

Speech by M. A. **S U S L O V**

Member of the Presidium of the Central
Committee of the C.P.S.U.

at the

20TH CONGRESS
of the Communist Party
of the Soviet Union

February 16
1956

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.



Soviet News
Booklet No. 9

2^{D.}

Scanned / Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus – London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>



SPEECH BY M. A. SUSLOV

*Member of the presidium of the central committee of the Communist
Party of the Soviet Union.*

16 February

COMRADES, in his report Comrade Khrushchov gave a clear, profound and comprehensive analysis of our party's activities in the period under review. He surveyed its outstanding successes, achieved under the leadership of the central committee, and formulated its tasks in the effort for the continued advance of communism.

The results of the central committee's activities are there for all to see. And in assessing these results our congress, the whole of our party, and all the men and women of the Soviet Union, have every reason to approve them with a feeling of the deepest pride and satisfaction.

The central committee proved itself equal to the gigantic tasks with which it had to contend in the period between the 19th and 20th Congresses. Its general line, both in home and foreign affairs, has been a correct and genuinely Leninist line.

For Lenin taught us that the party's policy can be successful only if it takes into consideration the requirements of the situation, only if the party is always in close contact with the realities of life. And if we examine the period between the congresses in this light, we can safely say that throughout these years the party, headed by its central committee, has been especially close to realities, to the people, has been especially far-seeing in judging the situation at home and abroad, has correctly sized up the requirements of that situation, displaying a creative approach to the solution of both economic and political problems.

The central committee's report fully reflects the creative, militant spirit which has been characteristic of our party's work since the 19th Congress, and that supreme degree of initiative and activity which is characteristic of the work of our central committee in marshalling the forces of the party and the people for the implementation of our political line.

The report sums up the impressive results of socialist construction both in this country and in the people's democracies, the results of the struggle waged by the progressive forces of the world for the easing of international tension, national independence and the democratic rights of the people, for lasting peace and universal security. Our people, and progressive people throughout the world, will derive from facts and figures cited in the report, and from the theoretical propositions it puts forward and the political conclusions it draws, fresh faith in the ultimate triumph of peace, democracy and socialism.

However, at the same time, the central committee's report, in complete conformity with the Leninist tradition, does not seek to conceal from the party and the people the shortcomings and defects in our work and the problems that still await a solution. This shows that our party is not

prepared to rest content with its achievements to date, and is setting new and still bigger tasks. A critical analysis of the work done is an indispensable condition of Bolshevik leadership. For only in this way can we avoid stagnation and stimulate a constant advance to what is new, better and progressive. We were taught that by the great Lenin.

"The important thing," he said, "is not to rest content with the ability acquired from past experience, but *always to move ahead*, always to *seek for more*, always to go from easier tasks to more difficult ones. Without this, there can be no progress in general, and no progress in socialist construction" (*Works*, Russian edition, Vol. 28, p. 172).

The Struggle for Lasting Peace and Socialism

COMRADES, the party's intense activity in the sphere of foreign policy during the period under review has been based on a profound understanding of the distinctive features of the present international situation and of the tasks that confront the progressive forces of mankind. On every single international problem that is agitating the minds of the peoples, the Soviet Union has stated its position and has contributed in a very large measure towards a solution.

In this sphere our party has been an active, guiding factor, constantly endeavouring to find practical and concrete solutions for all the problems on which the fate of peace depends. And as a result of this active peace policy of the Soviet Union and the joint actions of all the peaceloving nations, considerable progress has been attained in the settlement of many issues. On other issues, the Soviet proposals are definitely the most realistic and constructive, and if no settlement of these issues has so far been achieved, that is not our fault.

The implementation of Soviet foreign policy, formulated by our party, has always been strictly in keeping with principles; but at the same time it has been highly flexible. While resolutely repelling every attempt at dictation by certain powers, the Soviet Union has always shown its readiness to reach agreement, provided it is based on mutual respect for one another's interests.

The active efforts of the Soviet Union and other peaceloving nations have culminated in important results. First, there has been a definite measure of relaxation in the international tension that has existed for many years. Second, the forces of peace, democracy and socialism have considerably strengthened their positions. The international prestige and influence of the Soviet Union and of the entire socialist camp has increased substantially. On the other hand, the position of the imperialist camp has been considerably weakened. That is admitted, albeit reluctantly, even by such men as Mr. Acheson, a former U.S. Secretary of State. The *Washington Post and Times-Herald* recently quoted him as saying that "if we look around us we will be hard put to find any area in which the events of the past few years have not moved to our disadvantage".¹

The cause of peace has gained added strength in this past period through the extension of friendly contacts and co-operation between the Soviet Union and the peaceloving nations of Asia. And the peace forces have grown in strength and scope in the capitalist countries as well. Evidence

of this is provided, for instance, by the recent French elections, in which the parties of the left considerably extended and consolidated their position, both among the population generally and in parliament.

But, of course, it would be wrong to rest content with these results. Much more remains to be done to convert the present measure of relaxation of international tension into lasting peace. The people's struggle for peace can and must be raised to a higher plane, particularly in connection with the attempt now being made by certain elements in the West to revive the "cold war".

As for the Soviet Union, it will continue to be guided by Lenin's thesis that the socialist and capitalist systems can co-exist in peace. And it will continue its tireless efforts for the further relaxation of international tension and for the strengthening of peace, for this is completely in accordance with the interests of our peoples and with the interests of socialism.

The discussion at this congress on basic questions of internal and international development brings out with much greater clarity the meaning of our present-day struggle and the place it holds in history. The congress enables us to gain a deeper understanding of the trend of development in this age of momentous changes in the life of all nations, an age in which the imperialist system is collapsing and the world system of socialism is taking shape.

Such fundamental questions of contemporary international development as the peaceful co-existence of the two systems, the possibility of preventing war in our age, the forms which the transition to socialism will take in different countries, and our attitude toward Social-Democratic parties, posed in Comrade Khrushchov's report, are of immense importance.

The treatment of these questions in Comrade Khrushchov's report provides a concrete example of the creative application and development of the great teachings of Marxism-Leninism. Comrade Khrushchov has given convincing answers to questions uppermost in the minds of people everywhere—answers based on a Marxist analysis of the present international situation and of the epoch-making changes that have taken place since the war, and on a study of the new experience accumulated by our own party, the fraternal Communist Parties and the world workers' movement.

Comrade Khrushchov has demonstrated that, at the present state of history, the question of whether war is inevitable must be treated differently from the way it was treated before the First and Second World Wars. For today the correlation of forces on the world scene has changed radically in favour of the forces of peace, and against the forces of war. Certainly, inasmuch as imperialism still exists, there will also exist the economic basis that breeds wars, and for that reason the danger of the arch-reactionary monopoly interests precipitating fresh war gambles, particularly against socialist countries, is by no means eliminated. Consequently, there must be no complacency on this subject, no let-up of attention where the further strengthening of our country's defensive might is concerned. But there is now no fatal inevitability about war. For today, in the new historical conditions, there are powerful forces disposing of effective means for preventing the imperialists from unleashing war and—should they try to unleash it—for crushing the aggressors and ending the war, and with it the system of capitalism—a system which not only dooms the vast majority of the popu-

¹ Retranslated from the Russian.

lation, the workers, to cruel exploitation, virtual disfranchisement, malnutrition and poverty, but also to periodical bloodbaths.

The imperialist rulers cannot but take these new historical conditions into account. Yet, it is self-evident that the prevention of war and aggression is not an automatic process. War can be prevented only through a resolute struggle for peace, in which all the peace forces act in a united and vigorous way to ward off the menace of war and aggression, and display vigilance with regard to the fomentors of war, expose their designs in good time and keep the peoples on the alert and ready for action.

The knowledge that in this age war is no longer fatally inevitable, is no longer unavoidable, will undoubtedly stimulate further expansion of the peace movement and will be a source of inspiration to every peacemaker.

Of no less significance is the thesis expounded in Comrade Khrushchov's report on the variety of forms which the transition to socialism will assume in different countries.

The epoch-making changes in the international situation have produced more favourable conditions not only for the peace effort but also for the struggle for socialism, for the transition of non-socialist countries to socialism, facilitating a greater variety in the forms this transition will take in different countries.

The emergence and development of the socialist system in a whole number of countries has fully confirmed Lenin's brilliant forecast that, though the principal and basic features of the advance to socialism will be common and identical, the actual transition to socialism will not be the same in all countries, and each nation will make its own distinctive contribution in one or another form of democracy, one or another variety of proletarian dictatorship, one or another rate at which socialist transformations will be effected in the various aspects of social life.

The experience of countries where the socialist system has already been established has confirmed that the transition to socialism requires that political leadership of the state be in the hands of the working class headed by its vanguard. And it is recognition of this basic and decisive condition for the transition to socialism that constitutes the principal difference between revolutionary Marxists and reformists. Working class political leadership of the state is essential in order—within a shorter or longer period, depending on concrete conditions—to deprive the capitalist class of the means of production and convert them into public property, in order to organise successful resistance to possible attempts by the overthrown exploiting classes to restore their rule, and in order to organise socialist construction.

The march of events has likewise confirmed that in each of the socialist countries, though the basic features of their development have been the same, and though there is fraternal and mutual assistance and utilisation of experience, and notably the assistance and experience of the Soviet Union, there has also been much that has been constructively new and unique in the way the working class has won a decisive part in the administration of the state, and in the subsequent organisation of socialist construction.

The question naturally arises: What about the future? Will there be new forms of transition to socialism? That question is of cardinal importance. For the people's urge to socialism is irresistible, the power of attraction of

socialist ideas increases from day to day, and the process will be accelerated by the continued achievements of socialism in this country, in China and all the people's democracies. Progressive minds in many countries are, in this situation, giving thought to what paths their own peoples will follow in the change-over to socialism.

Comrade Khrushchov has given an absolutely clear, Marxist reply to that all-important question. It is quite probable that the transition to socialism in capitalist countries will produce a great multiplicity of forms. This will be an expression of the more favourable general situation, and of the concrete specific features pertaining in each country.

It would be wrong, however, to assert that under all circumstances the transition to socialism will inevitably be attended by civil war. In this respect very much depends on the relation of forces within the given country and on the international scene, on the degree of organisation and political understanding of the revolutionary classes, and on the strength of the resistance offered by the reactionary classes. When the proletariat of Russia directed the revolution in this country, it faced a united front of the imperialist powers. Today the progressive forces in other countries have a much more favourable prospect before them, for new conditions have taken shape in the capitalist world. The political struggle there centres around such issues as the defence of peace, the democratic freedoms and national independence. That being so, the working class and its political parties have every opportunity of uniting, on the basis of a common democratic platform, the overwhelming majority of the nation—the peasantry, the lower middle class, intellectuals, and even the patriotically minded sections of the bourgeoisie. This, obviously, will make the victory of the working class easier.

However, even in these conditions, in a number of capitalist countries, in those where the reactionary forces and the military and police machine are especially powerful, the transition to socialism will be attended by frenzied resistance from the exploiting classes, and, consequently, by sharp revolutionary struggle on the part of the working class. On the other hand, in those capitalist countries where the reactionary forces and the military and police machine are less powerful, the possibility of a peaceful course of the revolution and resultant transition to socialism is not to be ruled out. In particular, the possibility is not to be ruled out of the working class peacefully coming to power through a parliamentary majority and the conversion of parliament into a genuine people's assembly. Such a parliament, relying on the support of the mass revolutionary movement of the proletariat, the working peasantry and all progressive sections of the population, would be able to break the resistance of the reactionary forces and carry out the socialist transformation of society.

The enemies of communism depict Communists as confirmed believers in armed insurrection, violence and civil war under all circumstances. That is slanderous nonsense, an attempt to smear the Communists, and the working class which they represent. It stands to reason that the Communists and the working class prefer the least painful forms of transition from one social system to another. But the forms of this transition, as Comrade Khrushchov has demonstrated here, depend on concrete historical conditions. Moreover, the application of more peaceful or more violent methods depends not so

much on the working class as on the degree and form of resistance offered by the exploiting classes, which do not want voluntarily to relinquish their wealth, political power and other privileges.

The central committee's report sets forth the principles governing our party's attitude to Social-Democratic parties in the present stage.

No one will deny that the cleavage in the international labour movement, at a time when the energies of the peoples should be united to combat the war danger, is doubly impermissible. The movement is faced with problems of overwhelming importance, and on these we can find common ground with the Social Democrats. It should be possible, therefore, to establish working contact, closer relations and co-operation on these problems. Such a possibility arises, above all, from the fact that, in the present situation, the paramount issues confronting the labour movement are the defence of peace, national freedom and democracy. A leftward swing of the masses is to be observed in many capitalist countries. Peace-loving sentiments are strong among the vast majority of the rank and file of the Socialist Parties, Christian trade unions and other organisations.

It is to be hoped that the idea of unity will steadily gain support among the various sections of the working class and will find expression in practical action. But this will not happen of itself, spontaneously. It will depend largely on us Communists, on our efforts to attain this goal.

It would be hard to overestimate the importance of the theoretical propositions on pressing international problems set forth in the central committee's report. They will go a very long way towards consolidating the forces of progress; they will help all progressive people who are working to promote peace and replace the obsolete capitalist system by a new, progressive social system which will bring the peoples liberation from exploitation and war, from social and national oppression in whatever shape or form.

Party Organisational Work Must be Raised to the Level Demanded by the New Tasks

COMRADES, in the period under review the party dealt with questions relating to the country's internal development with no less vigour and initiative. This activity was based on a clear understanding of the pressing requirements for the further development of the country.

The party boldly laid bare shortcomings in the various fields of economic, government and party work. At a number of plenary meetings of the central committee it worked out a comprehensive programme for the rapid promotion of agriculture and improvement in the operation of industry. It called on the working people to make new efforts to reorganise the work of the collective farms, machine and tractor stations, state farms and industrial enterprises, and carried out a tremendous amount of organisational activity. One can safely say that the great economic undertakings now under way in our country are the biggest the party has embarked on since the period of industrialisation and collectivisation. The fact that in two years we were able to increase the crop area in our country by more than 30 million hectares¹—the equivalent of the crop area of a number of European countries taken together—shows that our party is today equal to tasks of the greatest magnitude.

¹ Nearly 75 million acres. 1 hectare = 2.47 acres.

The tremendous work done by the party is bearing fruit. In the field of agriculture the first big step has been taken in the matter of increasing the production of grain and industrial crops and in developing livestock breeding, and the conditions have been created for rapidly increasing, within the next few years, the output of agricultural produce on a scale commensurate with the country's growing requirements. The fulfilment of the Fifth Five-Year Plan in four years and four months in industry shows what tremendous potentialities are being revealed in this sphere of our national economy as well.

Basing ourselves on our accomplishments, we can now put forward new and gigantic tasks. We are in a position to develop at a rapid pace not only heavy industry, as the foundation of the entire national economy, but also the production of consumer goods, to increase public wealth considerably and on this basis substantially to improve the wellbeing of the people. These are the tasks set forth in the draft directives of the congress on the Sixth Five-Year Plan. The fulfilment of this plan will mean new and major successes in the socialist economy, a new and big step forward in creating an abundance of consumer goods, in building communism in our country.

Comrades, the Soviet people will welcome with great enthusiasm and redoubled efforts in production the measures outlined by the central committee of the party for a further improvement under the Sixth Five-Year Plan of working and living conditions of which Comrade Khrushchov spoke here: the introduction in the course of the Sixth Five-Year Plan of a seven-hour day for all factory, office and other workers, and a six-hour day for the basic underground trades in the coal and ore-mining industries, and for young people, without any reduction of wages; the reduction of the working day on Saturdays and on the eve of holidays by two hours in the near future; wage increases for lower-paid categories of workers and other employees; readjustment of pensions; a rapid expansion of housing construction (doubling the figure under the Fifth Five-Year Plan), and improvement of canteens and other establishments serving the public. All these measures will raise the wellbeing of Soviet people to a higher level. The party has thought of everyone: working people, the youth, who are our hope for the future, veteran workers, women, children, of each individual, and this is as it should be in a socialist society.

The measures projected are arousing widespread comment abroad. All right-minded people are as pleased about them as we are. But there are also those who do not like them. The publication of the new Soviet Five-Year Plan has gone against the grain with certain elements. These elements no longer doubt that this Soviet Five-Year Plan, too, will be carried out. Everyone now admits that. They are afraid of something else. This was frankly put recently by Judge W. Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court. "If Russia", he wrote, "can get peace even for a decade, she can bring about a great increase in her standard of living. By that very act, she can create tremendous pressure on Asia and on Europe too. . . . A smiling, peaceful, prosperous Russia presents a most difficult international problem. . . ."¹

Mr. Douglas is obviously made uneasy by the prospect of peaceful economic competition between the two social systems, and we have no

¹ Retranslated from the Russian.

intention of reassuring him. It is enough only to point out that a peaceful, prosperous Russia by no means presents a "most difficult international problem" for ordinary working people throughout the world, for they rightly regard the successes of the working people of the Soviet Union as victories of the great cause of peace, democracy and socialism.

The Sixth Five-Year Plan marks an important stage in the peaceful economic competition between the two systems. A specific feature of this stage is the fact that the Soviet Union now enjoys all the necessary prerequisites for accomplishing, within a historically brief space of time, the basic economic task of the U.S.S.R.—to catch up with and surpass the most highly developed capitalist countries in production per head of the population.

In order to carry out this task we must see to it that the entire national economy is raised to a new and higher technical level, and substantially increase the productivity of labour. This is now the main requirement in order to ensure for socialism the first place in the competition with capitalism. Hence the economic aspects of production assume greater importance than ever.

Economic management, the work of the Ministries and heads of enterprises, collective farms, machine and tractor stations, and state farms must be raised to a higher level.

In these conditions specific demands are presented also to the party organisations.

Our party came to its 20th Congress united and monolithic as never before. The party's correct political line and the inexhaustible energy it puts into its work for the good of the working people have rallied the entire Soviet people around it as never before, and strengthened still further the alliance between the working class and the peasantry and the great, indestructible friendship of the peoples of our country.

Ideological and organisational unity of the party is the basic guarantee of its strength and the source of all its successes. Only because of the unity of its ranks has the Communist Party been able to deal successfully with the problems of both foreign and home policy, and to direct economic and cultural development.

The restoration of the standards of party life and principles of party leadership worked out by Lenin, which were often violated before the 19th Party Congress, has done much to strengthen the unity of the party and enhance its activity, initiative and militancy.

The theory and practice of the cult of the individual which, though alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, was current before the 19th Congress did considerable harm in the fields of both organisational and ideological party work. They tended to minimise the role of the masses and the party, to belittle collective leadership, to undermine inner-party democracy, to suppress the activity of party members and their initiative and incentive, to lead to lack of control, irresponsibility and even arbitrariness in the work of individuals, to prevent the development of criticism and self-criticism, and to give rise to one-sided and sometimes even erroneous solutions of problems.

Re-establishment of the Leninist principle of collective leadership means re-establishment of the very foundations on which the party edifice rests, for our party is a living and self-acting organisation. Collective leadership,

the principle that all party bodies are elected and accountable, criticism and self-criticism—these are all key conditions for stimulating initiative and the activity of party members, disclosing mistakes and shortcomings and devising ways and means of rectifying them.

That the principle of collective leadership at all levels, from the central committee to basic party units, is now being effectively re-established, is borne out by the increased volume of criticism and self-criticism, by really collective discussion and decisions on all major problems in party bodies. It can be said without the slightest doubt that the principle of collective leadership has been fully re-established in the central committee. The decision on all major questions rests with the plenum of the central committee, which meets regularly and which represents a broad, collectively functioning party centre that maintains the closest contact with the vital sectors of communist construction. The collective experience of the central committee, based as it is on Marxism-Leninism, guarantees correct leadership of the party and the country and the indestructible unity of the party ranks.

The cult of the individual, both in theory and practice, must be completely overcome, and party committees must in all their work be guided unswervingly by the principle of collective leadership. Its significance must be fully understood and appreciated by every party functionary for it is a most important condition for party unity, for working out correct policies and successfully implementing them. It is a condition, also, for the proper training of cadres, and for improvement in every aspect of party work.

The unity, solidity and effectiveness of the party depend largely on the composition of its membership.

The party does not accept everyone who wishes to join its ranks. It takes into its midst the most forward-looking and active men and women and regulates the admittance of new members in accordance with the tasks it has to solve at any given stage. In the years of industrialisation and collectivisation of agriculture, the party admitted mainly workers and peasants to membership. During the war preference was given to the men at the battle-fronts. I need hardly prove that today, when our goal is a steep rise in the output of material values, it is only reasonable to lay emphasis on priority acceptance of the men and women who produce these material values—the workers and collective farmers.

What is the position with regard to recruitment? It should be observed that in the past two years the proportion of workers and collective farmers among new members has increased, as compared with earlier years.

Yet in many party organisations the proportion of workers and collective farmers among newly admitted members is very small. And what is more, we often find that the proportion varies considerably in party organisations working under nearly the same conditions. The amount of industry in the Sverdlovsk and Novosibirsk regions is practically the same. However, in the Sverdlovsk organisation, the proportion of workers among new recruits last year was 47.2 per cent, and in Novosibirsk 32.2 per cent. In the Omsk region, collective farmers made up 31.7 per cent of the new members, whereas in Stalingrad region the figure was only 11.4 per cent. What is the explanation for the proportion of workers in Novosibirsk being lower than in Sverdlovsk, and for the lower proportion of collective farmers in Stalingrad as compared with Omsk? The only explanation is that the Novosibirsk and Stalin-

grad regional party organisations have not paid sufficient attention to this matter. Unfortunately, this also applies to a number of other party organisations.

It should be borne in mind that the success of any undertaking depends to a large extent on the composition of the party organisation. And party organisations must be more exacting in regulating the admission of new members and must radically increase the proportion of workers and collective farmers among new recruits.

There is no need, of course, to emphasise the importance of our organisational work, or to stress that it is a prime factor in all our activities and in the accomplishment of the impressive economic tasks outlined in the Sixth Five-Year Plan. That is why the need to improve the quality of leadership, notably at district level, is now so imperative.

In his report, Comrade Khrushchov revealed the serious shortcomings in the functioning of local party committees: an inclination towards grandiloquent declarations, armchair leadership, management without a proper study of economic problems, inability to organise the masses to eliminate shortcomings, overcome difficulties and apply the experience of front-rank workers and the achievements of science in industry and agriculture.

Regional, territorial, town and district committees have somewhat improved their work following the central committee's demand that an end be put to bureaucratic methods of leadership. There are fewer meetings and conferences. Party officials pay more frequent visits to factories, collective and state farms, and machine and tractor stations, and are doing more to help them to organise their work properly. But all too little has been accomplished in this respect. Unfortunately, there are still not a few party organisations whose officials devote most of their time and energies not to the living work of organisation but to endless conferences and to the composition of reams of records, circulars etc. There is no need to say what such work is worth. For all these endless meetings and these voluminous records bring no practical results. The secretary of the Makhovsk District Party Committee (Vitebsk region, Byelorussia), Comrade Ignatenko, declared at the regional party conference: "For ten years now our district and a number of others have been criticised at every meeting and conference for lagging behind. In these ten years there have been nineteen district committee secretaries and six chairmen of the district Soviet's executive committee. Nine commissions came to investigate and study the situation on the spot, but for all that the district continues to lag behind. To all practical purposes, neither the regional party committee nor the regional Soviet have done anything concrete to help the district."

This penchant for record-writing is spreading to basic party units as well. And often enough with the encouragement of district party committees, which demand "full-length" minutes of meetings and conferences, all manner of data, statistics and so on. The result is that some unit secretaries devote all their time not to the work of organisation but to the penning of all these records and minutes.

Here is a case in point—Comrade Rustamov, secretary of the party organisation at the Kirov Collective Farm, Shamkhor district, Azerbaijan. His desk and bookcase are piled high with folders and ledgers. He keeps a record of party work among women, of work among new party members, of

how the party helps the Young Communist League organisation, lists of complaints submitted by collective farmers, of assignments to party members, a record of the progress of party education, attendance at political classes and amateur art circles. He has dossiers labelled: "Wall Newspapers", "Flash Bulletins", "Emulation Drive in Cattle Breeding", "Emulation Drive in Field Work", "Forest Friends Society". The work of party lecturers is recorded in three separate ledgers: "Tabulation of Work Done by Lecturers", "Mass Political Work", "Daily Assignments for Lecturers". You can just imagine how much time is spent on this pen-pushing which, of course, keeps the secretary away from the living work of organisation. And yet, in the collective farms, no educational work is conducted with milkmaids and cowmen. There is no mechanisation, no daily work schedule, or feed ration for the animals. Productivity is extremely low: the milk yield per cow for the year was only 484 litres.¹ And, of course, the secretary's dossiers yield no milk at all—in this respect they have proved hopelessly sterile.

The work of the party apparatus must be improved, and every vestige of bureaucracy must be rooted out. Party organisations must concentrate on work among the masses. They must turn their attention—and very resolutely—to giving competent, concrete leadership, to effectively organising the propaganda and application of front-rank experience and the achievements of science in the work of every factory, collective and state farm and machine and tractor station.

The party apparatus must be reduced: it should consist of a small number of efficient and knowledgeable workers. The central committee has reduced its apparatus by 25 per cent. We have, I think, thereby made a beginning for further reductions. There should be a reduction in the apparatus of the central party committees in the Union Republics, and of regional, territorial, town and district party committees. Their work will only benefit from this.

In this connection, I would like to say a few words about political departments in civilian organisations. In their day, when they were first instituted, they played a certain positive part, but at the present time they have proved of little value and tend to duplicate the work of territorial party bodies. Comrade Khrushchov rightly drew attention to the technical backwardness on the railways. It stands to reason that the officials of the railway political departments must share responsibility for this state of affairs. For certainly it was their duty to raise the question of technical backwardness in the railway system. But have they raised their voices, have they so much as whispered about the need for technical progress on the railways? No. Evidently the time is ripe for liquidating these political departments.

End the Harmful Divorce of Ideological Work From Life

COMRADES, in the report of the central committee Comrade Khrushchov gave a comprehensive analysis of the ideological work of party organisations. He showed that the main failing now is that this work is to a great extent divorced from life, that the people who carry it on are unable to draw general conclusions from advanced methods of communist

¹ About 106 gallons.

construction which have stood the test of life and popularise those methods among the masses, and also that they do not combat to a sufficient degree negative phenomena that hinder our progress. That was correct and just criticism.

The party regards ideological work as an integral part of all its activities in building communism. Its main purpose is to give practical help in the building of communism, raising labour productivity, enhancing the socialist consciousness of the masses in every way, in relentlessly fighting against the survivals of capitalism in the minds of people, against bourgeois ideology and morals, arming the working people, and first and foremost the leading cadres, with Marxist-Leninist theory, and creatively developing this theory.

Yet our ideological work is insufficiently concentrated on accomplishing all these big tasks and to a large extent it is being conducted to no purpose; it is reduced to learning by rote the same well-known formulas and propositions, and not infrequently it brings up doctrinaires and dogmatists who are divorced from life.

Our propaganda has been in a large measure directed into the past, into history, to the detriment of present-day problems. Moreover, the history of our party has been taught so that the experience of history has not helped in understanding current problems properly. The situation is bad as regards the propaganda of economic knowledge and the experience of front-rank workers, engineers, collective farmers, the best industrial establishments, collective farms, state farms and teams.

And so in the party educational system millions of Communists have studied for many years on end the erroneous views of the Narodniks, Economists and Bundists, but have not learned how to combat the survivals of capitalism in the minds of the people in our country and how to expose our present-day ideological enemies in the international arena; they have not studied the economic processes in the country, the experience of innovators, of the best industrial establishments and collective farms, and the achievements of science so as to manage economic affairs with greater efficiency, raise labour productivity, increase the production of material values and cope more successfully with other tasks of communist construction.

Many rank-and-file Communists, too, realise the abnormal nature of this situation. Comrade Ignatov, a combine operator of the Mikhailovskaya Machine and Tractor Station, Stalingrad region, put it very well: "For the thirteenth year now I have been attending a party history circle. For the thirteenth time the propagandists are telling us all about the Bund. But have we no affairs that are more important than criticising the Bund? We are interested in the affairs of our machine and tractor station, district and region. We want to know about the present and the future, but our propagandists are so bogged down in the Narodnik and Bund business that they simply cannot get out of it."

Party propaganda has, in this way, thus begun to lose its militant Bolshevik spirit.

Most of our propagandists are poorly versed in the economics of socialist production. Very often they are guided and trained by people who likewise do not know production or have a very general idea about it. What is the way out? The way out is resolutely to draw our leading economic, party

and government workers into the propaganda work, especially propaganda concerned with economic knowledge.

Greater demands must be made of propagandists. We should not go after numbers but select people who are really able to dovetail our propaganda with the practical tasks of economic and cultural development.

At the same time it is necessary to work constantly with the propagandists as well, bearing in mind that the best of them can "run dry", if party bodies do not give them guidance, do not direct their attention to urgent tasks and do not help them with advice and provide them with concrete data and facts. The system of training and advanced training for propagandists has to be reorganised so that it should be possible to equip them with the necessary knowledge in the spheres of industry and agriculture.

It is not only our propaganda, unfortunately, that is divorced from life and lags behind it; this is largely the case on the theoretical front as well.

Let us take, for instance, the economic sciences. At the present stage the study of the deep-going processes of our society's economic development should be the chief, decisive trend in the study and development of Marxist thought. This does not imply that less attention should be given to the study of the past revolutionary experience of the party or to Marxist-Leninist philosophy. But Soviet society has entered a stage in its development when the main attention should be concentrated on the study and elaboration of economic science, since it is the knowledge of the objective laws of development of socialist economy that enables us, first and foremost, to make use of these laws to accelerate the building of communism.

The publication of the textbook of political economy is a favourable development in this sphere. But a textbook alone is not enough, and as regards serious scientific works containing a creative study of economic processes, there are, unfortunately, very few of them as yet.

Some economists have made serious mistakes in their works. The party had to correct a number of ill-starred economists who were spreading anti-Marxist views on the need to slow down the pace of development of heavy industry. The denial by economists of the category of moral depreciation of machinery under socialism did serious harm, for it provided theoretical justification for stagnation and conservatism in technology.

Economists do not make an adequate study of the operation of the law of value in socialist production. That our architects, carried away by extravagances, have not worked out what this will cost the people and that personnel of machine and tractor stations and collective farms still very often do not work out the cost of a ton of grain or meat is undoubtedly due in some measure to the fact that our economists have not elaborated the problem of how the law of value operates concretely in our economy.

The scientific study and elaboration of problems of economics in particular branches of the national economy is in a neglected state. The U.S.S.R. has more than forty research institutions whose task it is to study the economics of agricultural production. They have done very little, however, to summarise the wealth of experience accumulated by the collective and state farms. Publication of a textbook on agricultural economics and also of a textbook on industrial economics has dragged out much too long.

In the sphere of philosophy, too, theoretical thought is divorced from the

urgent tasks of our life, of communist construction.

Dogmatism and doctrinairism have become widespread, because a section of the economists and philosophers have held aloof from practical life. The essence of the evil disease of doctrinairism is not simply that those infected with it cite quotations all the time, whether they fit in or not; they regard as the supreme criterion of their correctness not practical experience but the pronouncements of authorities on this or that question. They lose the taste for studying real life. Everything is replaced by the culling of quotations and artful manipulation of those quotations. The slightest deviation from a quotation is regarded as a revision of fundamental principles. This activity of the doctrinaires is not merely futile, it is harmful.

There is no doubt that the cult of the individual has greatly promoted the spread of dogmatism and doctrinairism. Worshippers of the cult of the individual ascribed the development of Marxist theory only to certain personalities and relied entirely on them. As for all the other mortals, allegedly they had to assimilate and popularise what was created by those personalities. The role of the collective thinking of our party and that of fraternal parties in developing revolutionary theory, the role of the collective experience of the masses of the people was thus ignored.

The party has never tolerated dogmatism, but the struggle against it has become especially acute at the present time. Present-day developments make the task of creatively developing Marxism more pressing than ever. Each day of building communism in our country and building socialism in the people's democracies brings to the fore ever new problems, which should be illuminated by theory. Gigantic changes are taking place all over the world and many problems now appear in a new light. In order to keep in step with life it is imperative to elaborate new problems in a scientific way, further to enrich and develop Marxism. Lenin, in drawing attention to the creative nature of Marxism, stressed that "we do not regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary we are convinced that it has only laid the cornerstone of the science which socialists *must* further advance in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life" (*Works* (Russian edition), Vol. 4, p. 191).

It is this task that now confronts us, and, in particular, our economists and philosophers. The party expects them to create fundamental scientific works based on a summary of the vast experience of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and the people's democracies and a deep-going analysis of the processes taking place in present-day capitalism—works which could be of theoretical help to government, economic and party cadres. Of course, when Marxists speak of advancing revolutionary theory by summarising the new practical experience and the achievements of the whole of science, they always mean the further development and enrichment of Marxism-Leninism on the basis of its bedrock principles, in uncompromising struggle against all attempts to revise these principles.

The shortcomings in our ideological work are very serious and the party cannot tolerate them.

It is the duty of all party organisations, from top to bottom, to eliminate these shortcomings, to secure a sharp turn in our ideological work towards life, practical activities, concrete questions of communist construction; propaganda and agitation should be closely linked, in the first place, with the tasks

confronting each industrial establishment or collective farm in increasing the production of material values.

We must constantly work to enhance the socialist consciousness of the working people, to answer the urgent and pressing questions they raise; we must not relax the struggle against the survivals of capitalism in the minds of people, and we must resolutely expose the reactionary ideology of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Aiming at the further easing of international tension and strengthening of peace, we must not curtail our criticism of bourgeois ideology, imperialism and colonialism; on the contrary, in order to achieve these aims we must intensify our criticism, expose the aggressive ideology and policy of imperialism with convincing examples and facts, lay bare the exploiting essence of the capitalist system, contrasting this doomed system with the socialist system, revealing the latter's immense advantages and lofty and exalted principles and aims.

We must once again invest our ideological work with the Bolshevik militancy and purposefulness developed by the party throughout decades, and this work should be subordinated to the struggle for the triumph of communism.

The party will continue to display tireless concern for propaganda and the creative development, on the basis of new experience, of Marxist-Leninist theory, which is the scientific foundation of all our policies and all our activities, the indispensable guide for the building of communism.

* * *

Comrades, it is difficult to overestimate the historic significance of the present congress. The congress is opening up before our party, country and the Soviet people sweeping, breath-taking prospects in building communism which arouse feelings of joy and pride. The tasks we face are magnificent and we have inexhaustible potentialities for their successful accomplishment. A wonderful life is unfolding before the Soviet people. In the near future our socialist motherland will become still greater and mightier politically, economically and culturally. And by its side other fraternal socialist countries, the entire great socialist commonwealth will grow, become stronger and prosper.

Our party faces these splendid prospects monolithically united, militant and filled with great creative energies. It enjoys the undivided love and support of the whole Soviet people and is armed with the wise and invincible teaching of Marxism-Leninism.

There can be no doubt that after its 20th Congress the party will achieve still greater victories in its work for the further progress of our motherland, for peace among the nations, for the triumph of communism in our country.

FURTHER BOOKLETS on the 20th CONGRESS OF THE C.P.S.U.

In this series (price 2d each) the
speeches of

G. M. Malenkov

A. I. Mikoyan

V. M. Molotov

D. T. Shepilov

Report by N. S. KHRUSHCHOV 4d.

**Report by N. A. BULGANIN and
Directives of the Sixth Five-Year Plan 6d.**

*Available from Newsagents and bookshops, or direct from
Soviet News, 3 Rosary Gardens, S.W.7*