importance.

It is necessary to work persistently to improve our equipment; the most productive, economical and reliable machines must be created, electrification, all-round mechanisation and automation of production processes must be promoted extensively, and the achievements of science in the peaceful uses of atomic energy must be utilised to the full.

The engineering industry is a decisive factor in accelerating technical progress. Hence, the technical equipment of this key industry, and primarily the machine-tool and cutting tool plants, must be substantially improved. Particular attention must be paid to increasing the manufacture of powerful presses.

In previous years we built many large plants designed to complete the whole manufacturing process of a wide range of items. By going over to greater specialisation and co-operation we can considerably increase output, reduce the cost of production, and raise the productivity of labour.

Our party is consistently carrying out Lenin's behest on electrification. Since the beginning of the First Five-Year Plan the output of electricity in the U.S.S.R. has increased thirty-four times over. However, we have not yet reached the point at which the growth of electric power capacity is ahead of that of the national economy as a whole. The industrial level we have achieved enables us to set ourselves the task of sharply increasing the annual growth of electric power capacity and advancing electric power production to a point where it will fully meet the needs of the national economy and the population.

Although the iron and steel industry is forging ahead at a rapid rate, we still experience a shortage of metal. This is due to the rapid growth in the demand for metal throughout the national economy, and also to the fact that our iron and steel men are slow in developing the production of most economical and necessary sections and new types of metal.

Every effort must be made to develop the supply of raw materials to our iron and steel mills, to speed up the construction of metallurgical works, to make considerably more efficient use of existing production capacities, to expand the assortment, and improve the quality of metal.

It must be said that metal is often used in an uneconomical way. It is used not only where it is really necessary, but also where other materials could easily be substituted for it. Machine-builders can save a huge quantity of metal by reducing the size and weight of the machines they make, by using low-alloy steels and new materials which make for higher productivity and longer life in machines and other equipment. We must be more resolute and enterprising in substituting concrete and reinforced concrete for metal construction.

To work unremittingly to increase the output of non-ferrous and rare metals, and also of stainless and heat-resisting steels and alloys, is a highly important task.

Technical progress manifests itself not only in the modernisation of the old but also in the establishment of new branches of industry and the launching of new lines of output. One such new branch is the production of synthetic raw materials and substitutes, which are of great importance in further increasing consumer goods output.

To this day large quantities of foodstuffs go into the production of goods intended for industrial use. For instance, in 1955 more than two million tons of grain and more than 700,000 tons of molasses were used in the manufacture of alcohol. Some 400,000 tons of edible fats are used annually to make soap, detergents, drying oil and lubricants, and for other technical requirements. Yet for all these purposes oil, coal and natural gas by-products could be effectively used. We must unflinchingly substitute synthetic raw materials for all food products used for industrial purposes by the end of the Sixth Five-Year Plan, so that, beginning with 1961, no food will be used in this way. Every effort must be made to develop the production of artificial fibres, which, although it has increased in recent years, is still far from able to satisfy our needs.

While continuing to maintain a high rate of development of heavy

industry in the future, we can and must at the same time expand the production of consumer goods.

The aim of capitalist production is, as we know, to extract steadily increasing profits. This is achieved by constantly intensifying exploitation of the workers and by the expansion of production. However, the tendency towards expansion of production comes into conflict with the narrow limits of popular consumption, due to the decline—inevitable under capitalism—of the working people's effective demand. A deep-going contradiction between production and consumption is a feature of capitalist society.

Socialism has abolished this contradiction of capitalist production. The aim of socialist production is the maximum satisfaction of the steadily growing material and cultural requirements of the working people, of society as a whole. As heavy industry expands, the development of industries directly engaged in meeting the growing needs of the population acquires a steadily wider scope. Now that we possess a powerful heavy industry developed in every respect, we are in a position to promote rapidly the production of both the means of production and consumer goods. Suffice it to mention that in 1960 the output of consumer goods will be almost three times more than in 1950. The party is doing, and will continue to do its utmost to ensure that the requirements of the Soviet people will be satisfied more fully and better; it considers this its prime duty to the people.

### 3. Improvement of Transport and Telecommunication Equipment

DEVELOPMENT of the transport and telecommunication services is of tremendous significance for the national economy. During the Fifth Five-Year Plan further improvements were made in the technical equipment of the transport system. Organisation of labour and operation of transport facilities improved. The 19th Party Congress target for freight haulage by rail, sea and road transport was successfully reached.

While noting these accomplishments, it must be admitted that railway transport is lagging behind technically. In the main, steam locomotives are used, although it is a well-known fact that the efficiency of steam traction is low—only 4-5 per cent as compared with 16-18 per cent in the case of electric traction.

Going over to electric traction makes it possible sharply to increase carrying and traffic capacity and improve transport operating conditions. Electric traction cuts fuel expenditure to a third or a quarter in comparison with steam. According to data of the State Planning Commission and the Ministry of Railways of the U.S.S.R., the introduction of electric traction on the Moscow-Vladivostok line would save no less than 18 million tons of coal and reduce operating costs by more than 2,700 million roubles annually in comparison with steam traction. It has been estimated that the capital expenditure required to electrify this line would pay for itself within no more than four years.

In spite of the importance and urgency of this matter, not only have the people in charge of railway transport failed to work energetically to put electrification through, but even the funds allocated for the purpose

have not been fully used. Only 2,267 kilometres\* of railways, or 58 per cent of the five-year target, were electrified in the course of the past five years. Throughout this period the Ministry of Railways failed from year to year to make full use of the allocations given it for capital construction under the annual plans. The people in charge of the Ministry are obviously suffering from conservatism when it comes to technical reconstruction of the transport system.

Railway electrification is the most important element of the technical reconstruction of rail transport and its further development in line with advanced technology. In view of the tremendous importance of this matter to the national economy, the central committee of the party the other day took a decision on a general plan for the electrification of railways covering a fifteen-year period. This plan provides for the electrification of a total of 40,000 kilometres of railway.

Besides electrification, rapid replacement of steam locomotives by diesel locomotives is of outstanding importance in improving the technical equipment of the railways. The present production of diesel locomotives and their haulage capacity are altogether insufficient. Because of this, the central committee of the C.P.S.U. and the Council of Ministers took a decision in September 1955 to turn over a number of transport machinery works to the production of diesel locomotives.

The wider use of electric and diesel locomotives, the improvement of the permanent way, automation and centralisation of traffic control and other measures will make it possible to increase carrying capacity.

Everything must be done to increase cargo shipment by the merchant fleet and inland waterways. At present it amounts to only 12 per cent of the total freight turnover in the country, which is altogether insufficient.

Air and pipe-line transport must be promoted at a faster pace.

During the Fifth Five-Year Plan freight haulage by road transport more than doubled. This, however, is not enough. There are still huge latent potentialities to draw on in our road transport. One of its most serious shortcomings is the unbelievable lack of centralisation. A vast number of dwarf organisations have sprung up to which many heads of factories and institutions stubbornly cling. Suffice it to say that 85 per cent of these organisations have ten vehicles or less. This is the main reason why last year, for instance, about half of all our lorries were standing idle and half of the time those operating were running empty. We must put an end to this kind of backwardness and concentrate motor transport in the hands of bigger organisations. This will have a big economic effect. Highway construction must be expanded to the utmost.

It must also be said that our cars are obviously being used wastefully. It has become the practice to assign cars to particular people. Often, when the person who has been assigned a car has no need to go anywhere, the vehicle stands idle. But one or two drivers and the service personnel are nevertheless drawing their wages. We must resolutely put this matter on a socialist footing and put an end to the practice of assigning cars to individuals, except for a strictly limited number of personal cars. For the use of executive personnel there should be service taxis. This is all the more necessary since our car production will continue to grow

\* One kilometre equals 0.621 miles approx.

and, if we were to carry on in the old way, the huge service personnel we already have would increase still more. And this is utterly impermissible. Of course, whenever necessary we must assign cars to individuals, but we must also see to it that these people learn to drive themselves. The question of bringing order into the operation of our motor transport is long overdue and it must be settled, bureaucratic resistance notwithstanding. The interests of our socialist state demand it.

In recent years there has been a certain improvement in the telecommunication services. Nevertheless telecommunication facilities, particularly radio-relay lines, phototelegraph, and television broadcasts, still fail to meet the requirements of the population and the national economy. Still more energetic work is required to develop and improve the means of communication in line with the latest scientific and engineering achievements.

#### 4. The Proper Distribution of Productive Forces

**I**N order to achieve a further increase in the volume of industrial output it is imperative to draw on new sources of raw materials, fuel and electricity, and, above all, on the enormous natural resources of the east of our country.

It must be remembered that up to 75 per cent of all the coal reserves of the U.S.S.R., 80 per cent of its water power, four-fifths of its timber, its principal reserves of non-ferrous and rare metals, and enormous resources of chemical raw materials, iron ore and building materials are to be found in the eastern regions.

Experience has shown that the mining of coal and the production of electricity in the east are economically more advantageous than in the European part of the U.S.S.R. It is enough to mention the fact that during the Fifth-Five-Year Plan capital expenditure per ton of increased coal output was in Eastern Siberia about 40 per cent, and in the Kuzbas nearly 67 per cent of that in the Donbas. The cost of production of one ton of Kuzbas coal last year was some 33 per cent less than one ton of Donbas coal. In 1960 it is planned to produce 80 million tons of coal in the Kuzbas. These 80 million tons will cost the state 2,400 million roubles less than the mining of an equal quantity in the Donbas.

Here is another example of the same type. The Bratsk hydro-electric power station, with a capacity of 3,200,000 kw., which is now being built on the Angara River, will turn out 22,000 million kwh. of electricity annually, or as much as the two biggest hydro-electric stations in the European part of the U.S.S.R.—Kuibyshev and Stalingrad. Nevertheless the Bratsk power plant is costing only half as much as the Kuibyshev and Stalingrad stations combined, while the annual production cost of the electricity produced on the Angara will be 200 million roubles less than the corresponding figure for the Kuibyshev and Stalingrad stations.

Comrades, you can thus see how advantageous it is for us to tap the power resources of the east on a wider scale. Within the next ten years we must make Siberia a leading producer of coal and electricity in the Soviet Union, the principal centre of industries consuming a great deal of fuel and power, especially industries producing aluminium, magnesium

and titanium, as well as of the electro-metallurgical, coke by-products and electro-chemical industries.

To carry out this important national economic task successfully, every effort must be made to promote iron and steel development in the east. In 1955 the Urals and Western Siberia produced over 14 million tons of pig-iron—more than Britain. Nevertheless every year we have to send several million tons of ferrous metals to the east from the European part of the U.S.S.R. Hence we must take resolute steps to speed up the development of the iron and steel industry in Siberia, Kazakhstan and the Far East.

The task now is to create in Siberia, within the next two or three five-year plans, the country's third great metallurgical centre, with an annual output of 15-20 million tons of pig iron. It is necessary in this connection to work out a general outline for the development and distribution of iron and steel plants in Siberia and undertake largescale prospecting, scientific research and other work in that part of the country.

The engineering industry, too, has been insufficiently developed in the eastern regions. In the next ten years we must establish there new large engineering centres capable of producing all kinds of machines, mechanisms, devices and instruments.

We must harness more energetically the tremendous natural industrial resources in the east and ensure their more effective use in the interest of the further development of our country's productive forces.

Attention must also be paid to the most expedient comprehensive distribution of industry according to economic zones. Our country is huge, and if in developing industry we do not observe a balance within the various economic districts, we shall artificially increase unnecessary goods transport and create difficulties in the general development of the national economy.

#### 5. Productivity of Labour, Cost of Industrial Production, and Capital Construction

**G**UIDED by Lenin's well-known precept that the productivity of labour is in the last analysis the most important factor ensuring the victory of the new social system, the party has worked and will continue to work for a steady increase in productivity of labour on the basis of technical progress.

The most important condition for the growth of the productivity of labour, Lenin pointed out, is "the heightening of the working people's sense of duty, skill, efficiency, intensity of labour, and better organisation of work". Soviet people know that higher productivity of labour is the foundation of their increasing wellbeing. Hence we must tirelessly improve the organisation of labour and production and do away with wastage of material resources and working time.

Party and economic organisations must pay the greatest attention to the economic aspect of the operation of enterprises. Constant effort must be exerted to ensure the smooth operation of every plant, reduce the cost of production, always observe the strictest regime of economy, and do everything to strengthen cost accounting.

Comrades, capital construction is of paramount importance in the further development of industry and the entire national economy. Now that our annual capital investments will reach nearly 200,000 million roubles, we must devote more attention to capital construction and place it on a firm industrial footing.

The central committee of the party and the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. have recently adopted a number of important decisions on the development and modernisation of the building industry. The question here is of ensuring the most effective utilisation of the funds allocated for capital construction, raising the level of organisational and technical control of construction, waging a determined fight against the diffusion of funds, radically accelerating the rate of construction and reducing costs. These tasks can be solved only by industrialising construction, by extensive use of factory-made ferro-concrete and concrete structural sections and units.

The scale of capital construction in our country is increasing steadily and the fixed capital of industry is mounting rapidly. Simultaneously with the improvement of construction methods, we must always see to it that the existing capacities are most effectively used. We know by experience that many enterprises can considerably increase, and some even double or treble, their output without large additional capital investments. The only thing that is wanted is to tackle the matter properly—modernise the plant, improve the organisation of production and labour, make wider use of such a potent factor as the experience of the foremost workers, the creative initiative of inventors and rationalisers.

The millions of men and women of our glorious working class, our engineers and technicians are searching for and harnessing the enormous reserves latent in socialist production with increasing vigour. Socialist emulation is a striking expression of this. We must extend this emulation movement still wider, always remembering that it is not a campaign, but the vital cause of millions of people, a powerful force promoting the development and perfecting of socialist production. We are confident that our working men and women, engineers and technicians, will, by their creative labour, ensure the successful fulfilment of the Sixth Five-Year Plan.

## AGRICULTURE

COMRADES, together with a powerful industry our country must have a comprehensively developed agriculture, capable of producing foodstuffs and raw materials in quantities sufficient to satisfy fully the needs of the population and meet all the other requirements of the state.

The development of socialist economy, the growth of labour productivity, and the reductions of retail prices during recent years have substantially raised the real wages of factory, office and other workers and the incomes of collective farmers, increasing the purchasing power of the population.

These conditions have confronted the party with an urgent national task—sharply to increase the output of farm produce. At its plenary meetings the central committee of the party has brought to light serious shortcomings and mistakes in the guidance of agriculture, and drawn up an extensive programme for expanding the output of grain and livestock products.

Our party, with the active support of the working class and the whole people, has carried out largescale measures for the development of agriculture. During 1954 and 1955 alone, capital investment in agriculture totalled 34,400 million roubles, or 38 per cent more than the total capital investment in agriculture during the entire Fourth Five-Year Plan. In these two years collective farms, machine and tractor stations and state farms received 404,000 tractors (in terms of 15-h.p. units), 228,000 lorries, 83,000 combine-harvesters and a large number of other machines.

To provide greater material incentives for the collective farms and collective farmers to develop their socially owned enterprise and increase the output for the market, the procurement prices of grain, livestock products, potatoes and other vegetables, flax and hemp were raised considerably. These measures and increased production for the market added 20,000 million roubles to the incomes of the collective farms in 1954 and 1955.

In the machine and tractor stations regular operating staffs have been built up, a factor of prime importance in their transformation into model socialist establishments. Many thousands of engineers, technicians, party functionaries and government officials have gone from cities and industrial centres to work on machine and tractor stations, and collective and state farms. More than 120,000 agricultural specialists have been sent to collective farms. More than 20,000 Communists, sent from the town to the country, have been recommended as collective-farm chairmen. The central committee of the party and the government have introduced a new planning system in agriculture which has given scope to the initiative of the collective farmers. Measures have been taken to improve the work of the state farms, to reinforce existing state farms, and to set up new ones.

The fulfilment of the measures for the further advance of agriculture drawn up by the party has made it possible to take the first big step to increase the output of grain and industrial crops. This is graphically shown by the following table:

TOTAL OUTPUT OF GRAIN AND INDUSTRIAL CROPS IN THE U.S.S.R.

(1950=100)

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
Grain .....	100	97	113	101	105	129
Sun-flower seed .....	100	97	123	146	106	207
Sugar-beet .....	100	114	107	111	95	147
Raw cotton .....	100	105	106	108	118	109
Long-staple flax fibre .....	100	76	83	64	85	149

It should be noted that while during the first three or four years of the Fifth Five-Year Plan the production of grain and industrial crops hardly rose at all, in 1955 gross harvests increased considerably thanks to the carrying out of a number of measures of which you know. Compared with 1954, grain production last year increased 22 per cent, sun-flower seed 95 per cent, sugar-beet 54 per cent, and flax fibre 74 per cent. We had no increase in the cotton crop because plants were damaged by early frosts. Potato yields were low in a number of districts, particularly in the non-black-earth zone.

### 1. Grain Farming—Foundation of All Agriculture

COMRADES, the party has pointed out more than once that without well-developed grain farming it is impossible to advance livestock breeding or to increase the output of industrial crops. But in this vitally

important matter the heads of the Ministry of Agriculture of the U.S.S.R. and the Ministry of State Farms of the U.S.S.R. and of planning organisations were obviously on the wrong track. The allocation of areas under crops was in recent years sharply at variance with the need to expand grain production. In most districts the area under grain was reduced. Some mistakes were made in introducing the *travopolye* crop rotation system. The *travopolye* system of farming was applied mechanically; millions of hectares were sown with grasses in areas where they do not produce high yields.

The outcome of all this was that in 1953, when the requirements in grain had risen greatly in comparison with pre-revolutionary years, the area under grain was almost the same as in 1913.

Having made a thorough study of the country's requirements in agricultural produce, the January 1955 plenary meeting of the central committee of the C.P.S.U. put forward the task of sharply increasing, within a short space of time, the grain production and of more than doubling the output of the main livestock products.

The development of virgin and long-fallow lands in Kazakhstan, Siberia, and other areas, undertaken following a decision by the party, is of particularly great importance for the continued advance of agriculture. The central committee of the C.P.S.U. set the task of bringing no less than 28-30 million hectares\* of new land under cultivation by 1956. The solution of this problem is of historic significance for our state. What will the virgin lands give the country? Estimates show that we can get on the average no less than 2,000 million poods† of grain annually from the new lands. With a big quantity of marketable wheat from the virgin lands, the government can confidently undertake a big expansion in the area under maize in the Ukraine and the North Caucasus, in order that these areas may sharply raise meat and milk production and also the production of industrial crops.

Within a short time over 200,000 tractors (in terms of 15-h.p. units) and thousands of other machines and implements have been sent to the virgin land development areas. The party's measures to cultivate the virgin lands have been ardently approved and supported by the whole Soviet people. In response to the call of the central committee of the C.P.S.U. 350,000 Soviet patriots went to these areas to bring virgin and long-fallow lands under the plough. They have laboured with a staunchness worthy of builders of communism.

Allow me, on behalf of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to express warm thanks to the young men and women, members of the Young Communist League, to the agronomists, engineers and technicians, to all the patriots who responded to the party's call and are taking an active part in cultivating the new lands. By their devoted labour they have earned the love and respect of the whole Soviet people.

Had we undertaken to develop the virgin lands in the usual way, by the gradual resettlement of people in the new areas, we would have required a tremendous number of people, vast resources, and much time. Then, of course, we should not have been able to solve the problem of ploughing up 30 million hectares of new lands within two years.

Most likely in the new Five-Year Plan the party will have to issue such calls to the youth more than once. We shall continue to develop new areas,

\* 70-75 million acres. One hectare = 2.47 acres. Ed.

† 32,230,000 tons. 62 poods = 1 ton. Ed.

to build atomic, thermal and hydro-electric power stations, plants, and railways. The party is confident that our glorious youth will continue to respond with enthusiasm to its calls. The young people know that their labour on the splendid construction projects of communism is of the greatest importance not only for our generation but for generations to come.

The assignment for cultivating virgin lands has been fulfilled with credit, thanks to the selfless labour of the collective farmers, the workers of the machine and tractor stations and state farms, and the active support of the working class. In 1954 and 1955 some 30 million hectares were put to the plough in the virgin and long-fallow land areas; over the whole country the total reached 33 million hectares. This is a big victory for the party and the whole Soviet people.

The ploughing up of virgin lands has made it possible to expand substantially the area under grain. In 1950 grain was sown on 102.9 million hectares in the U.S.S.R.; in 1955 the figure was 126.4 million hectares—an increase of almost 24 million hectares.

Some comrades might ask whether we are doing right in developing virgin lands in areas subject to drought. A study of the available data shows that even with periodic droughts grain farming is profitable and economically justified in Kazakhstan, Siberia and the Urals. If in five years we have only two good, one average, and two poor crops, it is possible, with the relatively small outlays needed for grain cultivation in these conditions, to farm at a big profit and produce grain at a low cost.

The results of our work in virgin land development make it possible to draw the indisputable conclusion that the line of cultivating new lands adopted by the party is correct. This policy ensures a substantial increase in grain production within the shortest possible time and with the least outlay of labour and resources.

In further developing virgin lands attention should be paid to the Krasnoyarsk territory, the Irkutsk region and the Khabarovsk and Primorye territories which have many good uncultivated tracts. This will make it possible to build up facilities for grain farming and livestock raising to satisfy the Far East's agricultural produce requirements from local sources.

To expand the grain production changes had to be introduced in the allocation of the sown areas, in order, together with an increase in the sowing of wheat and other cereals as well as other crops, to extend sharply the area under maize. Estimates show that no less than 4,000 million poods of fodder grains are needed annually for livestock breeding. Without a substantial increase in maize production we cannot obtain such a quantity of grain. Therefore the central committee found it necessary to increase sharply the cultivation of maize. In 1955 almost 18 million hectares, that is 13,600,000 hectares more than in 1954, were sown to maize.

The increased maize acreage made it possible considerably to improve the supply of silage and fodder concentrates to livestock farming. In 1955 the collective farms prepared 17 million tons more silage, including more than 6 million tons of corn cobs, than in the previous year.

The result has been a sharp increase in milk yields and in the total production of milk. According to figures from the Central Statistical Administration of the U.S.S.R., during the last four months (1 October 1955 to 1 February 1956) the total collective-farm milk production rose by 65 per cent compared

with the same period during 1954-55 over the whole of the Soviet Union, in the Ukrainian S.S.R. by 100 per cent, in the R.S.F.S.R. by 53 per cent, while in individual areas of the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, and Kazakhstan, in the Uzbek S.S.R., the Azerbaijan S.S.R., the Tajik S.S.R., the Turkmen S.S.R., and the Moldavian S.S.R. gross yield rose two or three times over and even more. No such increase in milk production has ever been registered before throughout the years of Soviet rule. There is no doubt that maize, the new system of planning, and the greater material incentives to collective farmers have proved decisive in this.

At the same time, there are a number of districts where maize has not given an adequate return. For this there is only one reason—the careless attitude to maize cultivation by the leaders in those districts. This is the case in a considerable number of districts in Byelorussia, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, in Kostroma, Yaroslavl, Tula and some other regions. The question arises: Perhaps the central committee of the C.P.S.U. made a mistake in recommending this crop, which is cultivated in the South, for the entire Soviet Union?

No, comrades, it was not a mistake. In the republics, territories, regions, districts, collective farms and state farms where the leaders treated the matter earnestly, studied the specific features of maize, and trained the personnel on the collective farms and state farms—there good results were obtained. Conversely, where maize-growing was left to drift, the collective and state farms had a low yield.

Each region has collective farms which obtained big maize yields. I will cite some examples of districts where maize was a new crop and was planted over large areas.

The Stalin collective farm, in the Chuvash Autonomous Republic, planted maize on 240 hectares last year. Of this, 70 hectares were harvested for green fodder; a big crop of stalks and cobs in the milk-wax stage was obtained on 170 hectares, and it was used by the collective farm for making 8,000 tons of silage.

The Petrovskoye state farm, Moscow region, obtained an average yield of 29.5 tons of maize stalks and cobs per hectare, and on a section of 15.5 hectares the average yield was 40.2 tons, including 75 tons per hectare on a plot of five hectares.

The Rassvet collective farm, Byelorussian Republic, last year got an average yield of 35 tons of maize stalks and cobs per hectare from 500 hectares.

Facts convincingly prove that maize can give high yields in all zones of our country, that it has no equal as regards yield and nutritional value per hectare, and as regards return for labour expended in cultivating it. Therefore it is necessary to analyse thoroughly the mistakes made in cultivating maize in some districts and collective farms and the reasons why it has not produced a good yield in some collective and state farms, and to prepare now with the utmost energy for the spring sowing, in particular, to train personnel in order that a big maize crop may be grown this year on each collective and state farm.

Our main task in farming is to bring up the annual total grain crop to 11,000 million poods by the end of the Sixth Five-Year Plan through raising yields and developing more new lands; to extend the areas and increase

considerably the yields of industrial crops—cotton, sugar-beet, flax, hemp and sun-flower seed; and also sharply to expand the production of potatoes and other vegetables. In the next two years we can and must accomplish the task of fully supplying the country with potatoes and other vegetables of high quality.

Orchards and areas under vines and berries should be increased. The planting of shelter belts should be developed and our youth urged to take an active part in this work. It is very important to extend the scale of irrigation development and at the same time to improve the use of irrigated and drained lands.

The central committee of the party deems it necessary to increase the production of mineral fertilisers and chemical weed and pest killers. We must continue to raise the efficiency of farming, persistently introduce advanced agrotechnical methods, and proper crop rotations, cutting the time of agricultural jobs, and on this basis ensure higher yields of grain and industrial crops in all areas.

## 2. The Tasks of Further Advancing Livestock Farming

COMRADES, the further development of livestock farming and an increase in the output and procurement of livestock products is one of the most difficult and at the same time most urgent tasks our party has faced in the recent period. The central committee of the C.P.S.U. and the government have drawn up and implemented a range of major economic and organisational measures designed to increase herds and to raise livestock productivity.

The central committee of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet government have found it necessary to give collective farmers greater material incentives to develop livestock farming. An extensive plan for the mechanisation of work in livestock raising and the construction of buildings for livestock has been adopted and is being carried out. Local party organisations have done considerable work in reinforcing the personnel engaged in key sections of livestock breeding.

All this could not but produce, and actually did produce, favourable results. Allow me to cite some figures illustrating the state of our livestock farming.

### HEAD OF PRODUCTIVE LIVESTOCK IN THE U.S.S.R.

(1950=100)

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
Cows	100	102	100	107	113	120
Total head of cattle	100	103	99	110	114	117
Pigs	100	111	117	195	210	214
Sheep	100	110	114	139	142	151

### OUTPUT OF THE MAIN LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS IN THE U.S.S.R.

(1950=100)

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
Meat (slaughter-house weight)	100	96	106	120	129	130
Milk	100	102	101	103	108	119
Wool	100	107	122	130	128	142
Eggs	100	113	123	137	147	154

Our country has immeasurable livestock farming reserves. If persistent organisational work is carried on on the collective and state farms, exceptional



results can be achieved in a year or two. Take, for example, pig breeding. The figures I have given show that during the first two years of the Five-Year Plan the increase in the number of pigs was negligible. But when concrete measures were taken to promote pig breeding, the number rose sharply in the last three years. During the past four months (from 1 October 1955 to 1 February 1956) the collective farms delivered and sold to the state 62 per cent more pigs than in the same months of 1954 and 1955. The collective farms are now fattening pigs on a larger scale. On 1 February 1956 they were fattening more than three times as many pigs as on 1 February 1955. There are every grounds for being confident that the programme outlined for raising the output of livestock products will be carried out successfully.

The expansion of fodder production is of special importance in the programme for the development of livestock farming. The task is: Together with bigger grain production and the utmost expansion of maize cultivation, which is the main thing, to develop the sowing of perennial grasses—for example, clover, lucerne etc. It goes without saying that in selecting perennial grasses and their mixtures, both cereal and leguminous, account must be taken of the climatic and soil conditions in order to grow the crops which produce the biggest yields in the given zone. We should also encourage the sowing of annual grasses, for example, Sudan grass and sorghum in the southern regions, and in the central regions the vetch-oats mixture, which is especially valuable for sowing on fallow land.

Mention must be made of the wrong attitude of some comrades towards the sowing of grasses. There are instances of clover being ousted from areas which specialised in it for many years. Such an attitude to grass runs contrary to the instructions of the party. By its well-known decision taken at the February-March plenary meeting, the central committee of the C.P.S.U. did not condemn the cultivation of grasses as such, but the mechanical approach to perennial grasses, when they were sown on millions of hectares in arid districts and produced very low yields. While resolutely condemning a mechanical approach to grass cultivation, the party at the same time pointed out that in areas where perennial and annual grasses yield big crops they should be grown and the production of hay increased.

The manager who utilises every opportunity and provides his cattle with home-grown feed, both forage and succulent fodder, which is necessary for a rapid expansion in the supply of livestock products, is doing a good job. Yet we still have leading personnel on collective and state farms who, instead of concentrating all their efforts on increasing the output of fodder, prefer to become dependent on others and want to get more fodder from the state. And there are also not a few who, taking advantage of the retail price cuts, buy up bread, grits, and other products in the shops and use them as livestock feed. That is not productive activity but speculation.

Here is one such fact. The chairman of a collective farm in the Moscow region set up a fodder team of twelve collective farmers and gave them money, bags and a lorry. This team worked to get fodder, not on the fields of the collective farm, but in Moscow shops. It brought up buckwheat grits, millet, pearl-barley, flour, yeast and other products as feed for poultry and livestock.

This is not an isolated instance. Such "businessmen" are inflicting great harm by their actions because they reduce our potentialities for expanding

livestock farming. They want to get to the front ranks without special effort, at the expense of others. This reminds one of Gogol's Patsyuk who found that dumplings were flying by themselves into his mouth. This is the picture Gogol paints in his story *Christmas Eve*:

"Patsyuk opened his mouth, looked at the dumpling, and opened his mouth wider still. At that moment a dumpling popped out of the bowl, splashed into the cream, turned over on the other side, leapt upwards, and flew straight into his mouth. Patsyuk ate it up and opened his mouth again, and another dumpling went through the same performance. The only trouble Patsyuk took was to munch it up and swallow it."

But to Patsyuk this happened only on Christmas Eve, while some of our present-day Patsyuks want the dumplings to jump into their mouths every day and, moreover, such people are even respected by others.

It is also appropriate to point out here that such "business" is plied on an ever greater scale by negligent members of suburban collective farms and some people living on the outskirts of towns who do not work anywhere. They buy bread and other products in the shops, feed them to cattle, and then sell the livestock products on the markets at higher than shop prices. A more vigorous struggle should be waged against profiteering elements who, taking advantage of the fact that in some places there are temporarily not enough products to satisfy the population fully, make profits at the expense of honest people and at the expense of the state.

Comrades, our main task in livestock farming is to increase in every possible way the output of livestock products per 100 hectares of farm land. It is above all necessary to continue expanding the socially owned livestock farming, which makes it possible to increase considerably the income of the collective farms, improve the material wellbeing of the collective farmers, and ensure an improvement in the supply of meat, milk and other produce to the public. Special attention should be given to improving the breeds, raising the proportion of cows in the herds, ensuring a considerable increase in the productivity of dairy farming, and developing the fattening of pigs as a most important means of rapidly increasing meat production. Agriculturists in the Voronezh region have initiated a fine undertaking: they have pledged themselves to complete the assignment for bigger meat and milk production set in the Draft Directives for the Sixth Five-Year Plan ahead of time, namely: to double meat production in one year, instead of five, and to double milk production in eighteen months. There can be no doubt that the patriotic initiative of the Voronezh agriculturists will be followed by other regions, territories and republics, in order to complete within two or a maximum of three years the Sixth Five-Year Plan's output targets in the main livestock products.

The interests of the job in hand demand that the raising of breeds of sheep which yield fine wool, semi-fine wool, meat and wool, and sheepskin should be developed to the utmost in order to have more high quality woollen fabrics, karakul skins, good sheepskin coats and felt boots.

Collective and state farms should have as many hens, geese and ducks as possible; should breed fish in ponds and reservoirs, and give due attention to rabbit breeding and bee-keeping.

It would be wrong and utterly disastrous to present the situation as though all the difficulties in livestock farming have been overcome. No,

comrades, the collective farmers, the workers at the machine and tractor stations and on the state farms, and the agricultural specialists will have to work hard to raise livestock farming to a level which meets the rising requirements of the people.

### 3. Mechanisation of Agriculture

COMRADES, our socialist industry is equipping agriculture with millions of up-to-date machines. The introduction of new equipment increases the mechanisation of agricultural work. The problem of mechanising the most important jobs in field work has been solved. This is a great victory for the Soviet people. We are now confronted four-square by the task of going over in the shortest possible time from the mechanisation of separate jobs to the comprehensive mechanisation of all agricultural production, livestock farming included. In these conditions the machine and tractor stations acquire still greater importance. A number of measures designed radically to improve the work of the machine and tractor stations have been taken in the last two years. About 2 million tractor drivers, combine operators, lorry drivers, other farm machine operators and skilled maintenance men have joined the machine and tractor stations as permanent staff. Industry has sent 29,000 engineers and technicians to the machine and tractor stations. All this has produced a certain improvement in their work. But it cannot yet be said that their work fully measures up to present-day requirements.

Experience shows that operation on a cost-accountancy basis is of prime importance in all branches of socialist production. But this tried and tested method of management is not applied in the machine and tractor stations. The present system of financing them through the state budget results in a lack of responsibility and control. Many machine and tractor station workers do not study thoroughly the economic indices of the station's operation and do not take sufficient interest in the efficient use of machines. The stations are financed irrespective of the results of their work; the remuneration of their personnel is not made dependent on the efficient use of machines, the yield of crops, and livestock productivity on the collective farms.

It will be expedient gradually to transfer the machine and tractor stations' work to a cost-accountancy basis in the coming years. Naturally it is impossible to establish a uniform system with the same indices for all stations throughout the country. A flexible system of operation on a cost-accountancy basis should be introduced, a system which takes into account the specific features of the different zones and within the zones, the specific features of the different districts. This measure will stimulate the efforts of the station workers and enhance their responsibility for the progress of agriculture.

Together with an improvement in the work of the machine and tractor stations there must be an important alteration in the technical policy of our agricultural Ministries and the Ministry of the Tractor and Agricultural Machinery Industry. Leading officials of these Ministries proceed from the premise that the same types of tractors, combines and soil-tilling implements should be used throughout the vast territory of our country. The same heavy caterpillar tractors, tractor-drawn and self-propelled combines are produced for the Kuban with its vast steppes as for the small plots in the

north-west or the Baltic republics. But that is wrong. The time has come to work out a range of models which takes into account the distinctive features of the country's main zones.

Wheel tractors were used very efficiently in the north-western and other regions before the war and in the early postwar years. The manufacture of wheel tractors has dropped sharply lately. Yet wheel tractors, moreover easily manoeuvrable rubber-tyred tractors, are needed no less, if not more, than caterpillar tractors. Their production and especially their operation and repair are simpler and cheaper.

During the Sixth Five-Year Plan agriculture should go over completely to tractor-mounted tilling and other cultivation implements. As for implements which have to be drawn by tractors (for example, heavy ploughs), factories should design and manufacture special attachments enabling the tractor driver to work them without trailer implement operators. The change-over to mounted implements will make it possible to release hundreds of thousands of trailer implement operators, cut the quantity of metal expended upon implements by 40 to 50 per cent, reduce fuel expenditure and raise the productivity of labour.

It is exceedingly important to expand substantially the manufacture of machines for two-stage harvesting in order to go over to this system in the main grain-growing areas in the coming years.

Special attention should be paid to the electrification of collective farms, machine and tractor stations, and state farms, which is a very important prerequisite for the mechanisation of agriculture. We have not yet tackled this problem properly, on an adequate countrywide scale. Moreover, the approach to the electrification of collective and state farms has been wrong. The linking up of collective and state farms to power grids has not been permitted even in places where this was economically advantageous and did not present technical difficulties. All our workers should regard the electrification of collective and state farms as an integral part of the great plan for the country's electrification.

When Lenin spoke about the necessity to cover the country with a network of power stations, he had in mind not only big state power grids but also the building of a ramified chain of rural power stations. How is this task to be accomplished? At present collective farms and state farms are themselves building small stations but they do not always have the possibilities of coping properly with the technical problems of electrifying production. The building of power stations by several collective farms, or on a district or even inter-district basis, should be developed. Standard power station designs which take into account the distinctive features of different zones should be drafted. Stations located near natural gas deposits could work on gas fuel, others on peat, still others on coal or lignite. Where there are water-power resources hydro-electric stations should of course be built.

The question arises: who is to build these stations and with what funds? It would be correct to stipulate that republican organisations should build these stations with collective-farm funds on a co-operative basis. State plans should envisage the supply of fuel and other materials to inter-collective-farm, district, and inter-district stations.

We cannot now set a schedule for the completion of the electrification of agriculture. The State Planning Commission and the respective ministries

should make a thorough study of this matter, receive concrete proposals from the republics and regions, and on their basis work out an all-embracing plan for the electrification of collective farms, machine and tractor stations, and state farms and submit it to the government.

#### 4. Development of State Farms

**I**N solving the urgent problems of continued agricultural expansion, we must pay special attention to developing the state farms, the highest form of organisation of socialist agriculture.

The central committee of the party has adopted a number of important measures to reinforce the old state farms and to build new ones. During the last two years, 581 large state farms were set up, including 425 on the virgin lands; the sown areas of the state farms of the Ministry of State Farms of the U.S.S.R. were extended by 10,500,000 hectares and reached 24,500,000 hectares last year, the grain area increasing 2.4 times over. As a result, the government is now getting much more grain from the state farms than in 1950. The state farms have considerably increased the delivery of livestock products, potatoes and other vegetables.

Along with increasing the grain production on state farms we must now expand the state farms' production of cotton, sugar-beet and other crops. Livestock state farms, especially sheepbreeding, should be set up on idle lands which are unsuitable for cultivation but are quite suitable for stock raising. It is expedient to revise the planning system in the state farms, basing the plan on output per 100 hectares of farmland and taking into account the specific zonal features. This will put the task of lowering production costs and making each state farm into a high-income establishment on a more practicable basis.

#### 5. Seed Production—an Important Element in the Progress of Agriculture

**T**HE proper management of seed production is an important element in the advance of agriculture. Seed production is neglected in our country, although it would seem that in large-scale organised farming it should not be so difficult to cope with this task. That it has not been accomplished is due only to underestimation of the matter by agriculturists.

It is high time to realise that without the proper organisation of seed production crop yields cannot be raised to the necessary level. This question must be solved. It can be solved quickly by concentrating seed production mainly in the best state farms and by improving the work of the district seed farms. Each state farm and district seed farm should be assigned a definite zone in which it must be responsible for seed production and the supply of seed to the surrounding collective farms.

Special mention should be made of the production of hybrid maize seed. In this matter our agriculture lags behind a number of other countries; it lags behind not because our agriculturists have not realised the significance of hybridisation. Our scientists and advanced farms have been producing hybrid seed for a long time and we have remarkable specimens of our own hybrids. The agricultural organisations, however, have not put this work on a proper footing and as a result we have to buy hybrid maize seed in the United States. Since the war the Americans have gone over almost exclusively

to hybrid maize seed. This has raised the maize yield in the United States from 1.5 to 2.5-2.7 tons of grain per hectare. There are special seed-producing companies in the United States. They produce hybrid seed for definite zones: grow the maize, harvest it, dry it, sort the seed according to size and shape, bag it and sell it to farmers. This is a good method and we should make use of it.

The task is to improve plant-breeding, to organise the production of hybrid maize seed on a large scale, to set up factories for the treatment and packing of seed, to allot the equipment and personnel for this work—in a word, to solve the problem of producing hybrid maize seed.

#### 6. Construction on the Collective Farms

**C**OMRADES, it is urgently necessary to draw the attention of party and government organisations to problems of construction in the countryside. We all know that the heritage remaining in the village from centuries of economic and cultural backwardness and the aftermath of the destruction wrought by the recent war are still making themselves felt strongly. Much remains to be done to improve substantially the housing and living conditions of the collective farmers, a considerable number of whom still live in homes lacking many conveniences. Neither can we tolerate such a heritage of the past as the lack of roads in the vast expanses of many rural districts. It goes without saying that the needs of developing production must always be in the foreground. At the same time the expansion of production and the improvement in the socially owned economy of the collective farms create favourable conditions for increasing the construction of homes and cultural institutions. We have today thousands of collective farms who have made big strides economically and get high incomes. Such collective farms are in a position not only to step up the construction, above all, of socially owned collective-farm buildings, kindergartens, maternity homes, recreation clubs, baths, houses for aged collective farmers, and bakeries, but also to render substantial assistance to their members in building houses and improving their living conditions.

Homes should be built with the funds of the collective farmers themselves. Tens and hundreds of thousands of collective-farm families get incomes which now enable them to have convenient, attractive houses, but the collective farmer cannot always cope with the job of building his own home, and especially with the purchase of building materials. Consequently, it is necessary to help the collective farms organise the production of building materials on the spot.

Also, officials of district organisations should organise the production of building materials on a higher technical level. Then the materials will be better and cheaper, and, what is most important, there will be more of them. Our potentialities must be utilised and prefabricated houses should be built in accordance with standard projects.

The question arises: how is the building of homes to be paid for? Here different variants are possible. First, collective farmers wishing to build or to buy a house can allot a certain part of the money they receive on their work-day units for this purpose. A special fund can be formed from these allocations. It should be kept in the bank without anyone having the right to

use it for any purposes other than house-building. This is one way. Another way is for collective farms which have met their social needs by erecting the necessary farm buildings and cultural and service establishments to earmark a definite sum from their income for housing construction. It goes without saying that this must be done with the consent of the collective farmers, with the approval of a general membership meeting. This money would be used by the collective farm to build houses for its members. The collective farmers would have to pay back to the collective farm the full cost of the house over approximately five or ten years, depending on actual circumstances. Lastly, there can also be a third form of house-building—on mixed funds. On the one hand, the collective farm allots money which is to be issued as building loans to members, and on the other the collective farmer adds to this loan a definite sum from his own resources. It is understood that the houses may and should differ as regards cost, size and layout.

How is construction to be organised? We should recommend the collective farms to set up skilled building teams and provide them with the necessary equipment and tools in order to make the work of the collective-farm builders more productive. Wherever possible there ought to be district collective farm-building organisations, to which the collective farms would assign a definite number of builders of different trades. This would make it possible to mechanise construction on a wider scale, to put up homes and other buildings more rapidly and with smaller outlays. Naturally, such construction organisations should be maintained on collective-farm funds. They would be co-operative collective-farm organisations and their owners the collective farms. The state, as represented by the Executive Committee of the District Soviet, should merely help the collective farms to guide these organisations.

Let me say a few words about the production of bricks and tiles. This problem should be solved by collective farmers themselves. Where it is expedient, where the collective farmers themselves can cope with this matter, the production of bricks and tiles can be organised directly on the collective farms. In some cases it will be expedient to set up collective-farm and inter-collective-farm brick or tile works.

It is the duty of the Ministry of Agriculture, the Councils of Ministers of the Union and Autonomous Republics, and of the Executive Committees of the Regional and District Soviets to help the collective farms organise building work, to plan village improvements properly, and to draw up standard designs for homes and other buildings. Assistance is especially needed in the production of plumbing, fixtures and hardware, and in the making of door and window frames. The building of houses for collective farmers is an urgent necessity because it is inseparably bound up with the further progress of our agriculture, with the improvement of the material and cultural standards of millions of collective farmers.

## 7. For Better Guidance of Agriculture

COMRADES, now that the material and organisational prerequisites have been provided for a steep advance in agriculture everything depends on proper guidance, on the ability of party, government, and agricultural bodies to ensure the implementation of the decisions adopted by the party, by persevering organisational work.

Every zone of the Soviet Union in the same climatic and soil conditions has advanced, average and backward collective farms. This means that it all depends on the leadership of the farms, above all on the selection of the chairmen of the collective farms, heads of teams, agronomists and livestock experts, managers of machine and tractor stations and state farms, and other personnel, whose task it is to organise agricultural production. Hence the selection of personnel and improved guidance are now decisive for the continued advance of socialist agriculture.

A radical improvement in the work of agricultural bodies, both in the centre and the localities, is imperative for the successful development of our agriculture. Our government apparatus must be rooted in production and subordinate its work to the interests of production. Do the organisational structure and practical activities of the Ministries of Agriculture, State Farms, and Agricultural Stocks meet these requirements? No, they do not. Their structure is still cumbersome and bureaucratic. We do not need a central apparatus which substitutes itself for the local bodies.

Under the present conditions, what should be the functions left with the agricultural ministries? Long-term planning, finance and supply, and state control over the fulfilment of government assignments. To study and popularise the best experience, to introduce the latest achievements of science in production is a major task for the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of State Farms. To discharge these functions the ministries need a small but highly skilled apparatus. The task is therefore to pare and simplify this apparatus as much as possible and to bring it into line with the changed situation.

And what is the situation as regards the procurement apparatus? For each collective farm we have several representatives in charge of the procurement of different products. Are they needed? No, they are not. In our socialist state everything is determined by plans, which the collective and state farms carry out on time without waiting to be reminded by procurement agents. Therefore, the functions of the Ministry of Agricultural Stocks ought to be limited to building grain elevators, developing the flour-milling and cereals industry, receiving and storing grain and other produce. The day-to-day control of procurements should be entrusted to the machine and tractor stations and hundreds of thousands of procurement agents should be utilised in production.

Our socialist state has now every possibility of providing all sections of agriculture with highly skilled personnel. Last year over 400,000 specialists with higher or secondary education were working in agriculture. In planning personnel training we must proceed from the premise that in the near future field and tractor teams should be headed by agronomists and mechanics, and livestock sections by livestock experts.

To seriously improve agricultural management we should call the attention of our personnel to problems of economics, to cutting the expenditure of labour in production. Learn to count—Lenin told executives in the first years of Soviet power. If it was important when our state was born, it is a hundred times more important today, when we are accomplishing the task of catching up and surpassing the principal capitalist countries in *per capita* production.

Available data show that in our country considerably more labour is spent to produce a ton of milk or meat than in the United States. The result is that more of the population are engaged in agriculture in the U.S.S.R. than in the United States. We, of course, cannot blindly follow the American example. In America one man makes a profit by ruining another. Suffice it to recall that from 1940 to 1954, that is, in fourteen years, nearly 1,300,000 farmers in the United States were ruined, lost their land and, together with their families, flocked to the towns in search of work in industry, or became "migrant farmers" who roam from state to state in search of shelter and a livelihood. In the last four years alone the number of farms in the United States dropped by 600,000 according to agricultural census returns. The big farmer, an owner of a capitalist enterprise, looks upon labour power as a source of profit. If the worker loses his health, if he is unable to produce maximum profit, the capitalist throws him out.

Things are different in our country. A collective farm is a co-operative enterprise. All the collective farmers are its owners; they are full-fledged members, they distribute the work among themselves. And this is fully understandable. In our socialist society everything is designed to satisfy the growing requirements of man. The collective farmers do not cast out one of their number who is unable to work at full capacity. Therefore, even when labour outlay per unit of product in our country is lower than in the United States—and we will achieve this—it is possible that the agricultural population in the U.S.S.R. will be somewhat larger than in the United States. Nevertheless, it must be said that we do not as yet employ labour productively enough. So we must assess our work critically and utilise everything that is useful in foreign experience.

The implementation of the agricultural measures outlined by the party has created all the prerequisites for increasing agricultural production to a level satisfying the country's growing requirements within the shortest possible time. We may be sure that the Soviet people, headed by the Communist Party, will discharge this vitally important task with honour.

## THE RISE IN THE MATERIAL AND CULTURAL STANDARDS OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE

COMRADES, the Soviet people's standard of living has risen steadily on the basis of the progress in industry and agriculture. During the Fifth Five-Year Plan, the U.S.S.R.'s national income—three-quarters of which, as you know, goes to satisfy the personal requirements of the population—increased by 68 per cent. The real wages of factory, office and other workers increased by 39 per cent, and the real incomes of collective farmers by 50 per cent. The state spent 689,000 million roubles on social insurance benefits, paid holidays for factory, office and other workers, accommodation in holiday homes and health centres provided free of charge or at reduced rates, pensions, medical service, grants for students and so forth.

Popular consumption has increased from year to year in step with the development of the socialist economy. The state and co-operative trade networks sold 90 per cent more goods to the population in 1955 than they did in 1950.

Here are some figures showing how the sale of goods to the population through the state and co-operative trade systems has increased (1950=100):

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
Meat and meat products	100	120	124	171	206	220
Fish and fish products	100	112	128	137	162	185
Butter	100	107	110	150	160	158
Vegetable oils	100	135	170	182	222	222
Wearing apparel	100	107	115	151	182	198
Footwear	100	108	118	150	163	168
Furniture	100	142	154	201	272	307

Sales of sugar, silks and cottons, clocks and watches, sewing machines and other commodities have also grown considerably.

There has been a sharp increase in the sale of radio and television sets, musical instruments, bicycles and other articles that go to meet cultural requirements and household needs. The Soviet people are eating and dressing better and are satisfying their cultural requirements more fully.

This improvement in the people's material wellbeing accounts for the fact that the population of our country increased by 16,300,000 during the Fifth Five-Year Plan.

### 1. The Fuller Satisfaction of the People's Growing Material Requirements

THESE are substantial achievements. But we must base ourselves not only on a comparison with past years, but mainly on the steadily growing material and cultural needs of the people. When we approach the matter from this point of view, it must be said that we do not yet have an adequate quantity of consumer goods, that there is a shortage of housing, and that many important problems connected with raising the people's living standards have not yet been solved.

The fact that our country was economically backward before the October Revolution, when its industries were underdeveloped and its agriculture primitive, must, of course, be taken into account. In the thirty-eight years since its establishment the Soviet State had to go through two wars which caused incalculable damage to the national economy and cost millions of lives.

That is why, notwithstanding the considerable rise in the living standard of our people, the Communist Party and the Soviet government have a lot to do to raise it to a level corresponding to the potentialities of the socialist system and the Soviet people's constantly growing requirements.

In the past few years the central committee has adopted a number of measures to raise the people's living standard still higher. Nevertheless, production of many important foodstuffs and manufactures still lags behind the growing demand. Some towns and communities are still insufficiently supplied with such items as meat, milk, butter and fruit; there are even cases where supplies of potatoes and other vegetables are irregular. There are also difficulties in supplying the population with certain high-grade manufactured goods. Inefficient work by our trade organisations is partly to blame for this, but the main reason is in-

sufficient production. The task is to achieve a sharp rise in agriculture and more rapid expansion of the light and food industries, on the basis of the priority development of heavy industry.

Comrades, the Draft Directives for the Sixth Five-Year Plan set the task of raising the real wages of factory, office and other workers by about 30 per cent and the collective farmers' incomes by not less than 40 per cent.

A number of measures which the central committee of the party has recently outlined will contribute to the fulfilment of the tasks of further improving the material standards of the people.

Instructions to draft a decision raising the wages of low-paid categories of workers were issued not long ago by the central committee of the party and the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. This wage increase is to be carried out side by side with general measures to introduce order into the system of wages and salaries of factory, office and other workers in various branches of the economy. A correct ratio should be ensured between the wage level of different categories of workers, depending on their qualifications and the burden of their work.

It must be pointed out that there is a great deal of disorder and confusion in the system of wages and rate-fixing. Ministries and other bodies and the trade unions have not taken up these matters in the way they should; they have neglected them. Cases of wage levelling are not uncommon. On the other hand, payment for the same type of work sometimes differs between various bodies, and even within a single body. Alongside the low-paid workers there exists a category of workers—a small one, it is true—in whose wages unjustified excesses are tolerated.

We are faced by the important political and economic task of introducing proper order into the payment of labour. We must consistently apply the principles of giving workers a personal material incentive, bearing in mind that the realisation of this principle is a prime condition for the uninterrupted growth of production. Lenin taught us that "every major branch of the national economy should be based on personal incentive" (*Works*, Russian Edition, Vol. 33, p. 47).

We must work persistently to improve and perfect the wage system in all branches of the economy, make wages directly dependent on the quality and quantity of the work done by each worker, and fully utilise the powerful lever of material incentive in order to raise labour productivity. Part of the salaries of engineers, technicians, and managerial personnel should also depend strictly on the basic work indices of the particular shop, establishment, industry, collective farm, machine and tractor station or state farm. This will be in line with the socialist principle of payment according to the work performed. The correct solution of this problem will help to bring about a further rise in production and in the wellbeing of our people.

Comrades, the central committee of the party considers that the conditions now exist in which we can return to that question of primary importance, reduction of the working day.

Under capitalism many generations of the working class fought for a reduction of the working day. The slogan of an eight-hour day was proclaimed by Karl Marx, the founder of scientific communism and the

great teacher of the working class, as far back as the 1866 congress of the First International. The eight-hour day was one of the demands in the programme of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks). The Great October Socialist Revolution put this programme demand into practice: one of the Soviet government's first decrees established an eight-hour day in our country. This is a solid and unshakable conquest of the socialist revolution.

Furthermore, at its 8th Congress, our party proclaimed the need to go over gradually to a shorter working day as social production grew and labour productivity increased. As you know, the first steps in this direction were taken in the prewar years. The growing war danger and then Hitler Germany's treacherous attack on our country forced us temporarily to hold back from further steps, however. Now we have real requisites for returning to this question and doing what could not be done before.

The central committee reports to this Congress that it has adopted a decision to go over, during the Sixth Five-Year Plan, to a seven-hour day for all factory, office and other workers, and a six-hour day for workers of the leading trades in the coal and ore-mining industries employed underground; also to re-establish the six-hour day for young people between the ages of sixteen and eighteen. It has also decided soon to establish a six-hour day for factory, office and other workers on Saturdays and the eve of holidays.

Beginning with 1957, the party and the government will gradually transfer one branch of the national economy after another to a seven-hour day, or, where it is desirable in the light of conditions of production, to a five-day working week (with an eight-hour day and two free days), with the aim of completing all this work by the end of the Sixth Five-Year Plan.

The switch to a shorter working day will not be accompanied by any reduction in the wages of factory, office or other workers.

The central committee's decision to reduce the working day has great national economic and political significance. There is no doubt that the 20th Party Congress and the entire Soviet people will unanimously welcome this decision.

These measures will call forth a new rise in the Soviet people's efforts to fulfil and exceed the national economic plans.

It should be brought to the particular attention of heads of enterprises and of party and trade union bodies that they will have to do considerable organisational work to ensure the successful fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan targets under the shorter working day.

Another urgent need, besides introducing order into the wage system and reducing the working day, is that of improving the pension system. The pension system in the U.S.S.R. is financed by the state and public funds, which are growing from year to year. This is a great achievement. But there are serious shortcomings in the pension system. For one thing, there are impermissible disparities in the size of pensions. Low pensions have been established for a number of categories of pensioners, while some citizens, including people who are able to work and are not yet old, receive high pensions.



True, there are not a few comrades who, though they have earned pensions, do not wish to give up their active efforts in our party's cause. As an example I could cite Comrade Orlovsky, a Communist, who is now working as chairman of the Rassvet collective farm in the Byelorussian Republic.

Comrade Orlovsky served in the forces many years. During the war he fought the enemy courageously. He was awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union for valour and courage. He lost an arm in the war and retired with the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel. He was deservedly given a pension on which he could get along quite well. But as a Communist he did not reconcile himself to the position of a pensioner; he went to his regional party committee and asked for an assignment in the front line, as chairman of a collective farm. He was recommended for election as chairman of the Rassvet collective farm. Comrade Orlovsky threw himself into the work, and under his management the collective farm has moved up from among the laggards to a place among the leaders. Today this collective farm is famous throughout the Soviet Union. There's a real Communist patriot for you!

The central committee of the party and the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers are taking steps to introduce order into the pension system, with a view to increasing considerably the lower categories of pensions, and somewhat reducing the size of the unjustifiably high ones. A Bill providing for a unified pension system for the U.S.S.R. making a fundamental improvement in this matter will soon be submitted to the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet for its approval.

Greater concern has to be shown for the welfare of aged citizens who are all alone or for some reason cannot live with their families; we must build homes where people who have worked conscientiously all their lives may have a really calm and secure old age. Good sections of land in picturesque spots could be used for the construction of such homes. We should also provide for an expansion in the network of homes for invalids, and at the same time do everything to improve vocational opportunities for invalids who can do socially useful work without detriment to their health.

The central committee of the Communist Party expresses the profound conviction that the Soviet people—a nation of builders—will respond to these measures of the party and the government with a powerful new increase in activity in all branches of the social economy, for only on the basis of a continuous growth in production and increase in labour productivity can the social wealth be multiplied, the working day reduced, and the people's wellbeing steadily improved.

All these measures will require considerable funds, of course. Where will they come from? First of all, we shall have to use part of the funds accumulating in the national economy as a result of increasing labour productivity, strict economy, elimination of excesses, and further pruning of the administrative and managerial apparatus. It may also be desirable to use for this purpose some of the funds allocated earlier to cover government expenditure in connection with retail price cuts. During the next few years, therefore, price cuts should be smaller than

before, so that part of the funds earmarked for them can be diverted to carrying out these measures.

The party regards as one of its important tasks a fundamental improvement in the people's housing conditions. You know, comrades, what tremendous damage was done to our country by the war. The government had to spend huge sums to restore the housing that was destroyed. Housing appropriations are increasing from year to year. In the last five-year period, for instance, government capital investment in housing construction totalled about 100,000 million roubles, or 120 per cent more than under the Fourth Five-Year Plan.

A lot has been done, yet the speed of house building seriously lags behind the development of our national economy and the growth of towns and industrial centres. In addition, many ministries and other bodies regularly fail to carry out their housing programmes. We cannot tolerate such a disgraceful state of affairs any longer.

The volume of urban housing construction under the Sixth Five-Year Plan is to be nearly double that of the Fifth Five-Year Plan. Dwellings with a total floor space of about 205 million square metres\* are to be built with government funds allocated under the plan. In 1956 alone the government will build about 29 million square metres†. The rates of housing construction will increase from year to year.

You know that the central committee of the party and the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. have condemned primitive methods and excesses in house building. We cannot permit millions of roubles to be spent on senseless decoration in order to pander to the poor taste of some architects. It is a matter of honour for our architects to create a socialist architectural style, which should embody the best features accumulated by man's architectural thought in the past, and at the same time carry on the spirit of the most progressive examples of Soviet architecture. The buildings we erect should have the maximum convenience; they should be durable, economical and attractive.

We must greatly improve the organisation of house building by putting it on an industrial footing. The experiment of concentrating and amalgamating building organisations, first in Moscow and then in Leningrad and Kiev, has yielded very good results. It should be boldly and resolutely extended to other republics and towns, and to various branches of the economy.

Improvement of housing conditions in such big cities as Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev is closely connected with the growth of population, because of people arriving from other parts of the country. How great this increase is can be seen from the example of Moscow, whose population grew by nearly 300,000 due to arrivals alone during the Fifth Five-Year Plan. In that time 4,305,000 square metres\* of housing was built in Moscow. The result is that, although house building is going ahead on a large scale, the need for housing has hardly dropped.

Since the natural increase in our urban population is quite large, we can stop drawing in labour to the cities from other places and meet any

\* 205 million square metres=2,206½ million square feet. 29 million square metres=312,146,000 square feet. These roughly approximate to 5 million and 700,000 two living-room flats respectively. Note.—Soviet floorspace figures omit space devoted to halls, passageways, kitchens, bathrooms, sculleries etc.—Ed.

† 4,682,000 square feet.—Ed.

labour needs that may arise by employing members of the city population themselves. This does not present any difficulty, because new industrial construction is not being carried out in the major cities, while in the existing enterprises the technical level is rapidly advancing, the technology of production is being perfected, and productivity steadily rising. If we can stop the influx into the major cities from other districts we shall create conditions for satisfying urban housing needs more quickly.

Another thing that should be done is to spread out the population of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Kharkov and other major cities by building small modern towns around them. This could be done with the funds allocated for housing construction in these cities. In other words, good modern dwellings should be built not within the limits of the major cities themselves but a short distance away; housing conditions that will attract people to move to these small towns should be provided. Some industrial establishments should be transferred to these towns to furnish employment for residents.

Private house building should be developed on a larger scale side by side with government construction; more extensive assistance should be given to factory, office and other workers in building their own homes with their personal savings; the manufacture and sale to the public of building materials and sets of parts for standard houses should be expanded.

Not enough attention is being paid to the daily needs of the population. To improve the life of the Soviet family we must manufacture more labour-saving household machines and articles—electric appliances, washing machines, sewing machines, improved kitchen equipment, in addition they must be made cheaper. We must open more public service establishments, laundries, tailoring establishments, and clothing and boot and shoe repair shops.

Public catering plays an important part in improving the everyday life of the people. A smoothly functioning system of public catering will free millions of women from many household chores and enable them to take part in socially useful work and pay more attention to bringing up their children, which is particularly important for us. We must therefore greatly expand the network of public catering establishments.

While doing this we must pay serious attention to improving the service in dining rooms, restaurants and snack bars; we must cut overheads, improve the quality of the dishes and lower their price; dining rooms and restaurants should produce more semi-prepared dishes of all kinds for sale to the population; fuller use should be made of local resources and auxiliary farms developed. We must go over more energetically to the cafeteria, or self-service system; we must introduce more automatic servicing devices. In a word, we must put public catering on such a footing that the mass of the people will find it more advantageous to patronise dining rooms and snack bars than to buy food and cook meals at home.

Well-organised public catering in the schools is very important for the health of the rising generation and for improving the standard of studies. We must arrange hot lunches for school children and set up a network of

snack bars and dining rooms in the schools. In the near future we must settle the question of introducing lunches free of charge or at a discount for the children of parents in the lower wage brackets.

Further improvement of the public health services is an important task. Our achievements in this field are universally known, but here, too, there are serious shortcomings, particularly in the rural areas. In the next few years we must set up many more medical establishments and improve their work.

There is not a single aspect of improving the people's wellbeing in which a great deal of urgent work does not lie before us. The exceptional importance of this work does not have to be demonstrated, for it is the people's vital interests that are in question. And concern for the welfare of the people always has held and will hold the centre of attention in the work of our party and the Soviet government.

## 2. Towards a New Flowering of Soviet Culture and Science

COMRADES, the Soviet people are reaping the fruits of the great cultural revolution carried out in our country. Not a single capitalist country has as many schools, specialised secondary schools, higher educational institutions, research institutes, experimental stations and laboratories, theatres, clubs, libraries and other cultural and educational establishments as the Soviet Union.

The state of public education is a clear index of our cultural progress. The U.S.S.R. has introduced universal seven-year education both in the towns and the countryside; ten-year education has in the main been introduced in the major cities.

The Draft Directives for the Sixth Five-Year Plan provide for the introduction of universal secondary education in all towns and rural localities, in the main, within the next five years. This is a very important task whose realisation requires a substantial improvement in the educational and material facilities of the general schools.

Small tuition fees are still charged in the upper forms of secondary schools, in specialised secondary schools and in the colleges and universities. A decision has been taken to abolish fees beginning with the new school year, with the aim of creating more favourable conditions for introducing universal secondary education and giving young people greater opportunities for higher education.

A big shortcoming of our school system is that the instruction is divorced from life to some extent; those who finish school are insufficiently prepared for practical work. Although the Directives of the 19th Party Congress for the Fifth Five-Year Plan called for measures to introduce polytechnical instruction in the schools, this matter is moving ahead very slowly. Many educationists and the Academy of Educational Sciences are still busy with general talk about the value of polytechnical instruction instead of doing something to put it into practice. They must be quicker about going over from words to deeds. To strengthen their ties with life the schools must not only introduce new subjects which teach the pupils the fundamentals of technology and production, but also systematically accustom them to working in

factories, collective and state farms, experimental plots and school workshops. The secondary school curriculum should be revised to include greater production specialisation, so that boys and girls who finish ten-year school have a good general education opening the road to a higher education, and at the same time are prepared for practical activity, since no small number of those leaving school will at once start to work in various branches of the national economy.

During the Sixth Five-Year Plan our country will make a big new step in building up a powerful material and production basis for communist society. But we must also solve the problem of creating the spiritual requisites for completing this historic transition from the lower stage of communism to the higher stage. In this connection I should like to dwell on a question of tremendous social significance relating to the education of our younger generation.

The war left us with a large number of widows on whose shoulders has fallen the difficult task of bringing up children. There are also many families in which both parents work in a factory or office and are able to give only haphazard attention to bringing up their children. In these circumstances, many children are left in the care of relatives or neighbours, and sometimes without supervision at all. A considerable number of children are thus left to themselves, and this not infrequently has serious consequences. Of course, the family and the school were and remain the most important centres of socialist education of the children. But we cannot restrict ourselves to this.

If we look back at the not so distant past we will see that in addition to the general schools the ruling classes had their own system of educating the growing generation, a system which corresponded to the existing régime and to the spirit of the time. The state set up special children's establishments in which the growing generation was trained in conformity with the interests of the propertied classes. These were the Corps of Pages, the cadet corps, schools for young women of noble birth, and the like. In these exclusive establishments the children went through a school of aristocratic upbringing.

A socialist country can and must make child education incomparably better and more perfect, for we must form not an aristocratic caste deeply inimical to the people, but builders of a new society, men and women of noble spirit and high ideals, who will selflessly serve their people, which is marching in the vanguard of progressive mankind.

How should we approach a practical solution of this task? It is evidently desirable to start building boarding schools (some thought should be given to the name) in picturesque suburban localities, in healthy wooded tracts. These schools should have bright, spacious classrooms, good bedrooms, up-to-date dining halls, well-equipped centres for all kinds of extra-curricular activity, creating all the facilities for the all-round physical and mental development of a young citizen of the Soviet land. Children should be enrolled in these boarding schools only at the request of their parents. They will live at the schools, and their parents will visit them on holidays, during vacations or after school hours. Good teachers equal to the high calling of engineers of the souls of the growing generation should be selected for the schools.

The system of fees in these schools should be graded, at least at the beginning. Children whose parents do not earn much or who are burdened by large families should be fully maintained by the state. Parents with higher earnings should pay part of the cost of the education of their children. Finally, some parents could fully cover the outlay made by the state on the education of their children in the boarding schools.

It is difficult to overestimate the immense importance of this system of education. Funds and efforts should not be stinted in this work, for they will be repaid a hundredfold.

We must also get down to solving another big educational problem, that of providing state nursery and kindergarten accommodation for all children of nursery and pre-school age whose parents want it. It will take quite some time to solve this problem completely, and we must make a large-scale beginning in the present five-year period. In the rural areas, collective farms as well as government agencies should take part in building and maintaining nurseries and kindergartens. Concern for children and their education is a matter of the people as a whole. Our Soviet society will continue to pay exceptional attention to the communist education of the rising generation.

A vast amount of work has been done in our country to train specialists for all branches of the national economy. During the Fifth Five-Year Plan more than 1,120,000 specialists, or 72 per cent more than during the Fourth Five-Year Plan, graduated from our colleges and universities. There was a particular expansion of evening and correspondence colleges: during the Fifth Five-Year Plan upwards of 260,000 specialists graduated from them, an increase of 170 per cent over the previous five-year period. The training of specialists with intermediate qualifications has been improved.

While we can be fully satisfied with the quantitative aspect of the matter, serious attention must be paid to the quality of the training of specialists. A big shortcoming is that the higher educational establishments are divorced from practical work, from production, and lag behind the present-day level of technology. They do not, as yet, give the young engineers and agronomists sufficient knowledge of the concrete economics and organisation of production. The practical training of students has to be fundamentally improved.

We are faced with the task of reorganising the work of educational establishments in such a way that, while going through the course of studies, the students are in touch with reality, with production, with factories, collective and state farms, and get production experience there.

Here mention should be made of the incorrect geographical distribution of higher educational establishments, which are chiefly concentrated in the major cities—Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Tbilisi, Kharkov, Baku, Tashkent, Minsk and others. We can see a trend not to distribute the schools throughout the country, but, on the contrary, to concentrate them to an even greater extent in these same cities. Such a state of affairs cannot be considered as normal. The time has come to revise the geographical distribution of higher educational institutions and put

them in the centres of production, in the localities having the greatest need of specialists.

A particularly intolerable situation has arisen in the geographical distribution of agricultural colleges, most of which are concentrated in big cities. It would be a good thing if the Ministries of Agriculture and State Farms and the Ministry of Higher Education were to work out a proper distribution of agricultural colleges in the country. An agricultural college should obviously have farms of 2,000 or 3,000 hectares,\* with good livestock sections. These farms should be operated in the main by the students so that their general education and theoretical grounding are combined with good practical training, giving them the knowledge and experience necessary for proper management of agriculture.

In setting up new agricultural colleges based on state farms, for example, the teaching staff should be provided with good facilities for fruitful work. The problem of better distribution of the agricultural colleges must be tackled right away.

We must give similar thought to the distribution of medical colleges and also teachers' training colleges, with a view to improving the training of medical and teaching personnel in the republics, territories and regions.

Many more correspondence and evening colleges must be set up and their work improved. We must provide factory, office and other workers and collective farmers with the best possible opportunities for studying in their spare time, since this is a reliable and time-tested method of training qualified engineering and technical personnel having a good knowledge of production. Now, when many thousands of young men and women who finish secondary school will go into industry and agriculture every year, tremendous opportunities open up for the expansion of higher education by correspondence.

Strange as it seems, the training of specialists for various branches of the national economy is still often determined not by the prospects of the development of those branches but to a considerable degree by unsubstantiated and, frequently, fluctuating requests submitted by ministries and other bodies. This leads to a shortage of specialists in some branches of economy and culture and a surplus in others. A big defect is that the training of specialists for industry and agriculture does not take into account the country's specific zonal features, does not take into account where, in which districts, at which factories, the specialists will work. We must vigorously put an end to these shortcomings.

Comrades, not a single social system is as concerned to promote science, or provides such conditions for its development as does the Soviet socialist system. Our scientists, who enjoy the constant and effective support of the Communist Party and the Soviet government, have achieved outstanding results in a number of sciences, including physics, geology, mathematics, mechanics, astronomy and zoology, and in certain branches of agricultural science.

Soviet scientists have, within a short time, splendidly solved the prob-

\* 5,000 or 7,500 acres—Ed.

lem of obtaining atomic energy. They are enriching our country's power resources, working successfully to develop the national economy and consolidate the security of our country. Such outstanding products of technological thought as electronic computing machines and other instruments and mechanisms have been created as a result of their efforts. They are successfully working on a number of other complex problems of science and technique. Allow me to express from the platform of this Congress the people's deep gratitude to our scientists for their fruitful work.

Soviet science has great and indisputable achievements. Yet we cannot close our eyes to the fact that there are major shortcomings in the work of many of our scientific institutions, that certain branches of Soviet science are definitely lagging behind the growing requirements of the national economy, and in some fields lagging behind scientific achievements in other countries.

One of the reasons for these shortcomings is that many scientific institutions have weak contacts with practical work, with production. Some scientific institutions are working on problems which lack big practical significance, and are not generalising the advanced experience of our development. The geographical distribution of scientific institutions and experimental stations does not take economic and natural conditions into account. Many research institutes and higher educational establishments are situated far from their subjects. For one thing, Moscow is the seat of three oceanographic and marine research institutions—the Marine Hydro-Physical Institute, the Institute of Oceanology of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, and the Institute of Oceanography of the Hydro-Meteorological Service—and two mining institutes—one under the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences and the other under the Ministry of the Coal Industry. Isn't that a bit too much for the Moscow Sea and the Vorobyov Hills? We must rectify this situation and bring research institutes and colleges closer to their subjects.

Lack of contact and co-ordination in the work of research institutions of the Academy of Sciences, industrial research institutes and higher educational establishments is absolutely intolerable. It hinders the concentration of scientific forces to solve the most important scientific and technical problems, gives rise to harmful parallelism, leads to wasteful outlays, and hampers the application of scientific and technical achievements in the national economy.

We must pay constant attention to developing socialist culture, persistently advance Soviet science, and increase the part which it is playing in the solution of the practical tasks of building communism.

## THE FURTHER CONSOLIDATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOVIET SOCIAL AND STATE SYSTEM

COMRADES, one of the most important results of the work done by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union between the 19th and 20th Party Congresses is the further strengthening of the moral and political unity of our people. This unity and the whole-hearted support given by all the peoples of the Soviet Union to the foreign and domestic

policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet government are patent in all the glorious deeds of our people.

The foundation of the moral and political unity of the whole of Soviet society—a foundation as firm as granite—is the indestructible alliance of the working class and the peasantry, forged by the party. The important measures which the party has carried out in industry and agriculture contribute to the further improvement of the well-being of the working people in town and country, to greater co-operation between the working class and the collective farm peasantry in production, and to the development of the creative activity of the masses of the people.

### 1. Some Questions of our National Policy

THE Communist Party is working tirelessly to strengthen and develop the fraternal friendship between all the peoples of the Soviet Union, for this friendship is the sure foundation of the might of the Soviet state system.

In its national policy, the party proceeded and continues to proceed from the teaching of great Lenin that “only the greatest attention to the interests of the different nations will remove the ground for conflicts and eliminate mutual distrust . . .” [*Works*, Russian Edition, Vol. 33, p. 349]. Our party has succeeded in doing away with the mutual distrust which existed among the peoples of tsarist Russia, in uniting all peoples of the Soviet Union by ties of brotherly friendship, precisely because it has always given profound attention to the interests of these peoples, to their specific national characteristics and aspirations, it has coupled this with educating the working people of all nationalities in the spirit of the socialist community and with concern for the interests of the country as a whole. As a result, the formerly oppressed and backward nations of old Russia have made immense progress in their development and have taken an equal place in the friendly family of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Here are some figures showing the development of the national economies of the fraternal union republics. Compared with 1913, gross output of all industry in the Kazakh S.S.R. had by 1955 increased thirty-three times over, in the Georgian S.S.R. twenty-seven times over, in the Kirghiz S.S.R. thirty-seven times over, in the Armenian S.S.R. forty-one times over, in the Tajik S.S.R. twenty-four times over, and so on.

Our republics have also made vast progress in developing their national cultures. The growth in the number of the national *intelligentsia* may serve as an example. A comparison with the prewar period shows the number of specialists with a higher education to have increased 380 per cent in Kazakhstan, 480 per cent in Kirghizia, 340 per cent in Tajikistan and Moldavia, 330 per cent in Turkmenia, almost three times over in Estonia, and so on. During the same period the number of scientific workers has increased 1.5 times over in the Ukraine, more than twofold in the Latvian S.S.R. and the Azerbaijan S.S.R., more than two and a half times over in Kazakhstan, nearly three times over in the Estonian S.S.R., and more than three times over in the Lithuanian S.S.R. and the Karelo-Finnish S.S.R.

The rapid economic and cultural progress of the union republics has placed on the agenda certain problems of improving the guidance of the national economy and cultural development.

Before, when there were few specialists in the localities, when the leading personnel in a number of the republics had not attained a high level—and there were not so many industrial enterprises—practically all enterprises were managed through union ministries. Today the situation is different: along with the development of industry in all union republics, people have developed, national cadres have been forged, and the general level of culture of all the peoples of the U.S.S.R. has risen sharply. Under the new conditions the old methods of running the economy require considerable revision. While leaving to the union ministries the powers of general direction, the determination of assignments to be included in the plans, control over their execution, the supply of equipment, and the financing of capital investment, the powers of the republican ministries should at the same time be considerably broadened.

Of late, the central committee of the party has adopted a series of measures in that direction. Among these measures are, in particular, the establishment of republican ministries, for instance, of the iron and steel and coal industries in the Ukraine, the oil industry in Azerbaijan, and the non-ferrous metals industry in Kazakhstan, and the turning over to these ministries of all enterprises of the given industry within the republics concerned. These measures have resulted in a larger share for republican industry. In the Ukraine it today makes up 67 per cent of the total industrial output, in Kazakhstan 62 per cent, and in Azerbaijan 80 per cent.

This has certainly proved correct: the direction of enterprises has become more concrete, more operative, and there is a noticeable increase in the initiative shown by the republican organisations and in their responsibility for the work of industry. Work should be continued in that direction and it will make for a still greater unfolding of creative initiative in the localities, for the strengthening of the union republics and the further consolidation of the friendship of the peoples of our country.

Certain other practical questions connected with the development of the economy of the union republics also require careful study. Let us take, for instance, the following question. We sometimes hear critical remarks that in a certain republic the incomes of collective farms and collective farmers are immeasurably higher than in the neighbouring republics.

Of course, we cannot get along without encouraging production of the agricultural crops whose development has to be pushed. However, such encouragement must be applied with the knowledge and approval of all union republics, and in the common interest. To this end it is necessary to make a deeper study of the economy of each republic. That should be done by an inter-nation, inter-republic agency which is able to compare the situation in the different republics and prepare well-founded decisions.

Such an agency could be, for instance, an Economic Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet. This commission, made up of competent representatives of all republics and of prominent economists—people who know the economy of the republics—would study the expenditure of labour in the production of particular agricultural crops and, on the basis of that study, prepare recommendations for procurement

and purchase prices of agricultural produce. The commission's recommendations would then be discussed in the union republics and when approved there, would be submitted to the proper legislative and executive bodies. Everybody then would understand that where incentive measures are adopted with regard to a particular crop, they are called for by economic necessity and the interests of all the peoples of our country.

Or let us take the distribution of the budgetary funds among the union republics. By and large, the funds are distributed correctly, although we should think seriously of enhancing the role and authority of the republics in this matter, too. Some comrades have complained that there is as yet no proper system in deciding on the allocations for public education, health services, housing construction and the building of cultural and service establishments, city improvements etc. As a result, we sometimes have a wholly inexplicable gap between the appropriations for some of the republics.

Can such a state of affairs be regarded as normal? Of course not, primarily because it violates the basis of fair relations—equal conditions for all. And what do equal conditions for all mean in the given case? It is a common principle of distribution of budgetary funds. If this principle is established, the amounts allocated will depend on perfectly objective indices, such, let us say, as outlays per head of population or per person actually working in the national economy. Of course, there must be no levelling.

In discussing the need to extend the powers of the union republics we must underline the need for the principle of centralised planning. It should always be remembered that a paramount condition for the successful development of our country and of each republic of the Soviet Union is the unity of effort of all the peoples of the U.S.S.R., a certain centralisation of our national economy coupled with broad initiative and independent action by the republics. The principle of planning gives the socialist system of economy a vast advantage. We are not renouncing this advantage and never will. What we have in mind is that while perfecting planned direction of the national economy, the economic requirements of the union republics and the perspectives of their economic and cultural development should be carefully considered and every new factor arising in the life of the republics noted in good time and taken into account. No petty tutelage towards the union republics should be permitted. They should decide for themselves, within the limits laid down by the Union's national-economic plans, the concrete problems of developing particular branches of their economy. That will make for a still greater consolidation of the sovereignty of each republic and for mutual trust between the republics, and will help each of them fully to develop initiative in the use of local resources.

Far from erasing national differences and specific features, socialism, on the contrary, assures the all-round development and prosperity of the economy and culture of all the nations and nationalities. It is our duty, therefore, not to ignore specific features and differences, but to give them the most careful consideration in all our practical work in the guidance of economic and cultural development.

Mention should here be made of some comrades' lack of clarity in their interpretation of the national question.

Take, for instance, the question of Soviet patriotism and internationalism. It is important that there shall be complete clarity on this question, not alone

in order to carry out the national policy in our country correctly as Lenin has taught us, but also in order to build correctly our relations with the working people of other countries, including those of the whole of our socialist camp. Unfortunately, there are comrades who believe that love for one's country runs counter to the international solidarity of the working people and socialist internationalism. Such an interpretation is insulting to the national sentiments of the people, in no way helping to promote co-operation between the socialist nations, and the development of international solidarity between the working people of all countries.

It is appropriate to recall here the following words of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. In 1914, when the First World War was at its height, when the muddy wave of chauvinism and bourgeois nationalism inundated the European countries, when our party was the only party which kept aloft the fighting banner of proletarian internationalism, Lenin, the leader of the party, wrote: "Is the sense of national pride alien to us class-conscious Great-Russian proletarians? Of course not! We love our language and our country, we are doing our utmost to have *its* toiling masses (i.e. nine-tenths of *its* population) become conscious democrats and socialists." [*Works*, Russian Edition, Vol. 21, p. 85.]

The organic combination of socialist patriotism and internationalism is the ideological basis for strengthening the fraternal relations between the socialist nations. Our party was guided by this in the past and will continue so to be guided in its national policy. By intensifying the education of the masses in the spirit of proletarian internationalism we have done everything and will continue to do everything to aid the growth and development of the national economy of all union republics, for the still greater enhancement of their culture, national in form and socialist in content. At the same time, we must resolutely repulse all manifestations of bourgeois ideology, including nationalism, we must safeguard the purity of our Communist ideology and work tirelessly to unite the peoples of the U.S.S.R. still more firmly and further to strengthen their great friendship.

## **2. The Development of Socialist Democracy. The Improvement of the State Apparatus. The Strengthening of Soviet Law**

**T**HE period under review was marked by the further development of Soviet democracy and an increased creative effort by the broad masses of the working people.

Only under a socialist system could such remarkable forms of participation by the people in the solution of important state questions arise and become regular features as, for instance, conferences of leading representatives of the working class, the collective-farm peasantry and intellectuals convened by the central committee of the party at the centre and in the localities. Another illustration of the development of Soviet democracy is the widespread participation of the personnel of enterprises in working out and discussing drafts of the Sixth Five-Year Plan for their enterprises.

The great tasks in building communism require still greater creative effort and initiative by the working people, extensive participation by the masses of the people in governing the state, in all of the vast organi-



sational and economic activity going on in our country. This means that we have to develop Soviet democracy in every way, to eliminate everything that hinders its all-round development.

I shall begin with the work of the Soviets, which are the political foundation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It must be said that there are many grave shortcomings in the work of the Soviets, and at times outright deviations from the requirements and provisions of the Soviet Constitution. For instance, Deputies should report on their activity to the voters. Yet in recent years, the incorrect practice has developed, in the localities, of Deputies of the Soviets and the Executive Committees\* reporting to the electorate only occasionally, mainly during election campaigns. The Constitution also provides that a Deputy of a Soviet who has not justified the trust placed in him may be recalled by his constituents. This provision is not always applied to Deputies who have not justified the confidence of the voters. Sessions of the Supreme Soviets of the Union and Autonomous Republics are, as a rule, called once a year, instead of twice, as is required by the Constitution.

It is necessary to put an end to these defects in the work of the Soviets, to strengthen their ties with the electorate, and to observe strictly all the provisions of the Constitution. The Soviets should turn their attention to concrete questions of economic and cultural development and regularly discuss these questions at their meetings.

In carrying out the tasks of building communism the Soviet state apparatus has an important role to play. Our state apparatus is by its nature truly an apparatus of the people. A large force drawn from among the Soviet intellectuals—men and women devoted to their people and the building of communism—is engaged in it. It is through the Soviets that the economic, organisational, cultural, and educational functions of the socialist state are exercised; so also is the task of strengthening the defence potential of our country. Without a well co-ordinated and well-organised apparatus, which stands close to the people and works efficiently, it is impossible to manage any sector of socialist construction. That is why it is the duty of our party organisations to keep close to the Soviets, and conduct organisational and ideological work among the wide section of workers engaged in the various sectors of the apparatus.

In conformity with the Leninist principles on the organisation of the work of the apparatus, the central committee of the C.P.S.U. and the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers have in the past two years taken important steps to simplify the structure of the administrative and managerial apparatus, reduce the staffs and improve their work. As a result, the administrative and managerial apparatus has been reduced, according to the information available, by nearly 750,000 persons. It must be said that the administrative apparatus is still excessively large, and the state spends huge sums on its upkeep. It is in the interests of Soviet society to have more people working in material production—in mills and factories, in mines and on construction sites, in collective farms, machine and tractor stations and state farms, wherever the national wealth is produced.

\* i.e., the Executive Committees of the Soviets.—Ed.

It is necessary to go on perfecting the administrative and managerial apparatus. This, however, is not a mechanical matter, and it should be accompanied by a simplification of the structure of the apparatus, an improvement in all its practical activity, the strengthening of its ties with the masses, and the enlisting of a broad *active* from among the workers, collective farmers and intellectuals who will take part in the management of economic and cultural development. There are still a good many unnecessary links in our state apparatus duplicating each other's work. Many workers in the ministries and other bodies, instead of keeping busy organising the working masses to carry out party and government decisions, continue to sit in their offices, killing time in paper work and bureaucratic correspondence. A most ruthless struggle must be waged against red tape—that intolerable evil that is doing great harm to our common cause.

In recent years the party and the Government have divided up a number of ministries. While reducing the total number of people working in the administrative and managerial apparatus, economic guidance will be brought closer to the point of production and guidance will be made more concrete.

The measures taken by the party to improve socialist planning are of great importance to the state. One of these measures that should be specially mentioned is the reorganisation of the planning bodies, the division of long-term and current planning, which makes it possible to work out national economic plans more thoroughly and to organise control over their fulfilment better.

It should be said that our plans do not yet fully reflect the requirement of the law of the balanced (proportionate) development of the socialist economy, as a result of which there arise in the country's economy temporary, partial disproportions, which to a certain extent impede the development of a number of its branches. It is our task to prevent the emergence of such disproportions, and fully ensure the planned development of the national economy. Our planning and economic bodies should make a thorough study and outline the prospects for the expansion of the leading branches of the national economy over a number of Five-Year Plan periods.

It is necessary to pay special attention to the proper organisation of control over the execution of the decisions of the party and the government. It would be wrong to think that only workers who are remiss have to be checked. It is also necessary to check up on the work of conscientious people, for control is, first of all, system; it disciplines officials, prevents them from making mistakes, and gives them a greater feeling of responsibility for the job entrusted to them.

Up to now, the weakest spot in the organisation of the work of party, government and economic bodies in the centre and in the localities is the unsatisfactory system of verifying the fulfilment of the directives of the party and the government. Nor does the Ministry of State Control of the U.S.S.R. cope with this task. It carries out Lenin's injunctions on state control poorly. And it raises no important questions for improving the state apparatus.

We can no longer reconcile ourselves to the primitive system of

verifying the execution of the directives of the party and the government. The work of the Ministry of State Control must be radically re-organised so that it can make a profound study of the work of the state apparatus and its structure, check on how particular links of the apparatus carry out decisions of the party and the government, and place before the government important questions, questions of principle, of improving the state administration and making it more efficient.

The central committee of the party has given and is giving much attention to strengthening socialist law. Experience has shown that the enemies of the Soviet State attempt to use the slightest weakening of socialist law for their foul subversive activity. That is how the Beria gang, which was exposed by the party, functioned in its attempt to remove the state security agencies from the control of the party and the Soviet government and put them above the party and the government, and create an atmosphere of lawlessness and arbitrariness in these agencies. To serve their hostile ends that band fabricated false charges against honest leading workers and rank-and-file Soviet citizens.

The central committee has checked up on the so-called "Leningrad case" and found that it had been rigged by Beria and his accomplices in order to weaken the Leningrad Party organisation and discredit its cadres. After establishing that the "Leningrad case" was groundless, the central committee also checked up on a number of other questionable cases. The central committee took steps to restore justice, and on the recommendation of the central committee the innocent people who had been convicted were rehabilitated.

The central committee has drawn important conclusions from all this. Proper control by the party and the government has been established over the work of the state security agencies. A considerable amount of work has been done to strengthen the state security agencies, the courts, and procurator's offices by putting in tried and tested people. The supervisory powers of the Procurator's Office have been completely re-established and strengthened.

Our party, state, and trade union organisations must vigilantly see to it that Soviet laws are observed, must expose everyone who violates socialist law and order and the rights of Soviet citizens, and sternly call a halt to the slightest manifestation of lawlessness and arbitrariness.

It should be stated that because a number of cases have been reviewed and set aside, some comrades have begun to manifest a certain distrust of the workers of the state security agencies. That, of course, is incorrect and very harmful. We know that the overwhelming majority of our state security personnel are honest people devoted to our common cause, and we trust them.

It should not be forgotten that enemies have always tried, and will go on trying to hinder the big job of building communism. The capitalist world around us has sent a good many spies and saboteurs into our country. It would be naive to suppose that the enemies will now give up their attempts to harm us in every way. Everybody knows that subversive activity against our country is openly supported and advertised by the reactionary circles of a number of capitalist states. It is enough to point out that since 1951 the United States has allocated 100 million

dollars annually for subversive activity against the socialist countries. We must therefore in every way increase revolutionary vigilance among the Soviet people and strengthen the state security agencies.

A major historical gain of our party is the fact that under the socialist system new people have developed—active and conscious builders of communism. It would, however, be wrong to think that the survivals of capitalism in the minds of people have been done away with. Unfortunately, we still find in our splendid and industrious Soviet family people who take no part in productive labour, perform no useful work either for the family or for society. We also come across people who maliciously break the rules of our socialist community. It is impossible to put an end to these ugly manifestations merely by administrative measures, without participation by the masses themselves. In this matter, public opinion has a great role to play. It is necessary to create such an atmosphere that people violating standards of conduct, the principles of Soviet morality, should feel that their actions are condemned by the whole of society. We must make indefeasible the following provision of our Constitution—one of its cornerstones—"Work in the U.S.S.R. is a duty and a matter of honour for very able-bodied citizen, in accordance with the principle: 'He who does not work, neither shall he eat'."

It is the bounden duty of party, government, Young Communist League and trade union organisations to carry on energetically the noble work of fostering in the Soviet youth and all working people a socialist attitude towards work and public property, and to educate them in the spirit of the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

Comrades, while consistently pursuing the policy of peace, our party deems it its cardinal duty tirelessly to strengthen the brave and glorious armed forces of the Soviet State—our army, navy and air force—to provide them with the latest equipment, to raise the political consciousness and fighting skill of their personnel. The Soviet people may be sure that their armed forces, which are vigilantly guarding the peaceful labour of the Soviet people, will honourably do their duty to their socialist homeland.

\* \* \*

THE internal position of the Soviet Union has never been as strong and as firm as it is today. The Communist Party and the Soviet people are entitled to be proud of the great fruits of their devoted work, of the results of their creative effort in every economic and cultural sphere. At the same time, we must always remember that Lenin taught us never to rest on our laurels, to concentrate our attention and efforts on the problems which still have to be solved.

The great advantages of the socialist economic system, the high rate of development of social production, make it possible for us to carry out in a historically very brief period the main economic task of the U.S.S.R.—to overtake and surpass the most developed capitalist countries in output per head of the population. Fulfilment of this task will be the strongest and most reliable guarantee for our country and the entire great community of socialist countries against accidents or surprises, and will make it possible to bring the well-being of the people up to a level corresponding to the great aims of socialist society. The Sixth Five-

Year Plan is an important stage in the fulfilment of this task. We have every possibility, not merely for fulfilling the new Five-Year Plan, but for overfulfilling it.

However, as everyone knows, possibilities are not yet realities. In order to convert possibilities into realities it is necessary for all party, government, economic, trade union and Young Communist League organisations to carry on organisational work steadily and with perseverance; it is necessary that all of our Soviet people—our heroic working class, our glorious collective-farm peasantry, and our people's intelligentsia—should work hard.

In the sphere of home policy the paramount tasks for the next few years are:

1. Persistently and energetically to widen the material and production base of socialist society, to introduce into all branches of the national economy higher techniques, the latest achievements of home and foreign science and engineering, and the production methods of the front-rank workers.

2. To ensure a steady rise in labour productivity, on the basis of technical progress and above all of the extensive electrification of the country, decisive improvement in the organisation of work and production, and undeviating observance of the Leninist principle of the material interest of workers in the results of their labour.

3. Tirelessly to reduce the cost of industrial and agricultural production, to apply the cost-accountancy principle more widely in industrial enterprises, state farms, and machine and tractor stations, to exercise the strictest economy, cut down expenditure of labour and material values per unit of output, and constantly improve the quality of the goods produced.

4. Along with a decisive improvement in capital construction, to utilise existing production capacities efficiently, to seek for and increasingly utilise potentials existing in all branches of the national economy, at every enterprise and construction site and every collective and state farm.

5. To continue to ensure in future priority in the rate of development of heavy industry—the foundation of the entire socialist economy—to expand considerably the production of consumer goods, and untiringly to push forward the development of the light and food industries.

6. Using the experience of the foremost collective farms, state farms, and machine and tractor stations, to bring the annual production of cereals up to 11,000 million poods and considerably to increase the production of cotton, sugar-beet, flax, potatoes and other vegetables, and other farm produce by the end of the Sixth Five-Year Plan. Production of meat is to be doubled, that of milk nearly doubled, and production of wool is to be increased by 82 per cent.

7. Steadily to raise the material welfare and cultural standard of the working people, to implement the decisions of the party on a shorter working day in an organised manner, and to carry out a wide programme of housing construction for the working people.

8. Persistently to improve the work of the Soviet state apparatus, to reduce it and make it less expensive, energetically to eradicate bureaucracy

and red tape, improve the guidance given to all sectors of the national economy, work to make the guidance as concrete as possible so that it may provide practical help to lagging enterprises, collective farms, machine and tractor stations and state farms in order that they may reach the level of the most advanced ones.

9. Widely to develop the initiative and creative effort of the millions of workers, collective farmers and intellectuals, to organise and lead the countrywide socialist emulation in a militant way for the fulfilment and overfulfilment of the Sixth Five-Year Plan.

10. Tirelessly to strengthen the great alliance of the working class and collective-farm peasantry, the indestructible friendship of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., the moral and political unity of the whole Soviet society, to educate the working masses' millions in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism, and to rally them still more closely around our glorious Communist Party and around the invincible banner of Marxism-Leninism.

### III

## The Party

COMRADES, the Soviet people know that the country's immense achievements are due to the correct policy of our Communist Party, its tireless work of organisation. Devoted service to the people has earned the Communist Party of the Soviet Union high prestige not only among our own people, but also in the international Communist and workers' movement, among the masses in the West and East. Its policy powerfully influences the whole course of world events.

#### 1. Consolidating the Communist Party's Ranks and Strengthening its Leading Role in the Soviet State

AS on 1 February 1956 the C.P.S.U. had a membership of 7,215,505, of whom 6,795,896 were members and 419,609 candidate members. That is nearly three times the membership at the time of the 18th Congress, and 333,000 more than at the time of the 19th Congress. In the period under review the party has grown still stronger organisationally and ideologically. The Marxist-Leninist training of its members has improved and there has been a significant development of party cadres—the key factor in party and government leadership.

The Communist Party was founded and built up by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, our great leader and teacher, to give inspiration and guidance to the working people in their struggle for the freedom and happiness of the people, for communism. Lenin vigorously combated every attempt to belittle or weaken the leading role of the party in the Soviet State. The central committee has always and undeviatingly been guided by Lenin's teachings on the party. And we can say today that in the period under review our party has played a still greater role in the affairs of state, in the country's entire political, economic, and cultural life.

In the struggle for further consolidation of the Soviet State, for a new advance of the socialist economy and culture, for higher living standards of the working people, the party has vastly extended its ties with the masses and has formed still closer bonds of kinship with the people.

It would be wrong, however, to think that the period under review was for our party a triumphal march under clear skies and over a smooth road. Far from it. We have had big victories, but also some failures; we have had much to rejoice in, and grief too. But the party was not carried away by the victories, nor dejected by the failures. It continues to advance along its chosen road with courage and confidence.

Shortly after the 19th Congress, death took Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin from our ranks. The enemies of socialism hoped there would be confusion in the party's ranks, discord among its leadership, hesitation in carrying out its internal and foreign policy. However, their hopes came to nought. The party rallied still more closely around its central committee, and raised still higher the all-conquering banner of Marxism-Leninism.

The imperialists had placed special hopes on their old agent, Beria, who had perfidiously wormed his way into leading posts in the party and govern-

ment. The central committee resolutely put an end to the criminal conspiracy of that dangerous enemy and his accomplices. That was a big victory for the party, a victory for its collective leadership.

The destruction of this gang of contemptible traitors helped further to strengthen the party and solve successfully the tasks confronting the country. The party has become still more monolithic. Its ideological and organisational unity is the guarantee of its invincibility, for no enemies and no difficulties are a danger to it when it is united. It can cope with any problem when it acts as a united force which knows no fear in battle, does not hesitate in carrying out its policy, and does not give way to difficulties. Today our party is united as never before; it is closely rallied round the central committee, and is confidently leading the country along the path pointed out by the great Lenin.

The party's unity has been built up over the course of many years and decades; it grew stronger in battle with a host of enemies. The Trotskyites, Bukharinites, bourgeois nationalists, and other malignant enemies of the people, the men who wanted to restore capitalism, tried desperately to undermine the party's Leninist unity from within—and all of them broke their necks.

Underlying this unity of the Communist Party and its leading core are the moral and political unity of the whole of Soviet society and the bedrock principles of Marxism-Leninism. People join our party not for personal gain, but to help to achieve its great aim—communism. The leading core of the party is not a group of men bound by personal relations or mutual advantage; it is a working collective of leaders whose relations are based on ideas and principles permitting neither of mutual forgiveness nor personal antagonism.

Whenever it was found that a party leader had made mistakes in his work, the central committee of the C.P.S.U. unanimously took the necessary steps to correct these mistakes. The work of a number of party organisations and individuals, among them members of the central committee, was subjected to Bolshevik criticism, without fear or favour, at plenary meetings of the central committee. Some party officials, who did not justify the high confidence placed in them by the party, were removed from the central committee. It need hardly be said that the unity of the party, far from losing by it, has actually gained thereby.

Lenin taught us that a line based on principle is the only correct line. Never to deviate a single step in anything from the interests of the party—that is the bedrock principle by which the Communists are guided in the struggle for the unity of their ranks. And the fact that in the period under review new and outstanding success has been achieved is the surest proof that the party and its central committee have ably guarded and strengthened the unity of the Communist ranks.

In reviewing the path we have traversed, we can confidently say that, in the period under review, the central committee's political guidance of the country was on a high level. The party devised correct solutions for the problems confronting it and the government, and competently led the country along the Lenin path.

The main task of the party, and of its central committee, was to ensure the further consolidation of the economic might of our socialist country,

to make its sacred borders still more impregnable, and raise the material and cultural standards of the people.

Our Communist Party is a ruling party. The success of every major undertaking depends to a decisive degree on its leadership, on the activity of its local organisations. And in order to cope with the tasks facing the country it was necessary, first of all, to muster all the strength of the party organisations and imbue every one of its members with the spirit of intolerance for shortcomings.

The plenary meetings of the central committee of the C.P.S.U., held regularly during the period under review, played an exceptionally important part in the life of the party and the country generally. At these, the central committee, with Leninist straightforwardness and fidelity to principle, laid bare, before the party and the people, the serious shortcomings in the development of agriculture and industry, and outlined ways and means of eliminating them and of accomplishing the urgent tasks involved in ensuring the country's continued economic progress and raising the material and cultural standards of the working people.

In criticising defects in economic development, the central committee proceeded from the belief that the party should not be afraid to tell the people the truth about the shortcomings and difficulties that beset our forward movement. He is no revolutionary who is afraid to admit mistakes and faults. And there is no need to conceal our shortcomings, for our general line is correct, the work of building communism is going forward victoriously. Defects will become less the more widely we enlist the masses of the people to combat them.

The central committee has urged party organisations to develop criticism and self-criticism in every way, to review the results of the work done with a critical eye, resolutely to combat self-delusion, boasting and conceit. Many of the shortcomings we are now working to eliminate would never have arisen if it had not been for the complacency that at one time gained currency in some sections of the party, and for the tendency to give a doctored picture of the real state of affairs. Principled and open criticism and self-criticism is the surest means of further strengthening the party, rapidly eliminating shortcomings, and registering fresh successes in all sectors of communist construction.

If party unity was to be further consolidated and party organisations made more active, it was necessary to re-establish the party standards worked out by Lenin, which in the past had frequently been violated.

It was of paramount importance to re-establish and to strengthen in every way the Leninist principle of collective leadership. The central committee of the C.P.S.U. tried to set an example in this matter. Everyone can see how much the role of the central committee as the collective leader of our party has grown in recent years. The presidium of the central committee began to function regularly as a collective body, keeping in its field of vision all major questions concerning the life of the party and the country generally.

The central committee was concerned to develop the creative activity of party members and the people at large, and to this end it took steps to explain widely the Marxist-Leninist conception of the role of the individual in history. It vigorously condemned the cult of the individual as being alien to

the spirit of Marxism-Leninism and making a particular leader a hero and miracle worker. At the same time this belittles the role of the party and the masses, and tends to reduce their creative effort. Currency of the cult of the individual tended to minimise the role of collective leadership in the party, and at times resulted in serious drawbacks in our work.

In the words of our party anthem, the *Internationale*: "We want no condescending saviours. . . . We must ourselves decide our duty, we must decide and do it well. . . ." Reflected in these inspiring words is the correct Marxist understanding of the revolutionary and creative role of the masses, the role of the collective. The people, led by the party armed with the Marxist theory, are a great and invincible force, the builders of a new life, the makers of history.

Application of the Leninist principles in party affairs has heightened the activity of party organisations, strengthened their ties with the working people, increased their influence among the masses of the people. The result has been to make our party organisations stronger still, and immensely increase their efficiency in carrying out the tasks of economic and cultural development.

And so, in the period under review the party's unity was further consolidated, its political and organisational role enhanced, its influence among the masses increased. The party has worked out a comprehensive programme for a new economic advance and higher living standards; it has mobilised the whole people to implement this programme, and has gained substantial success in all fields of communist construction.

However, today, too, when the strength and prestige of our party are higher than ever, we must not indulge in complacency. To ensure continued progress, we must keep all our party organisations highly mobilised, and constantly improve and perfect every aspect of party work. Above all, we must raise the level of the party's organisational and ideological activities.

## 2. Party Organisational Work

IN all its organisational activity the party and its central committee have proceeded from the injunctions of the great Lenin, that successful leadership of the country requires ability to convince the masses of the people and ability to organise practical implementation of the party's policy. The party's efforts are directed towards ensuring, organisationally, the successful fulfilment of tasks, towards helping our cadres master the art of practical organisation in all sectors of economic development.

From the day our party came to power, Lenin constantly linked party work with economic activity. He described the famous G.O.E.L.R.O. plan, a plan of economic development, as the party's second programme. "Our programme", Vladimir Ilyich said in that connection, "cannot remain merely a programme of the party. It must become the programme for our economic development, otherwise it is no good even as a programme of the party. It must be supplemented by a second programme of the party, a plan for rebuilding the whole of the national economy and bringing it up to the level of present-day technique" [*Works*, Russian Ed., Vol. 31, p. 482].

It must be admitted that over the course of many years our party cadres were not adequately educated in a spirit of high responsibility for the solution of the practical problems of economic development. The result was

widespread armchair, bureaucratic economic leadership; many party officials did not devote enough time and attention to the organisational aspect of economic development, did not probe deeply into economic matters, and it was not infrequent for the very practical task of organising the masses of the people to be submerged in a welter of talk and a sea of paper.

The central committee called upon party cadres, and all party members, to make a complete switch-over and turn their attention to concrete guidance of economic activity, to put an end to the superficial attitude towards economic matters, to study more thoroughly the technology and economics of industrial enterprises, collective farms, machine and tractor stations, and state farms, so as to gain profound knowledge for directing their work. Party officials who still insist on babbling about economic tasks "in general", on continuing their armchair methods, instead of earnestly studying their jobs and taking up the practical work of organisation, are now severely criticised. A good many present-day "mitrofanushkas",\* who have preferred to shy away from the real, live work have been removed from leading positions.

As a result of the measures we have adopted, local party organisations have to some extent improved their organisational work in the key sectors of industry and agriculture. Their work in guiding the economy has become more efficient, more concrete and more operative.

Unfortunately, in many party organisations we still find the absurd juxtaposition of party political work and economic activity. We come across party "leaders" who hold that party work is one thing and economic and government work quite another. These "leaders" even complain that they are being diverted from so-called "pure party work" and are made to study economics, technology and agronomy, to study production.

Such a conception of party work is fundamentally wrong and harmful.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the ruling party, and everything that happens on Soviet soil is of vital interest to the party as a whole and to each of its members. A Communist has no right to be a mere onlooker.

That is why the party demands of its cadres that they do not divorce party work from economic work, that their economic leadership be concrete and based on knowledge of the business. This, of course, does not imply confusing the functions of party bodies with those of economic bodies, or substitution of party bodies for economic bodies. That would obliterate personal responsibility and lead to irresponsibility. What is meant is that party work should be concentrated on organising and educating the masses of the people, on improving guidance of the economy, on promoting the continuous development of our socialist economy, on raising the living standards of the Soviet people, and advancing their culture.

If the work of organisation is to be brought to a level commensurate with the tasks confronting the party, there must be an all-round improvement of the party apparatus. It is still cumbersome. No little formalism, harmful in any matter, but especially inadmissible where people are concerned, is still to be found in the functioning of the party apparatus. Its highly skilled personnel is, as often as not, engaged not so much in the work of organisation, as in the collection of all manner of data, statistical

\* Mitrofanushka—a pampered boy, the principal character in Fonvizin's comedy *The Minor*.

returns and information, which, in very many cases, are not at all necessary. Much of the work of the apparatus is, therefore, just wasted.

The main thing in the party's organisational work is work among the masses of the people—to influence them and rally them for the accomplishment of the economic and political tasks set by the party. We must no longer tolerate a situation in which many workers of the party apparatus, instead of being daily among the masses of the people, confine themselves to their offices, produce reams of resolutions, while life passes them by.

In this connection we must speak again and again about the direction of the collective farms. The party and the government have furnished all the material and organisational prerequisites for a steep rise in agricultural output. In a short space of time thousands of formerly backward collective farms have advanced to the front ranks. But many collective farms are advancing slower than is necessary. If we take such a branch of agriculture as livestock farming, we will find that in each district there are collective farms that have taken big strides in this field, doubling or trebling meat and dairy output in a single year. But around such farms we frequently see collective farms with exceedingly low output indices.

What, then, prevents us from utilising to the full available potentialities in agriculture, and especially in livestock farming? The chief reason is the weakness of our work of organisation.

The defects in leadership find expression in the fact that many district officials do not deal concretely with the position in each collective farm. The leadership they give the collective farms is formal, and they lack real knowledge. They often leave out of sight crucial questions—proper planning of the development of each individual farm, and the proper organisation of the labour effort of the collective farmers. The result often is that the rudiments of the new break their way through independently, spontaneously. Is this normal? No. First you must study the substance of the best experience and then go to a lagging collective farm or work team and do everything to introduce that advanced experience, to show the collective farmers, by holding up that experience as an example, how to do the job most efficiently. In leadership this is the main thing.

There are still men in leading positions who come within the category of busy "idlers". At first glance they are very active and, true enough, they work a great deal, but to no purpose. Their conferences last late into the night, "until the cock crows", after which they make a lightning tour of the collective farms, chide the laggards, hold more conferences and deliver general speeches—usually in advance—urging the farmers "to pass the test", "surmount all difficulties", "bring about a sharp change", "justify the trust" etc. But for all the exertions of such a leader, it turns out at the end of the year that matters have not changed for the better. A man, as the saying goes, "was jumping out of his skin, but didn't advance the length of a pin".

Another big evil is that an irresponsible attitude to assumed pledges has struck root in the practical activities of many party and Soviet officials. If we verify how different regions, districts, collective and state farms fulfil their socialist pledges we will find a big gap between words and deeds. In fact, is fulfilment of these pledges verified at all? No, as a rule it is not.



No one bears responsibility, either material or moral, for the non-fulfilment of pledges.

Our press and radio extol and praise those who assume big pledges, but nothing is said when they fail to live up to their pledges, though there was every condition for fulfilling them. People should be made to feel more responsible for their pledges. Once you make a pledge you must live up to it at all costs. As the saying goes: "Once you pledge, don't hedge."

It follows from this that we must seriously improve organisational work, especially at the district level, attentively follow the work of our cadres, their progress, and help them master the art of organising the masses.

The party has always attached great importance to district-level party and Soviet officials, because it is on them that fulfilment of party and government directives largely depends. Much has been done by the party in this respect, and as a result considerable cadres, real mass organisers and leaders, have developed in the districts. But there is no overlooking the fact that in many cases the work of the district organisations is far below present-day requirements.

In the past we rightly pointed to the inadequacy of personnel in machine and tractor stations and of leading personnel on the collective farms. The party has reinforced these cadres, not, of course, to a degree that would allow us to say the job is done; we must continue this work. But under present conditions the biggest shortcoming as regards personnel is at the district level, in the district party committees, in the district executive committees of Soviets. The organising activities of the party district committees are not up to the mark.

Now that the country is confronted with tremendous tasks in advancing agriculture, the reinforcement of district organisations with experienced and capable cadres has acquired special significance. District-level officials work directly in rural primary party organisations, at machine and tractor stations, collective and state farms. They organise the labour efforts of the men and women who produce material values. Consequently, upon their activities largely depends the success of all our undertakings.

We must see that leading posts in district party committees and executive committees of district Soviets are filled by well-trained Communists, energetic mass organisers who know production. Without knowledge of farming, district officials cannot do their job properly, nor will they enjoy prestige among the collective farmers and the workers at machine and tractor stations and state farms.

Economic development is one of the major aspects of party work. The work of a party official should be judged, in the first place, by the achievements of the economic unit for the success of which he is responsible. Officials who do not appreciate this point are incapable of guiding the efforts to advance the economy, and should be replaced promptly as being insufficiently fit for party work. We must continue to reinforce district party organisations with leading cadres both by promoting local workers who have developed in collective and state farms and by drawing people from towns and industrial centres into the work at a district level.

Evidently, comrades, it is necessary also to raise the material responsibility of leading personnel for the job entrusted to them so that their wages should to a certain extent depend on the results achieved. If the plan is fulfilled or

overfulfilled, they should get more, if not—their wages should be reduced. Some may object that that principle cannot be applied to party officials, for their functions lie in the organisational and ideological spheres, and are not tied up directly with the results of economic activity. But can party organisational work be considered successful if it does not exercise a beneficial influence on production? To carry on party organisational and ideological work without tying it up with the task of improving production means to carry it on to no purpose.

Shortcomings in party organisational work are not confined to rural areas, they are to be found also in urban party organisations. True, in industry the situation on the whole is better. But here, too, alongside of advanced industries and individual plants, there are not a few which lag behind. One of the reasons for this is that the party organisations in these establishments are not working with sufficient vigour to bring forward new, advanced methods and are not waging a ruthless struggle against backwardness and stagnation.

The level of party organisational work largely depends on whether its forms are in keeping with the tasks confronting the party organisations. From this it follows that the methods of work and the structure of party bodies must be constantly improved and adapted to changing conditions. This applies not only to local party bodies but also to the central committee of the C.P.S.U.

A number of measures have been adopted during the past period to reshape the structure of party bodies and reinforce their cadres. To improve the party's organisational work in the countryside, the central committee has found it necessary to change the structure of rural party district committees. Instructors' groups, headed by secretaries of party district committees, have been set up for definite machine and tractor station zones. The idea was that when a secretary of the party district committee and instructors in the machine and tractor station zones had concrete tasks of organising the party's political work in a certain group of collective farms, this would tend to improve the work of these farms. Consequently, such a reorganisation was necessary.

But we see that not everywhere has this measure produced favourable results. What is the reason for that? Some see it in the fact that when secretaries of party district committees were appointed for machine and tractor station zones and instructors' groups were introduced, the first secretary of the district committee has found himself, as it were, removed from guidance of the machine and tractor stations and the collective farms and that this has allegedly weakened general guidance of agriculture at district level. But these statements are made by people who would want to bring back the old methods of leadership, when personal responsibility for work in the countryside was lacking to a great extent.

The party district committees and the first secretaries of the district committees, guiding properly the work of the secretaries and instructors for the machine and tractor station zones, will be able to bring about an improvement in the organisational work among the collective farmers. And wherever the reorganisation has been effected properly, this has improved the situation.

The main reason why this reorganisation has not produced tangible results everywhere is that in a number of districts people have been appointed as secretaries of district committees and instructors for machine and tractor

station zones who in their political and other qualifications did not measure up to the requirements of their jobs and could not cope with them.

Some of the comrades say that we should again change the structure of the party district committees. We ought to think twice before undertaking that. It seems to us that it is hardly expedient to carry out a further reorganisation. It is better to reinforce the cadres, selecting wherever necessary for the post of secretaries of district committees good organisers who are able to work well with the people. It is necessary to follow the line of bringing party leadership closer to production, and to do away completely with the obliteration of personal responsibility in party work.

The central committee holds that there is an urgent need for seriously improving party leadership in the regions and territories of the Russian Federation. The Federation consists of seventy-eight territories, regions and autonomous republics, each with diverse conditions and specific features. A special central party body is required to ensure more concrete and operational leadership in the regions, territories and autonomous republics of the Russian Federation. For this purpose the central committee considers it necessary to set up a bureau of the central committee of the C.P.S.U. for the Russian Federation.

The central committee attaches special significance to the selection and allocation of cadres, to the enhancement of their ideological grounding and general qualifications as a means of improving party organisational and political work. The party may be proud of the fact that it has been able to develop, ideologically train and steel numerous cadres for diverse branches of party, government and economic work.

But it would be wrong not to see the serious shortcomings and mistakes in work with cadres. Suffice it to say, for example, that graduates of our party schools are often ignorant of the fundamentals of applied economics. The training of cadres in party schools should be reorganised so that, parallel with a thorough study of Marxist-Leninist theory, students should acquire knowledge of the basic elements of production, and students of higher party schools should, in addition to a higher Marxist education, acquire practical knowledge in a definite branch of industry or agriculture equivalent to the curriculum of a technical school.

Many party organisations are oblivious of the party principle that, together with proper utilisation of old cadres, young people who have proved their mettle in practical work should be boldly promoted to leading posts.

Nor can we ignore the fact that a number of party and Soviet bodies are timid in promoting women to leading posts. Very few women hold leading party and government posts, specifically, secretaries of party committees, chairmen of the executive committees of Soviets of Working People's Deputies, managerial posts in industrial establishments, collective and state farms, and machine and tractor stations.

Replacement of cadres is excessive, owing to serious shortcomings in the selection and training of personnel and also to unnecessary shifting of officials from one job to another at times. All too often party bodies confine themselves to a formal study of cadres, their merits and demerits, and sometimes promote and shift people without taking into account their political and other qualifications.

Proper distribution of party members in the national economy is of great

importance for the successful accomplishment of the tasks confronting the party. It is an abnormal situation when a considerable proportion of the Communists employed in a number of branches of the national economy are engaged in work which is not directly connected with the decisive processes of production. There are some 90,000 Communists in coal industry establishments, for example, but only 38,000 work in the mines, underground. More than 3 million party members and candidate members live in rural localities, but less than half work in the collective farms, machine and tractor stations and state farms.

A serious drawback in the organisational work of local party committees is the slackening of attention to regulating the growth of the party, particularly to increasing the proportion of industrial workers. We must take a more resolute line in improving the qualitative composition of new members being admitted to the party through individual recruitment of foremost workers, notably those in key trades, foremost collective farmers and the best part of the Soviet intelligentsia.

The Soviet trade unions are called upon to play a big part in educating the millions of industrial, professional, and office workers, in marshalling their creative energies to advance and improve production, in raising the living standard of the working people and promoting their cultural and technical advancement. Yet the level of trade union activity is clearly below the requirements of life, and falls short of the tasks set by the party. The main thing our trade union organisations, including the U.S.S.R. Central Council of Trade Unions, lack is militancy in their work, creative fervour, incisiveness, adherence to principle, and initiative in raising fundamental, vitally important questions—whether they be measures for increasing labour productivity, or, say, questions relating to wages, house construction or catering to the everyday needs of the workers and other employees. Collective agreements are concluded at every enterprise, but often enough they are not carried out, and the trade unions keep silent, as though everything were right and proper. In general, the trade unions no longer have disputes with industrial executives, there is peace and harmony between them. But one need not be afraid to spoil relations where the interests of our cause are concerned; at times a good wrangle is beneficial.

We must make the trade unions a genuine Leninist school of administration and management, a school of communism for the millions of factory, office and other workers. It is perfectly clear that to achieve this the party must render them more practical help in their work. The trade unions should make much more use than hitherto of production conferences, meetings of industrial *actives*, and other forms of workers' participation in production management.

Our glorious Leninist Young Communist League holds an important place in the country's social life. Uniting in its ranks more than 18 million young men and women, the Y.C.L. takes an active part in economic and cultural development work, helps the party to educate the youth in the Communist spirit. But there are serious shortcomings in the activities of Y.C.L. organisations, especially in ideological and educational work. There have been cases of Y.C.L. organisations lacking the ability to enlist the youth for practical undertakings; there has been a tendency to replace the live work of organisation by resolutions, ostentatious rallies and so on.

If these shortcomings are to be eliminated, it is necessary, first of all, to improve party guidance of the Y.C.L., because in this lies the chief source of its strength and creative energy.

Certain partial changes, dictated by life, should be introduced in the rules of the C.P.S.U., with the object of further improving the party's organisational activities. Experience has shown that some provisions of the rules are out of keeping with the standards of party life as they have taken shape. Party regional committees, territorial committees, and central committees in the union republics, as well as some district and city committees, have now four or five secretaries, instead of the three provided for in the rules. In conformity with the proposals of party organisations, the intervals between plenary meetings of party committees stipulated in the rules have been changed. This should be reflected in the rules. Party committees in various parts of the country have rightly raised the question of changing the provision in the rules concerning the dates for holding party conferences. The correct procedure would be to hold congresses of the Communist Parties of the union republics, and territorial, regional, area and city (in cities sub-divided into districts) party conferences once in two years. Congresses of the Communist Parties in union republics which are subdivided into regions (the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan) could be held once in four years.

At the last congress, the party control commission of the central committee of the C.P.S.U. was reconstituted into the party control committee, and was given the right to maintain representatives, functioning independently of the local party bodies, in the republics, territories and regions. Actual practice has shown that there is no need for such representatives.

I shall not dwell on the other proposals for amending the party rules, since the draft amendments have been distributed to all the congress delegates.

In our day-to-day work we must keep a closer watch over adherence to the requirements of the rules by all party organisations and all party members. Observance of the rules is a cardinal condition for raising the level of all the party's organisational and political activities.

### 3. Questions of Ideological Work

COMRADES, the Marxist-Leninist education of Communists, and of the people generally, and the creative development of revolutionary theory are decisive conditions of our successful advance forward.

In the period under review, the central committee adopted a number of measures to improve work in ideological spheres. Publication of the classics of Marxism-Leninism considerably increased. The first books of the second edition of a 30-volume collection of the writings of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels have come out. Following the completion of the fourth edition of a 35-volume collection of the works of V. I. Lenin, a new edition of the biography of the great founder and leader of the Communist Party and the Soviet State was published. Study of the works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism gives us a deeper understanding of the laws of social development, enables us to envisage the future, enhances the Soviet people's confidence in the triumph of communism, and promotes the cause of com-

munist construction. There has been an improvement in the study by party members of the decisions of party congresses and conferences and central committee plenary meetings, in which the home and foreign policy worked out by the party is set forth.

An important landmark in the ideological life of the party was the publication of a Marxist textbook of political economy. It has been widely circulated both in our country and abroad.

Despite this progress in disseminating knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, the position in respect to ideological work as a whole is still unsatisfactory. The main shortcoming at present is that it is largely divorced from the practice of communist construction.

As long ago as 1920, great Lenin, discussing the tasks of propaganda in the conditions of transition to peaceful construction, pointed out that "propaganda of the old type tells, giving examples, what communism is. But this old propaganda is no good, for we must show in practice how to build socialism. All propaganda must be based on the political experience gained in economic development. This is our most important task, and he who would understand it in the old sense of the word, would find himself left behind and unable to carry on propaganda work among the mass of peasants and workers. Our main policy now must be the economic up-building of the state, in order to bring in more poods of grain, to mine more poods of coal, to decide how best to use these poods of grain and coal. . . . It is on this that all agitation and propaganda must be based" [*Works*, Russian Edition, Vol. 31, p. 346].

We must be guided by these wise injunctions of Lenin in all our activity. While combating indifference to the study and further development of Marxist theory, we cannot regard it as dogmatists, divorced from life. Revolutionary theory is not a collection of petrified dogmas and formulas, but a militant guide to action in transforming the world, in building communism. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that a theory isolated from practice is dead, and practice which is not illumined by revolutionary theory is blind.

Are our party workers, and primarily those engaged in ideological work, acquainted with this cardinal precept? Yes, they are. Many have even learned it by rote. Yet, wherever we turn we find party officials who try to conduct ideological work in the abstract, wholly unconnected with the struggle for the realisation of the practical tasks of communist construction. More, such people level charges of vulgarisation and utilitarianism against those who try to link their ideological activities with everyday practice, claiming that they thereby underrate the importance of theory.

That things are not well in economic science also is evident from the fact that our economists have not produced any serious works dealing with various questions of Soviet economy, or taken part in the discussion of the key issues of industrial and agricultural development at conferences sponsored by the central committee of the C.P.S.U. This indicates that our institutes of economics and their staffs have to a considerable extent cut themselves off from the practical work of communist construction.

Communism, Lenin said, springs from the creative labour of the millions who have been freed from the fetters of capitalism and are building a new life. Not all, however, have grasped this truth. There still are party members

who think that having delivered a lecture on communism they have fulfilled their duty to the party. Certainly, we must never cease to disseminate Marxism-Leninism, propagate the theoretical propositions of communist construction, but we cannot confine ourselves to that. Soviet people look to our propagandists and lecturers also for practical assistance, thorough explanation of the methods applied by the front-rank workers, sound advice on how this experience can be applied at a given plant or collective farm. But to do so, propagandists and lecturers must be acquainted not only with theoretical principles, but also with concrete economic problems; they must not speak in generalities, but with a knowledge of the question under discussion. This is the crux of the matter.

Now, when our country is gradually moving on from socialism to communism, it is particularly important not only to study the classics of Marxism, to explain the theory of Marxism-Leninism, but to translate theory into practice, work for material and cultural abundance, promote the growth of a communist mentality in our citizens. He who thinks that communism can be built solely through propaganda, without practical day-to-day effort to increase production and raise the well-being of the working people, will find himself slipping into talmudism and dogmatism.

An end must be put to the pointless political phrasemongering which Lenin so strongly condemned time and again. What the people demand of our executives is that they always match the deed to the word. If a party member knows how to make resounding speeches about the significance of Marxism-Leninism, but does not help people carry out this great teaching in practice, his value is nil; he will not enjoy prestige among the masses or win their confidence.

Some dogmatists might read in the above remarks underestimation of the propaganda of Marxist-Leninist theory. There is no need to enter into polemics with these dogmatists. Guided by the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet people have built socialism—an accomplishment of world-wide historical significance. Basing ourselves on knowledge of the objective laws of social development, and constantly studying the history and theory of Marxism-Leninism, we must make full use of the advantages of the socialist system in order to hasten in every way the creation of a powerful material and production basis for communism, and multiply the material and cultural benefits accruing to the working people. The Soviet people expect this of us, and we must live up to their expectations without fail and within the briefest possible space of time.

Now as always, Marxism-Leninism will continue to light the way to our great goal. Only one thing is wanted—revolutionary theory must be applied creatively, not dogmatically, it must be developed further in the process of the practical work of building communism, on the basis of generalisation of the latest historical experience and analysis of living realities. Regrettably, however, in many spheres this important work is still lagging very much behind.

There is also this: Lenin taught us that at different periods different aspects of Marxism come to the forefront. Now, when our society is working to attain higher productivity of labour and accomplish the country's basic economic task, the economic aspect of Marxist theory, questions of practical economics, come to the fore.

Over the past seventeen years our propaganda was based principally on the *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.), Short Course*. In the future, too, the glorious history of the party must serve as a cornerstone of our work of education. In view of this, it is necessary to put out a popular Marxist textbook on party history, a textbook based on historical facts and giving a scientific generalisation of the epoch-making struggle waged by the party for communism and bringing the story up to the present day.

The economic teachings of Marxism-Leninism, the concrete problems of the economics of industry, agriculture, construction, transport and trade, have assumed cardinal importance at the present time. Indeed, the problems of Marxist-Leninist economics inseparably linked with the practice of communist construction must be the central element of our propaganda.

The training and education of our cadres in higher schools and party study courses requires a textbook in which the cardinal principles of Marxist-Leninist theory would be set out in concise, simple and lucid language. Another book we need is a popular exposition of the fundamentals of Marxist philosophy. These books would be very valuable in popularising the scientific materialist outlook and combating reactionary idealist philosophy.

We have a big job ahead of us in drafting a new programme of the party which has not been prepared yet. This draft must obviously be drawn up simultaneously with a long-range economic and cultural development plan covering several five-year periods.

The central committee found it necessary to correct some people who introduced confusion in certain clear issues which the party had settled long before. Take, for instance, the question of building socialism in the U.S.S.R. and gradual transition to communism. Here some people employed erroneous formulations, such as the one that we have laid so far only the basis, the foundation, of socialism.

Yet, it is a well-known fact that by the time the new Constitution of the U.S.S.R. was adopted in 1936, the socialist system had triumphed and struck firm root in all branches of the national economy. This means that socialist society had been built in the main in our country already by then, and has been developing on the firm foundation of socialist relations of production ever since. Hence, to claim that we have laid only the foundation of socialism would mislead party members and the people generally on so crucial a question as the country's prospect for the future.

We encounter another extreme in the treatment of the question of socialist development. For we also have leading workers who interpret gradual transition from socialism to communism as a signal for implementation of the principles of communist society already at the present stage. Some hotheads decided that the construction of socialism had already been completed and began to compile a detailed time-table for the transition to communism. On the basis of such utopian views a negligent attitude to the socialist principle of material incentive began to take root. There were proposals, wholly unfounded, that we accelerate the substitution of direct products-exchange for Soviet trade. In a word, smug self-complacency began to spread. And there were wiseacres who counterposed light industry to heavy industry, arguing that priority for heavy industry had been essential only at the early stages of Soviet economic development, and that the only

job now was to force the pace of the development of light industry.

Understandably enough, the party duly rebuffed these attempts to minimise the results achieved in socialist construction and corrected the authors of these extravagant projects and the pipe-dreamers who, divorced from reality, introduced harmful confusion in fundamental issues of socialist economic development.

Only incorrigible braggarts can close their eyes to the fact that we still have not outstripped economically the most highly developed capitalist countries, that our production level is still insufficient to ensure a well-to-do life to all members of society, that there still are many shortcomings and poor organisation in the economic and cultural fields.

It must be realised that theoretical blunders and utopian illusions prevent people from orienting themselves correctly in practical work and strike a false note in our ideological work.

It is incumbent on party organisations to heighten their vigilance in ideological work, strictly safeguard the purity of Marxist theory, wage a resolute struggle against all throwbacks to bourgeois ideology, intensify the drive against the survivals of capitalism in the minds of men and expose their carriers.

In this connection, we cannot pass by the fact that some people are trying to apply the absolutely correct thesis of the possibility of peaceful co-existence of countries with different social and political systems to the ideological sphere. This is a harmful mistake. It does not at all follow from the fact that we stand for peaceful co-existence and economic competition with capitalism, that the struggle against bourgeois ideology, against the survivals of capitalism in the minds of men, can be relaxed. Our task is tirelessly to expose bourgeois ideology, reveal how inimical it is to the people, show up its reactionary nature.

In the battle which our party is waging against the moribund ideas and conceptions of the old world, for the dissemination and affirmation of communist ideology, a major role belongs to the press, literature and art. While noting the considerable achievements registered in this field, it must nevertheless be said that our literature and art still lag behind life, behind Soviet reality, for these are immeasurably richer than their reflection in art and literature. It is legitimate to ask: have not some of our writers and art workers been losing contact with life?

Art and literature in our country can and should take first place in the world not only for wealth of content, but also for artistic power and execution. We cannot reconcile ourselves to pallid works bearing the stamp of haste, as some comrades in art organisations, editorial offices and publishing houses are doing. Mediocrity and insincerity are often not given a sufficient rebuff, and this is detrimental to the development of art and the artistic education of the people.

We can note some progress in the cinema. More films are now being produced than before. Yet, in their drive for quantity, cinema workers often are less discriminating as regards the ideological and artistic quality of pictures and turn out feeble, superficial productions dealing with petty and insignificant phenomena. This practice must be ended, remembering that the cinema is a powerful instrument of communist education of the working people.

The party has combated and will continue to combat untruthful depiction of Soviet reality, both attempts to varnish it and attempts to scoff at and discredit what has been won by the Soviet people. Creative work in literature and art must be filled with the spirit of struggle for communism, it must instil buoyancy and firm conviction in people's hearts and minds, cultivate a socialist mentality and a comradely sense of duty. Particular attention must be devoted to enhancing further the part played by the press in all aspects of ideological, political and organisational work.

One of our important tasks is improvement of cultural and educational work in rural areas. Cultural activities in the villages are often neglected and such media as the radio, press, clubs and libraries are poorly utilised. Cultural institutions often have no contact with the practical tasks of communist construction. Party organisations must base their mass political, cultural and educational work on the houses of culture, clubs or club rooms and libraries. By popularising the experience of the best workers and facilitating the study of scientific farming methods, these institutions should play an important part in carrying out the programme for further advancement of agriculture.

We must make more effective use of all available ideological media in order to forge ahead to new successes in communist construction. The ideological training of our cadres, of the entire party membership and the people generally, remains the object of the party's unflagging concern.

And so, in the field of party development, organisational leadership, and ideological and political work we are faced with the following tasks:

1. Continue to enhance in every way the role of the party as the leading and guiding force of the Soviet people in all fields of political, social, economic and cultural life in the U.S.S.R., further expand and consolidate the party's ties with the masses and raise its prestige still higher; safeguard and strengthen the unity and solidarity of the party and its leading core, strictly observe the principle of collective leadership in the party; extend criticism and self-criticism, boldly revealing shortcomings in all fields of economic and cultural development.

2. Develop inner-party democracy and, on this basis, promote initiative and enhance the responsibility of party organisations and all party members; improve the work of organisation conducted by party units and direct it to the solution of practical tasks of communist construction; improve the selection, training and allocation of cadres; heighten the role of the trade unions and the Young Communist League in accomplishing the tasks of communist construction.

3. Raise the level of ideological work in all party organisations, direct it to the solution of practical tasks of communist construction; ensure the creative assimilation by Communists of the theory and historical experience of the party; increase vigilance in our ideological work, wage an irreconcilable struggle against bourgeois ideology; intensify our efforts in communist education of the masses and in eliminating the survivals of capitalism in the minds of men; make fuller and more active use, to this end, of all ideological media—propaganda, agitation, the press, radio, cultural and educational organisations and institutions, science, literature and art.

## Conclusion

COMRADES, the Soviet people have travelled a great and glorious path. Under the leadership of their Communist Party, they have achieved great historical gains. Our victories have been won in grim battle with external and internal enemies. The Soviet people have overcome many difficulties and adversities, and they are consistently and firmly carrying out the plans for the transformation of the country, the majestic plans for developing the socialist economy.

The achievements of the Soviet Union hearten and inspire our people and all our friends. Even our enemies have been forced to change their tone. The first Soviet Five-Year Plan they greeted with irony and disbelief in the strength of the socialist state; now they are sounding the alarm. Today even the blind can see what gigantic results the working class, working peasantry, the entire people of the Soviet Union, have achieved. Having taken their destiny in their own hands and having created, under the leadership of the party, the world's first socialist state of workers and peasants, our people are working with might and main to build a communist society, thereby setting an inspiring example to all the peoples of the world.

The Soviet land is now forging rapidly forward. Speaking metaphorically we have risen to such summits, to such a height that we can already see before us broad vistas leading to our ultimate goal, communist society.

The path our country blazed to reach these heights was arduous and incredibly difficult. But no difficulty could make the Soviet people falter or break their will. The grim and courageous struggle they waged to overcome these difficulties further steeled the working folk of the Soviet land. The Soviet people consciously denied themselves much as regards food and clothing, housing and the comforts of life, and in many other respects. We are criticised for not always keeping up with the latest Paris fashions and still often wearing padded jackets which are not very flattering to the wearer, but we see this ourselves and admit that it is so.

We denied ourselves many things; we had no other way out. To retain and multiply the historical gains of the Great October Revolution, we had to create within the briefest possible space of time a mighty socialist industry, the foundation of foundations of the entire economy of the country and its defence power. We had radically to reconstruct agriculture, create new cadres of intellectuals drawn from the midst of the people, build a socialist society.

Time and again our enemies have sought to test the strength and vitality of the Soviet socialist state, but all these attempts have failed and the organisers of war gambles broke their necks in the process. The Soviet State is advancing from strength to strength, it towers like a mighty beacon showing mankind the way to the new world.

In the present Sixth Five-Year Plan period the Soviet Union will take a new great stride forward. While continuing to develop heavy industry, we are laying a broader basis for promoting those branches of the national economy which produce consumer goods.

Our party is full of creative strength, mighty energy, and inflexible resolve to achieve the great aim—the building of communism. In all human history there has not been, nor can there be, a loftier and nobler aim. Communism will bring about the fullest development of all the productive forces of

society; it will be a social system where all the fountains of social wealth will flow freely, where every individual will work with enthusiasm according to his abilities and be compensated for his labour according to his needs. On this basis the prerequisites will be created for the all-round development of the individual, of every member of the communist society.

That is why the ideas of communism possess a tremendous magnetic power and attract ever new supporters. There is nothing more absurd than the fiction that people are forced to take the path of communism under pressure from without. We are confident that the ideas of communism will triumph, and no "iron curtains" or barriers erected by the bourgeois reactionaries can halt their spread to more and more millions.

At the same time we firmly stand for peaceful co-existence, for economic competition between socialism and capitalism; we follow a consistent policy of peace and friendship among nations.

Our party has many enemies and ill-wishers, but it has a great many more tried and tested friends and loyal allies.

Our cause is invincible. It is invincible because, together with the great Soviet people, many hundreds of millions in fraternal People's China and in all the other people's democracies are carrying it forward. It is invincible because it enjoys the ardent support and sympathy of peoples and countries which broke out of national and colonial oppression. It is invincible because it is supported by the working people of the whole world. No one can intimidate us, compel us to withdraw from the positions we occupy, to renounce the defence of peace, democracy and socialism.

The future is with us, for we are confidently marching forward along the only correct path, the path charted for us by our teacher, great Lenin. Hundreds of millions of men and women, inspired by the ideas of a just social system, the ideas of democracy and socialism, are rallying around us and our friends.

Under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, which is transforming the world, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will lead the Soviet people to the complete triumph of communism.



---

---

*Published by Soviet News,  
3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7,  
and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.)  
Beechwood Rise, Watford Herts.*

---

---