

MARXISM-LENINISM IS OUR BANNER, OUR FIGHTING WEAPON

Full text of the speech made by Nikita Khrushchov, First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, to a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., held in Moscow on June 18-21, 1963, to discuss "Present Tasks in the Party's Ideological Work."

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>



MARXISM-LENINISM IS OUR BANNER, OUR FIGHTING WEAPON

Speech by Nikita Khrushchov, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee on June 21, 1963

DEAR Comrades, our plenary meeting has been working in a sound and stimulating atmosphere. Many valuable ideas and suggestions have been put forward in the constructive report by Comrade Ilyichov and in the speeches by party leaders and workers in science, literature and the arts.

Since the leaders of the Communist Party of China had exacerbated in the extreme their differences with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the entire international communist movement, it was decided to inform the members of the central committee, our party and government leadership, about those actions which the leaders of the Communist Party of China had undertaken to exacerbate the relations between the Communist Party of China, on the one hand, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the entire international communist movement, on the other. The presidium of the C.P.S.U. central committee requested Comrades Suslov, Andropov and Ponomaryov to explain in detail the essence of the differences between the central committee of the Communist Party of China, on the one hand, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal parties, on the other, and to present our party's views concerning the further consolidation of the international communist movement at the forthcoming meeting of representatives of the C.P.S.U. central committee and of the central committee of the Communist Party of China.

A profound understanding of the problems facing the Communist Party and the Soviet people in the education of all working people in the spirit of communism has been characteristic of all the speeches at the plenary meeting.

The main aims of our entire ideological work at the present stage are the education of all working people in the spirit of noble ideals and loyalty to communism, the fostering of a communist attitude to work and social production, the complete overcoming of the vestiges of bourgeois views and customs, the versatile and harmonious development of personality, and the creation of a genuinely rich spiritual culture. This is how the main line of our ideological work is defined in the party's programme.

The higher the consciousness of the members of socialist society, the wider scope there will be for their creative activity in the creation of the material and

technical basis of communism, in the development of communist forms of work and new relations between people, and the more rapidly and successfully will the problems connected with the building of communism be solved.

This is why it was considered necessary to call a plenary meeting of the central committee to discuss the problems of the party's ideological work under the present conditions of the building of communism.

There is no doubt that our plenary meeting, which is noteworthy for its high ideological level, will have a great effect in improving all ideological educational work in the country.

The speakers here have referred to the vital problems facing the party and the people. It is a pleasure to note that complete unanimity and monolithic unity reign supreme, not only among the speakers, but also among all those attending the meeting.

THE LENINIST PARTY IS THE LEADER AND ORGANISER OF THE PEOPLE

OUR party has rallied the entire Soviet people around the banner of Marxism-Leninism and has directed their efforts to the great cause of the construction of communism, and it is confidently leading the country along the only correct road to the great goal—the triumph of communism. The Communist Party, founded and tempered by the great Lenin, is a tremendous force, comrades. Without the party we would be an unorganised mass. The entire existence and activity of our Leninist party is an inspiring example of service to the working class, to the working people, an example of heroic struggle for their vital interests. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the militant vanguard of the people, their collective leader and organiser. The party and the people are inseparable. True to its revolutionary Leninist traditions, the party organises and inspires the people for great achievements and exploits. It is only thanks to the wise leadership of the Leninist party that we won in the socialist revolution, defended Soviet power and scored immense successes in building socialism and communism and in the development of our economy, science and culture, successes that all progressive mankind now takes pride in.

Our enemies know and sense the power of our party. They have always concentrated and are continuing to concentrate their main efforts on attempts to destroy the party and thereby deprive the Soviet people of their guiding and organising force. But to destroy the party does not necessarily mean destroying physically the members of the party. Just as a man can be deprived of his heart or soul, our enemies reason, so, too, can the party be deprived of its ideas, of its revolutionary Marxist-Leninist ideology, that is to say, of what cements, unites and rallies all communists.

People of different age, sex, colour of skin and nationality, people engaged in different branches of industrial or agricultural production, soldiers protecting the Soviet people's peaceful work, and workers in science, literature and the arts are united on a single ideological basis, on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. We communists are all united by the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism. The party's inviolable ideological and organisational unity is a source of its strength and invincibility.

Many different parties have existed and exist in the world. But the Com-

munist Parties, the workers' Marxist-Leninist parties, parties such as ours, hold a special place among them. Our party is strong because the communists firmly believe that the great cause of communism will triumph and because our party is always guided by Marxist-Leninist theory. Viewing the future, the party reveals to the people scientifically charted routes of progress, instills enormous energy in the masses of the people and leads them to great achievements. The enemies of socialism have broken many a tooth in their struggle against our country. They have long come to realise that the main force which ensures the correct guidance of the entire building of socialism and communism, which makes it organised, planned and revolutionary in scope and ensures all its successes, is the Communist Party, its scientifically substantiated policy, revolutionary ideology and revolutionary philosophy—Marxist-Leninist theory.

In his speech at the plenary meeting, one of the most venerable Soviet writers, Konstantin Alexandrovich Fedin, spoke very well about the party, about its role in the life of our society and in the development of literature and the arts. All comrades present at the plenary meeting listened to his stirring speech with great attention because he found apt words and descriptive similes, because he spoke with great conviction, sincerity and force about our party, about the inseparable connection the Soviet writers and workers in the arts have with the party and the people, about the great power of socialist realism, about the unity of the older and younger generations of the Soviet people. He gave a sound rebuff to those who would inculcate in the minds of our creative intelligentsia false ideas running counter to the principles of allegiance to the party and affinity with the people underlying Soviet literature and the arts, to those spreading allegations by bourgeois propaganda about the creative intelligentsia's isolation from the party and the people.

The Communist Party is the recognised and well-tryed leader of the people, comrades. The party is the organiser of the people, and I should say, the architect of the new society, the guiding and leading force of Soviet society. The party works out the best organisational forms of development of the state and society. Rallying the most advanced representatives of the working class and all working people and inseparably linked with the masses of the people, the party always listens to the voice of the people and consults them on major issues of home and foreign policies. At each new stage the party reorganises its ranks, and those links in its organisational structure that are outdated are replaced with new ones, so that our entire work may be done better and the party and the people may use their potentialities more fully in the great cause of building communism. The party exists for the people, and it is in its service to the people that it sees the meaning of its activity.

I have several times had occasion to say that among us there are many people who have no party cards but adhere wholeheartedly to the principle of allegiance to their party—just as there are people who have party cards but have no longer anything in common with the party except party cards.

Konstantin Alexandrovich Fedin is not a member of the party, but his principles are fundamentally the principles of the party. However, the writer Victor Nekrasov—whom I do not know personally—although he is a member of the party, has lost the valuable quality of a communist, has lost his sense of allegiance to his party.

This should not surprise us, however. Allegiance to the principles of the

party is not an innate quality, but is fostered by life. Unstable persons may, even if they are members of the party, lose all sense of allegiance to the party's principles under the impact of hostile ideology. What surprises me in the case of Nekrasov is something else. He has been steeped so deeply in his ideological fallacies, he has changed so much, that he no longer recognises what the party requires. What does this mean? It means that he goes against the line laid down by our party. This throws a different light on the matter.

Every communist is entitled to his opinion, but when the party adopts a decision, maps out a general line, then all members of the party adhere to that line and do what has been worked out by the collective thought and will of the party. If a person who regards himself as a party member still holds a wrong view after the party has expressed and defined its attitude to the issue, if he still persists, he in fact ceases to be a member of the party. The party should get rid of such people who set their personal delusions above the decisions of the party—the entire great army of single-minded people. The sooner the party gets rid of such people the better, since it will become stronger and more united in the process.

Semyon Mikhailovich Budyonny, who is taking part in the work of our plenary meeting, knows only too well that a fighter's sabre must always be kept clean. If the sabre gets rusty, the soldier must throw it away and get a new one. The same holds good for our ideological weapon. Even more carefully must it be kept free of any rust and be ideally clean.

Some tourist may go to America, see that side of it shown to him zealously by people specially appointed for the purpose, and back home think: That is what it's like, that America! When such a person deludes only himself this is merely half the trouble. It is far worse if he spreads everywhere his incorrect views and impressions, imposed on him by a hostile ideology, as the only truthful views. What should be done in that case? Evidently such people who have risen to the bait of bourgeois propaganda should be corrected. The Soviet people are correcting them. It should be borne in mind that there are only a few such people among us—scores or perhaps hundreds. Millions, tens of millions of Soviet people, the entire people, see through the guiles of our class enemies, who bitterly hate socialism and communism.

The Soviet system and communist ideology have withstood all kinds of enemy attacks, all tests and trials. We hold firmly to our revolutionary Marxist-Leninist positions. Here we have stood, here we stand and here we shall stand, since these are the only correct positions. We have always condemned as yes-men of our enemies those people who slide into the positions of our class enemies and try to drag some unstable persons into the morass of the ideology of imperialism hostile to us. We say to such people: Either stand firm under our common Marxist-Leninist banner of builders of communism, a banner which asserts peace, work, freedom, equality, fraternity and happiness for all peoples, or clear off and don't make capital out of the noble title of party member.

Comrades, communist ideology, Marxist-Leninist teaching, is, to put it figuratively, the cement which binds the will and actions of millions, the party and the people into a single monolithic whole. I see many engineers present here. I see my old friend, Comrade Kucharenko, a well-known builder. Like all builders he knows very well that the strongest monolithic structures are created out of small particles of road metal, gravel and sand

bound by top-quality cement. Our people know how to make grades of cement as strong as granite.

The same holds true for our ideology. The party, its ideology, its Marxist-Leninist teaching, its organisational unity, is that binding material which converts millions of separate particles, separate individuals, into a powerful monolithic whole.

The strength of the party and its Marxist-Leninist ideology has been tested by life. For more than 60 years our party has been successfully fighting for the cause of the people, guided, as it has been, by the immortal teachings of Marxism-Leninism. Led by its great founder and leader, V. I. Lenin, the Communist Party brought the working class, the working people, to the greatest victory in October 1917 and organised the people for the defence of the Soviet country in the Civil War and the war against Hitlerism, and it has scored successes in peaceful constructive effort which have amazed the entire world.

The strength of our party is known both by our friends and by our enemies. Our friends are proud of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union but our enemies fear it. You have probably read more than once that the ideologists of the capitalist world are saying regretfully that capitalism has no ideas attractive to the masses of the people which would consolidate them like the great faith in communism, faith in the inevitable triumph of the ideals of communism, consolidates the working people.

We have no ideology uniting the people, we have to think up something, the most prominent politicians of monopoly capital confess. Capitalism, so to speak, is not a force of attraction but a force of repulsion.

Yes, Messrs. Imperialists, imperialism has fully revealed its brutal essence. No make-up will conceal the incurable ulcers and evils of that system of exploitation and oppression of the peoples, a system hostile to the peoples. No matter how the imperialists and monopolists may describe their world, be it "people's capitalism" or society of "free enterprise," and no matter what attire they may dress it in, nothing can conceal the anti-popular essence of capitalism and imperialism.

The world of socialism is demonstrating to the peoples of the globe its undeniable advantages over the old, outgoing world of capitalism. Thousands upon thousands of examples graphically show the advantages of socialism to the peoples. This does not mean that the world of imperialism will leave the historical arena voluntarily. No! Though imperialism is doomed, it still hopes to arrest the development of socialism, to contaminate the minds of the peoples with the poison of disbelief in the forces of communism.

A DECISIVE STRUGGLE SHOULD BE WAGED AGAINST BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY

MARXISM-LENINISM teaches the working people to understand correctly the processes at work in society today. The peoples are coming to realise ever more clearly that it was not in vain that the great path was traversed—a path drenched in the blood of fighters for the people's happiness, a path of illustrious victories and temporary setbacks—before communism, once nothing but a dream, could become the greatest power of our time, a society actually being built over vast expanses of the globe.

The new world has not only been born but is growing and becoming stronger, and it has already rallied behind its banners a third of the population of our planet. Surely we can be proud of this, comrades!

For all that there are still people who rise to the bait of bourgeois propaganda and try to disparage the theory and practice of our communist construction. We cannot and must not tolerate this sort of thing, and we should give a decisive rebuff to the attacks and slander of those who would like to undermine the people's trust in the party.

Incidentally, these people often try to undermine it, not directly, but by throwing out such apparently innocent slogans as peaceful co-existence in the sphere of ideology.

We have never concurred with such views, since we have always approached problems of ideology from the class angle. We fight what is harmful to our cause. Every peasant knows that the worst enemies of his fields are sowthistle, couchgrass and other weeds. Therefore he carefully protects his crops against the weeds. He protects and grows his crops, but he destroys the weeds mercilessly. The same holds good for society. We must grow and protect everything new, everything revolutionary, everything strengthening the people, and decisively fight what interferes with our movement forward, what interferes with the strengthening of our people, what is directed against our party and its life-asserting ideology.

I have said that the Marxist-Leninist ideology, the organisational unity of the party, is, to put it figuratively, the cement binding the party into a monolithic whole. The opposite of cement is salt. If you throw a handful of salt into a concrete solution you will have no binding and the concrete will crumble away. Peaceful ideological co-existence is a salt of this kind.

Our enemies want to throw this salt into our ideology when they call for peaceful co-existence in the sphere of ideology. Why? Because they dream, waking and sleeping, of undermining, of weakening the influence of the party among the people, that is to say, of depriving the masses of the people of their organising and guiding force. They have no power to undermine the party from within. All such attempts of our enemies have failed. Now they are trying their best to destroy the revolutionary soul of the party, to disparage Marxist-Leninist ideology and weaken its influence on the creative intelligentsia, on the entire people, and thus to dismember the living body, the single organism of the party.

To agree to the peaceful co-existence of communist and bourgeois ideologies means to enable the enemy to belittle everything precious to us, to encourage slander, to promote the corruption of the people's mentality, to destroy our organisation and hamper our progress in every way possible. We have been fighting and we shall continue to fight relentlessly not only against putrid bourgeois ideology but also its agents in our midst, as agents of our class enemies.

I think that everyone understands that we should always be vigilant and rebuff those who would insist on the view, a view alien to us, in favour of peaceful co-existence in the sphere of ideology.

I hope no one will blame me for not mentioning the names of the comrades who signed the letter which put forward the harmful thesis on ideological peaceful co-existence. I know some of these comrades very well. I hardly think they were in their right minds when they signed this letter. We do

not doubt their honesty. Probably, after some hard thinking, they withdrew the letter, and when their friends asked them how it had all come about they replied: "The devil knows!"

We want no devil among either party or non-party people. We want the consciousness and duty of a party member to be stronger than any devil. Only such a member of the party can really be a militant communist.

The enemies of communism have been unable to break us in open military conflict. Recall the years of the Civil War and foreign intervention, or the hard period of the Great Patriotic War. Recall the time when the United States of America had a monopoly in nuclear weapons. These are all stages in our life and struggle, comrades.

Many of you have probably seen that remarkable film *The Russian Miracle*. Seeing the film one can't help thinking: "This is what we were like, and yet we have survived." And we have not merely survived, but were the first to establish a workers' and peasants' state, were the first to build socialism, were the first to reach outer space.

We, the older generation, perceive the film differently from the young people who know this period only from books. In some of them that time probably evokes fear. The fact is that the German film producers, the Thorndikes, used only documentaries, without recourse to actors. In us, who witnessed that period, the film evokes respect and pride, since we recall the remarkable people of that day, heroes of labour and battle. Yes, those were hard times, yet the difficulties did not oppress us. On the contrary, surmounting those difficulties instilled enthusiasm and pride, and now, too, all this elevates the spirit of the people and gives them a feeling of vigour.

When one sees this film one cannot help recalling those who label as "varnishers" the workers in literature and the arts who show realistically the positive trends in the life of our country. Some shots in the film convey very well the difficulties and deprivations of those years. And other shots are flashed on the screen—nazi stormtroopers goose-stepping, the Soviet people toiling with spades and wheelbarrows, and then America with its technology. No one would say: Why is the enemy varnished so while we are shown in such an unseemly manner? The film *The Russian Miracle* portrays the truth of life. Yes, we were such; yes, we experienced those hardships and trials as we travelled the long path from backwardness to progress. The dark and gloomy side is shown in the film, too, but it is shown from the correct, true-to-life angle. In other words, we do not demand that writers and workers in art and in the cinema varnish and furbish realities of life. No, we say to them, show reality as it is, but show it from the life-asserting angle.

Recall A. Makarenko's "Pedagogical Poem". Look whom and what he wrote about. The people he wrote about horrified the philistine, bourgeois, intellectual of the West. But how he described those people, those urchins—thieves and perhaps even murderers among them! When one reads Makarenko, trust in his characters is evoked, one believes that those people who found themselves in such a plight as a result of the vestiges of the old system will show themselves at their best. And they did show themselves at their best.

Some writers say: So we are to varnish, to furbish life? No! We call on them to write faithfully even about the most sinister and negative things in life but to describe them from the life-asserting, true-to-life angle. But there are some who want to rake in the dust-bins, so to speak, for their themes

and to besmear everything that the Soviet people have accomplished by their work and through their suffering. And such people want to be applauded. No, that will never happen!

The problem can be put like this: We have attained our present stage and are going forward. The ideologists of imperialism, all the enemies of communism, are making every effort to prevent our progress. They are trying to win over all kinds of unstable people. We say to these people: Do not draw away from the people and the party, step into our common ranks under the Marxist-Leninist banner, the banner of our Communist Party. If you have any revolutionary spirit, any enthusiasm for the struggle for the happiness of the people, any spark of hatred for our enemies or faith in your people and their power, follow the great banner of Marxism-Leninism. And hatred for the class enemy is necessary, since one cannot be a good fighter for the people, for communism, if one does not know how to hate the enemy.

To those comrades who do not want to follow this banner, but try to interfere with us, clutching at our hands when a grim struggle is on, we say: Stop it, because you are getting into the fight on the side of our class enemies! And since you are getting into it you must know that no quarter will be given in the fight and you will get the worst of it!

Yes, comrades, a grim class struggle is in progress in the international arena. Enemies are attacking our Marxist-Leninist ideology and are trying to corrupt the souls and minds of the people. Should their ideological "echos" clutch at our arms or legs in the struggle, they will have no one but themselves to blame if they get some of the blows along with open enemies. A fight is a fight. Sometimes one is hit hard and proper by mistake and sometimes intentionally. There is no great harm in that either. One should not be led astray, should not attack his own side, should not help his class enemies and be of service to the ideologists of imperialism.

Those who leave our camp of builders of communism for the other camp will sooner or later be held responsible before our people. Nikolai Vasilyevich Gogol described masterfully how Taras Bulba killed his son Andrei for deserting to the enemy. Such is the logic of struggle.

A still more bitter struggle is now going on between the forces of imperialism, which is prepared to do anything to preserve its domination, and the forces of communism and socialism. Taras Bulba waged a national struggle and we are waging a class struggle, a struggle more severe and relentless. The class struggle knows no national frontiers, since the oppressors and the oppressed are not confined to any one nationality. This struggle knows no ties of kinship or family. This is especially graphically shown by Mikhail Sholokhov in *And Quiet Flows the Don* and also by other writers.

True, some comrades have a special opinion on this score and often substitute a national, racial approach for the class approach to the evaluation of social phenomena. But we are speaking the language of our party, expressing the views of our party, speaking about what has been written in our party decisions.

We are glad and proud of the fact that our country and the entire socialist community of peoples have attained such a position that our enemies have to reckon with us and, I should say, fear us.

We regard the Leninist principle of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems as the main course of our foreign policy, and we are

implementing this principle consistently. Life has fully confirmed the correctness of the principle of peaceful co-existence. The camp of imperialism, too, has to recognise this. Take, for example, Dulles. He could not even bring himself to utter these words.

When I was in America, Britain and France, it had to be explained at length during the negotiations what was meant by peaceful co-existence. During the negotiations in the United States with President Eisenhower, it was clear that he, just as State Secretary Herter, could not utter the words "peaceful co-existence".

By persistently strengthening the might of the forces of socialism and by working for peace we have taught the statesmen of the United States to pronounce well the words "peaceful co-existence".

What then has happened? The words are the same and their meaning has not changed. What has changed is the correlation of forces in the international arena.

We say that peace cannot be ensured by begging, but it can be won, and we are winning this peace. How have we been winning peace? With prayers! No, we are winning it by our work, the labour of the workers, peasants and intelligentsia. We have created a powerful socialist state, we have developed science, we have advanced the culture of our people, created our armed forces and equipped them with latest weapons. Surely this is not "begging" for peace? We have upheld the cause of peace by the policy of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems. Now the imperialists know that to attack the Soviet Union (and attack they may, of course, and it is impossible to give a guarantee against it, as we have repeatedly said) would mean at the present time to subject the entire system of imperialism to the threat of destruction, would mean to commit suicide. The imperialists know only too well that if they attacked us they would receive a devastating blow.

President Kennedy of the United States has correctly concluded that values should be reassessed, that the power of the forces of socialism should be taken into account and reckoned with, that relations with the Soviet Union should be changed, and so on.

You see how the problem is viewed now by the President of the United States? This does not mean, of course, comrades, that we should delude ourselves: Here comes the dawn of new relations between the Soviet Union and the United States! No! But it is quite indicative that it is the United States President, the leader of the imperialist camp, who is speaking about our strength. Such words are not inspiring to his allies. If the leaders of the United States say that much, what then can they be thinking in Norway, Denmark, Italy and France? Characteristically, President de Gaulle of France says that today to be "under the umbrella of the United States of America" does not at all imply safety. Therefore, he says, it is necessary for France to have her own umbrella. According to the French President, it is French atomic weapons that are to furnish a reliable "umbrella". But it is not simple to create an "atomic umbrella" and one may finally be left, so to speak, without either trousers or umbrella! This "atomic umbrella" requires vast forces, vast means.

Everyone understands very well that powerful nuclear weapons are expensive. But we have to accept this, comrades, because if we forget about this, if today we grudge capital investment and means for armaments, tomorrow

we shall have to pay in blood and millions of lives. The lessons of the Second World War have not been erased from the people's memories; the wounds have just closed and the scars show quite distinctly what our country suffered as a result of the barbaric invasion by the Hitlerites.

At the present time we can draw the conclusion that the imperialists are losing confidence in their strength, are losing hope that by means of war they can change the course of events, halt the building of communism in our country and the building of socialism in other countries, and arrest the movement of the progressive forces against imperialism and colonialism. The imperialists are coming to realise ever more clearly that a new world war, should they unleash it, will end in a still more devastating debacle than the Second World War ended for Hitler after he had unleashed it.

OUR SUCCESSES IN COMMUNIST CONSTRUCTION—MATERIALISATION OF IDEAS OF MARXISM-LENINISM

AS you know, international imperialism, having been defeated in armed battles in the years of the Civil War and the intervention against Soviet Russia, decided to shift the struggle to the economic front. For a long period the imperialists did not recognise the Land of the Soviets, did not trade with it; they blockaded us. Now as well, after the Second World War, this policy is being continued. The United States does not trade with us. There is a law in the United States which forbids American firms to buy our goods. Frantic reactionary forces raise a hue and cry against firms which sell goods that are not even on the embargo lists.

Now, what has this given the Americans? Today there already exist forces in United States business circles which admit that the policy of economic blockade of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries has failed. More and more frequently representatives of United States business speak of the need to revise this policy.

The imperialists expected that it would take our country a long time to recover after the Second World War. They cherished the hope that the United States, Britain, France and other big imperialist countries would be able to dictate their will to the Soviet Union. But these calculations of the imperialists fell through.

I would like to cite some figures showing the successes achieved in the Soviet Union's economic development. I am not going to say anything particularly new, because ours is an open policy, and you know the indices of the growth of our economy. Nevertheless, as they say, repetition is the mother of learning. I have quoted data about the rate of our development on several occasions already, and you know, in looking at the figures showing the growth of the Soviet economy, you hear, as it were, the ring of communism, the firm resounding step of our advance.

Here are some figures about the development of the Soviet Union's economy in the postwar years:

In the 18 years since the end of the Great Patriotic War the Soviet people, guided by our party, have attained outstanding successes. The

rate of our growth in a number of key branches of the national economy is shown by the following increase in production:

Steel—from 12.3 million tons in 1945 to 76.3 million tons in 1962;

Pig iron—from 8.8 to 55.3 million tons;

Rolled metal—from 8.5 to 59.2 million tons;

Oil—from 19.4 to 186.2 million tons;

Coal—from 149 to 517 million tons;

Cement—from 1.8 to 57.3 million tons;

Electricity—from 43,000 to 369,000 million kilowatt-hours.

These are remarkable figures, comrades, staggering indices!

You remember that soon after the end of the Patriotic War, Stalin, in a well-known speech to the electorate, set the task of reaching an annual steel production of 60 million tons and an oil production of 60 million tons. He considered that to be already a very high level. We have already exceeded considerably the target of development mentioned in Stalin's speech, but we shall still have to work a great deal to create conditions for the transition to the communist mode of production and distribution. The transition to communism will call for great efforts, for selfless work by the people.

Some people think, however, that this can be done comparatively easily and quickly. One must not play at communism. There are laws of development of society, and they have to be known and reckoned with. He who tries to ignore the laws of development will be punished by life itself.

Our party and the Soviet people organise all their great work of building communism on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, with regard for the real conditions in the country at every stage of its development. The figures I have quoted testify eloquently to our great successes in economic development. All of us—the party and the whole people—rejoice at these successes. How could anyone taking our common cause to heart say that this joy is the varnishing of reality?

With all the great successes, we have shortcomings as well. But attention should be concentrated not on the shortcomings alone. One has to see the entire picture of the battle, the picture of the great onslaught and of victory in this battle. Now, who is the winner and who is the loser in this onslaught? Our party and our people are the winner. And who is the loser? The capitalist world is.

Recall, comrades, the joy with which Lenin spoke at the 4th Congress of the Comintern in 1922 about the first steps in the development of our socialist industry. "We have found the resources necessary for putting heavy industry on its feet," Vladimir Ilyich said. "True, the sum we have been able to obtain up to now barely exceeds 20 million gold roubles; but at any rate we have this sum and it is intended exclusively for the purpose of reviving our heavy industry." What gigantic progress we have made since then! In the first four years of the Seven-Year Plan¹ alone, 3,700 big new industrial establishments were built. In these four years state capital investments (centralised and non-centralised) alone amounted to 126,000 million roubles. State basic funds increased in this period by 100,000 million roubles, or by 50 per cent. In four years, our basic funds grew by 50 per cent. Is this varnishing, comrades? No, it is the work and sweat of our people, it is their achievements. The Soviet people know full well that if they do not work selflessly they will be unable to

¹ [1959-1965]

overcome difficulties, to enter upon the bright road of the communist tomorrow.

I don't know, comrades, perhaps it is a weakness of mine, but when I travel through the country and look at our people, when I visit factories and collective and state farms, I am extremely excited and gladdened by everything our people have done in Soviet years. Everyone coming to us from abroad—even capitalists—cannot help expressing surprise at our rapid growth. The American farmer Roswell Garst, whom I met again not long ago, said:

“When I first came to the Soviet Union and walked through the streets of Moscow, my suit was better than the suits of others. This time, when I walked in your city, I saw that mine was perhaps the worst suit around.”

A good observation, comrades!

Our successes in communist construction are the materialisation of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

I am not saying that we have already solved all the problems, that we have no shortcomings. I merely want to say that our outstanding successes in communist construction show vividly that we stand on a life-asserting road. If we have a shortage of something now, it should be understood correctly why this is so; it is necessary to see not only what there is today but also what there was yesterday and what there will be tomorrow. If what we started with, what we had, is compared with what we have created, what we have now, we shall see how confidently and rapidly our country is advancing towards its goal. And this goal will be achieved. That is the main thing! One does not have to be very clever to say that the more goods the better. One has to be able to produce more industrial and agricultural goods. If you want to get more than is possible you may even lose what you already have.

In our programme, for example, we have set a target for economic development, and we have to reach this target in 20 years. Why have we done so; would it not be better to reach this target, not in 20 but, let us say, in five or 10 years? Of course it would. But it is practically impossible to do so in 5 or 10 years. This depends not only on one's wishes. What is needed here is not a mere volitional, subjective approach, but one which is objective and scientifically well founded, which takes into consideration all real possibilities. Even a mother giving a sweetmeat to her child says: “Don't hurry, or you'll choke.” And the mother wishes her child well.

In developing a country's economy one must not set impracticable tasks, one must not undertake to do more than is feasible in practice. If you do, you will overstrain yourself and roll back; life will thrust you aside.

We must move forward at a rapid pace, but the economy should be developed according to plan, without permitting slumps and breakdowns. This demands a sober regard for real possibilities and their efficient utilisation.

Our country has already outstripped the United States in the output of iron ore, butter, sugar, woollen fabrics, metal-cutting lathes and sawn timber—both in physical volume and in *per capita* production. We have outstripped the United States in the mining of coal and production of cement. We shall soon overtake it in steel production. The time is not far off when the Soviet Union will not only overtake but also outstrip the United States, this recognised leader of the capitalist world, in the output of all kinds of industrial products.

We frustrated the imperialists' hopes of defeating the Soviet Union by

means of an armed attack. Now their hopes of defeating the Soviet Union in economic competition are crumbling.

Imperialism has lost its confidence in the possibility of checking our advance through war, for such a war would threaten it with the doom of the entire capitalist system. The capitalists are beginning to realise that we are today not living in the time when Hitler nurtured his maniacal plan of marching rapidly and easily to the Urals. Today revenge-seekers only have to make a move to be wiped off the face of the earth in the very first hours of their military gamble. I have on many occasions talked with Germans from West Germany. They have told me that 95 per cent. of the West Germans realise all the dangers of a gamble against the Soviet Union, and that those 5 per cent. who fail to realise this are lunatics. It is clear to the overwhelming majority of the Germans in the West that to go to war with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries means to be destroyed.

Consequently, the imperialists' plan to crush us by force of arms fell through. They subsequently, as I have said already, tried to strangle us economically. They did everything to isolate the socialist countries, to thwart their economic development. But these calculations of the imperialists also suffered a fiasco. They have concocted tales about the weakness and poverty of the socialist countries. And there are people in the capitalist world who believe in these tales. On one occasion I have already recalled, I had a talk with an Eastern prince, who gave me his impressions of the Soviet Union. He said: “Mr. Khrushchov, when I was coming to Russia certain people tried to dissuade me from the trip, saying that you had communism here. I have come and seen that there is no communism here; the communism is in our country, where all the people go about naked.” You see what notions of communism are hammered into people's heads by the ideologists of imperialism!

Our tremendous economic successes are shattering the slanderous inventions of imperialism and showing the great advantages of the socialist system. These successes are confirmation of the correctness of Marxist-Leninist theory, of our ideology, of the advantages of our social system. They expose the falseness of the assertions of the ideologists of imperialism who have tried to prove that capitalism is the most productive system, that private ownership, private enterprise, private initiative, is the most powerful stimulus to economic progress.

Now we communists, our Soviet people, have proved to the whole world that when power comes into the hands of the working people even such an economically backward country as Russia was in tsarist times can within a short space of history raise production to a colossal height; this country has advanced to second place in the world in industrial output, and the time is not far off when it will take first place.

Comrades, when we speak of victory in economic competition, the point in question is not only cement or metal, but also policy, the power of our ideas, the power of Marxist-Leninist theory, the advantages of a planned economy based on this theory, the superiority of the socialist system over the capitalist system.

The capitalists know the cruel laws of competition: if one firm outstrips another, the stronger swallows up the weaker. The competition of the two systems in the economic field strikes even greater fear into the hearts of the

imperialists; they see that the rapid growth of socialism is increasingly shaking the foundations of capitalism, bringing nearer the end of this system, which is doomed by history.

Lenin and our party came to the conclusion that since, after the Great October Revolution, the world became divided into two opposed systems, capitalism and socialism, this fact of reality must not be ignored.

Ever since the first days of the existence of the socialist world, competition has been going on between it and the capitalist world. It is being decided in the world arena which of these systems will become still more firmly established and which will be defeated in this competition and make way for the other system. Peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems does not in the least mean a relaxation of the class struggle in the international arena. And since a class struggle is going on, peaceful co-existence in the field of ideology is impossible. Those advocating peaceful co-existence in ideology enter, voluntarily or otherwise, upon the road of the betrayal of socialism, betrayal of the cause of communism.

Those who deny the principle of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, the principles of peaceful competition, show disbelief in the revolutionary force of the working class, in the great power of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

Facts are stubborn things. The facts of our successes in communist construction are known to the whole world, and they can be neither suppressed nor refuted. The work of our people, who are building the powerful material and technical basis of communism, is a very strong factor having a tremendous influence on the minds of people the world over. The successes of the Soviet Union in the building of communism and the successes of the other socialist countries strengthen the belief of the working class of all countries in their forces; they raise the oppressed peoples to the struggle for freedom; they influence the conscience of the intelligentsia in different countries of the world; they arm the fighters for socialism in the ideological struggle against the forces of imperialism.

In building communism the Soviet people are blazing the trail to the future for all mankind and fulfilling their internationalist duty to the working people of all countries.

REALITY SHOULD BE PORTRAYED IN LITERATURE AND ART FROM LIFE-ASSERTING POSITIONS

THE outstanding successes of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in building socialism and communism convincingly show that the imperialists have failed in their calculations to undermine our economy.

Our enemies are now concentrating their main efforts on the ideological struggle against the socialist countries. The imperialist ideologists are cherishing the hope of undermining us from within with the aid of hostile ideology. Their thesis is as follows: The more educated people there are in the Soviet Union the more vulnerable will Soviet society become in ideology. They write this quite frankly in their newspapers and magazines. According to imperialist propaganda, as material and cultural standards rise the Soviet people will come out against the leadership of the party.

We should know that the enemy is now sharpening his poisonous ideological

weapon for more bitter clashes with us. We find here a similarity with what the Red Army men said during the Civil War: "We have one issue in dispute with the Whiteguards on which we cannot agree; the simple issue of land. The Whiteguards want to bury us and we want to bury them. Who will bury whom first, this is our little issue in dispute."

We have a similar issue with capitalism. It wants to bury the socialist system and we not only want to bury capitalism but have also dug quite a deep hole, and shall exert every effort to dig this hole deeper and bury the capitalist system for ever, the system of exploitation, wars and plunder. That capitalism will collapse, of this there is no doubt. But it will not collapse of its own accord.

Our successes will inspire the working class of all the capitalist countries to more decisive and active revolutionary class struggle. And we have helped and will continue to help them by our example of building communism. The peoples of various countries fighting for their freedom and independence are receiving our assistance today, and tomorrow there will be even greater possibilities for rendering assistance of another kind.

It is beyond doubt that the hopes placed by the imperialists in ideological subversion will also be smashed. Their attempts to undermine the strength of socialism and stop the development of revolutionary struggle will suffer the same defeat as the military campaigns they undertook in the past against the countries of socialism and the perfidious plans for strangling socialism by economic blockade.

Our science and culture are developing rapidly. The higher educational establishments of the Soviet Union are annually training 120,000 engineers, nearly three times as many as in the United States. Two and a half times as many engineers are engaged in the national economy of our country as in America.

Stewart Udall, United States Secretary for the Interior, visited the Soviet Union last year and acquainted himself with the construction of our power stations. He appraised our successes highly, and one should give him his due, he published his impressions in America. Of course, it is not easy for an influential figure of such a powerful imperialist country as the United States to speak the truth about our country, a country which is building communism. For them this is a very bitter truth. It is not easy to admit that the enemy, a powerful socialist country, is overtaking you. It is not easy to come out with it. Only some of our politically immature people prattle about their country without knowing what they are talking about, whereas Udall knew what he was saying.

Our achievements are great in the promotion of science, in the conquest of outer space. After the first Soviet sputnik was launched, one over-zealous American general said that there was nothing astonishing about throwing a piece of iron into outer space. His own countrymen spitefully ridiculed him and called this silly man by his proper name. No one would now dare to deny the irrefutable fact that the Soviet Union firmly holds first place in the world in the peaceful exploration of outer space.

Tomorrow we shall together be meeting our Cosmonauts 5 and 6, our Yaroslavna from space, Valentina Tereshkova, and cosmonaut Valeri Bykovsky. That is what our glorious young people are like. Now they are flying fast and high in wingless ships.

Our Soviet people have been flying well with wings, and now they have started flying without wings, making scores of circuits round the globe and landing their ships in the areas where we want them to land.

This, comrades, is an outstanding victory of the genius of our people and of the forces of socialism; it is a victory of our great Leninist party, which has provided conditions for the flowering of talents and for the development of our people's creative forces.

It is not only facts and figures that speak of our outstanding successes. We have made our enemies acknowledge publicly the great strength of socialism and recognise the Soviet Union's achievements.

I would like to read you some excerpts from an article by one of the "varnishers". I don't know why the anti-varnishers have not yet given him a dressing down. I will give you the name of this "varnisher".

Harry Schwartz, that venomous representative of the American bourgeois press, now considered to be the *New York Times'* leading expert on Soviet affairs, is forced to acknowledge the Soviet Union's outstanding achievements.

When I was in America, I had occasion to meet Harry Schwartz there several times. I recall one unusual press conference which took place in a railway carriage. Mr. Schwartz asked me the following question: "Mr. Khrushchov, will you give me your autograph for my little boy?" I replied: "I shan't give you my autograph." Later I thought that I had probably been wrong in getting angry over the matter. The boy could really have been given my autograph because there was no telling into what kind of man he would grow. Perhaps he would not be such an inveterate anti-communist as his father.

Now listen to what Harry Schwartz writes: "The image of the mythical bird Phoenix involuntarily comes to mind when you meditate on the Soviet Union's remarkable history in the past two decades. They say that after being burned Phoenix rose from the ashes as soon as the funeral pyre died out, and came to life with new force and energy. That is what happened with the Soviet Union, this 'red Phoenix'. . . . The swiftness and scope of the vast national recovery after the terrible losses in the Second World War upset all the earlier expectations in the West."²

Comrades, regarded from the angle of our tar-smearers, this is nothing but varnishing Soviet reality. How dare he!

This is a forced acknowledgement of our actual reality by our ideological opponent. What a lot of venom and poison our enemies used to eject, inventing their lies about the Soviet Union. But when life forces the enemy to the wall, he starts squirming and saying that this is a fabulous phenomenon.

A beautiful legend about the resurrection of a bird from the ashes was created in ancient times. It is a fine and interesting fable, but nonetheless it is only a fable. And all that has happened in the Soviet Union is not a fable but great reality, created by the work of the Soviet people under the guidance of our Leninist party.

Deliberating about the future, Mr. Schwartz declares: "Probably in the next few years the Soviet Union will acquire the features of the communist

² All quotations from American sources are retranslated from the Russian.

society of abundance. By 1970 or somewhat later the red Soviet flag will probably flutter in proud loneliness over the Soviet base on the Moon."

That is not badly put!

Then Harry Schwartz goes on to say: "Such is the magic of the constant and swift growth year after year, without slumps, depressions and other such obstacles." And all this was written by Harry Schwartz, an American bourgeois journalist!

Varnishing again! Where are our anti-varnishers and tar-smearers? How can they tolerate a bourgeois journalist varnishing our Soviet system!

An admission made by Howard Morgan, member of the U.S. Federal Power Commission, also merits attention.

After a thorough study of the figures on the development of the economy of the Soviet Union and the United States in the past 15 years, he came to the conclusion that, though America is in the lead at present, "the Russians are catching up with us with frightening speed". This is also varnishing! I want to make it tough for the anti-varnishers.

"We all know," Morgan continues, "the old American saying: 'Don't look back: you might suddenly find that they are catching up'. It is no use looking back now. They are really catching up with us."

This was written by a leading American government official. This is how our reality is forcing representatives of the capitalist world to talk. This is good "varnishing", comrades. We have compelled our opponents to speak this way today about our system and its superiority. Only the socialist system gives our country the opportunity to catch up with and surpass economically such a highly developed capitalist country as the United States. This is something for all people of our multi-national Soviet state to be proud of. It fills us with pride for our communist ideology, for our Soviet system. The enemies of Soviet power said that Russia could not stand up to the pressure of imperialism, because she was a polyglot, multi-national country. Here she is, a polyglot, multi-national country with a population of some 220 million people, united and mighty!

All the peoples of our country have a single, common programme, the programme of our party. They are united by a single ideology, which is Marxism-Leninism. All the nations share the same desire and are moving in the same direction, the direction indicated by Lenin—onward and onward to the construction of communist society in the U.S.S.R.

I can mention other, more authoritative admissions.

In his recent speech at the American University in Washington, President Kennedy said: ". . . We can . . . hail the Russian people for their many achievements—in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture, in acts of courage."

This is not at all badly put! Here is another case of a varnisher. The President of the United States has turned out to be a varnisher!

Yet some of our writers and art workers want to abuse their people and the work of their people. They want to dig up refuse heaps and draw images of our people in the darkest colours. Shame on you!

The party condemns all who give the tag of "varnisher" to our writers and art workers. Is the man who writes of all the good things our people

and our party have done a varnisher? Of course not! A writer or art worker who upholds the positions of partisanship truthfully portrays in his works both positive and negative phenomena in the life of society, and does this from life-asserting positions. There are shortcomings in our life, of course, but everything new and revolutionary is asserted and grows in a struggle with the old, casting out the survivals of the past. Can we tolerate the call of certain people to write only about negative things, to dig out all the nasty things about our country, about our people, about our reality? Those who take such positions are agents of bourgeois ideology among the Soviet people.

We are most emphatically against eye-wash. The party has always called and will continue to call for the exposure of eye-wash. It has been and will always be against window-dressing of reality. Our Soviet reality does not tolerate falseness.

You remember the film *The Kuban Cossacks*. As soon as it was shown we told Stalin that the life of the collective farmers was portrayed untruthfully in that film. It showed complete abundance. Stalin liked it when the screen showed every collective farmer seated at a festive table, putting a whole turkey away by himself. I told Stalin then that those turkeys had been bought by Minister of Cinematography Bolshakov, and that actors, and not collective farmers, were eating them. That did not happen in real life; the countryside at that time was experiencing great difficulties.

You remember that it was not only in films that eye-wash appeared. Malenkov's report to the 19th Party Congress, where he said that the grain problem had been solved, that there was plenty of grain, was a fraud, deceiving the party and the people.

Thousands of letters poured in from all parts of the country after the 19th Congress. People wrote that if the grain problem had been solved then why wasn't there enough grain? Then Stalin raised the question and practically made short shrift of the leaders of some regions, because letters coming from there drawing attention to the shortage of grain had reached him. Special commissions were sent to those regions to find out why they lacked grain.

At that time, during a discussion in the central committee, I said: Comrade Stalin, the Ukrainians are extremely dissatisfied with not being supplied with white bread. It was said at the party congress that the grain problem had been solved, whereas the Ukrainians, who had always eaten white bread, no longer had it. Stalin replied: White bread must be given to the Ukrainians. It was almost as bad as in the story about the French Queen who, when told that the people were without bread, said if they were without bread they should eat cake.

How could grain be provided when the country lacked it? At the September plenary meeting I could have said in my report, the same as Malenkov, that we had so much grain that we didn't know where to store it all.

Malenkov used figures on the so-called biological yield. Now, how was that biological yield determined? The number of ears was counted per square metre of the sown area, then all the grains of one ear were

counted and weighed and the figures obtained for this square metre were multiplied by the entire sown area. This is what was called the biological yield. But neither pies nor pancakes can be baked out of the biological yield. Bread and pancakes are made out of the actual harvest in the granaries. We criticised such a statement about the solution of the grain problem because that was eye-wash, deceiving the party and the people.

The party has done extensive work to expose the Stalin personality cult and overcome its harmful consequences. The central committee did this, showing thereby its sense of responsibility and courage. I remember we had a highly intense struggle in the leadership as we discussed these problems during the 20th Congress. We proposed that the party should be told the truth, while some people who were conscious of their guilt for the crimes they had perpetrated together with Stalin, were afraid of this truth, were afraid of their exposure. After long debates they consented to this problem being raised at the congress.

That was a great and complicated problem, a problem of vast political significance. Of course, if one had reasoned like a philistine, there was no need to raise this question. Stalin was no more and many people who had been victimised were no more. The state was growing, the leadership had taken shape, and why should everything be raked up, stirred and reshuffled! But a philistine approach is impermissible in politics. We had to raise and discuss this question, not for those who were no longer alive, but for those who are living and for those who will be living. We were fighting not for our personal interests, but for the party, the purity of the Leninist party, because the people's attitude to the party is sacred, the party is the highest and greatest truth, the brain and conscience of the people, the leader of the people, the organiser of the people.

Some people who were members of the central committee's presidium at that time, said: How will the congress understand it, how will the party understand it? We told them: "Both the congress and the entire party will understand it properly. We must tell the truth about the personality cult precisely at the 20th Congress of the party, because this is the first congress after the death of Stalin. If we don't speak about this until the 21st Congress or later, we may be misunderstood. At the 20th Congress we shall be listened to and we think we shall be understood correctly. If the mistakes and shortcomings during the period of the Stalin personality cult are not revealed and condemned, that would mean to approve and legalise them for the future.

At the 20th Congress our party condemned the personality cult and mapped out the Leninist course of its policy. It launched the work of restoring the Leninist principles of leadership and standards of party and state activity.

We do not deny the importance and role of leaders and heads, comrades, but we are against such leaders who place themselves above the people, above the party, and who believe that they have been well-nigh sent by God while the people are just the masses that are to listen to them and applaud. This was characteristic of Stalin.

Stalin did not like the people. When did he ever visit factories?

Probably his last visit was to the Dynamo plant in 1924. After that he hardly went anywhere.

Lenin constantly maintained close ties with the people. In 1918, when the Civil War was at its height, when the Soviet state was within a hair's breadth of destruction, he went to factories, spoke at meetings, visited villages and talked with Deputies sent from remote places. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin nearly paid with his life for that when an attempt was made on his life after a workers' meeting at Mikhelson's plant. Lenin needed live association with workers and peasants, with the people; he was a leader whom the entire people loved and love now. He was not above the people but always with the people, the recognised leader of the people.

The central committee considered it necessary to tell the truth about the Stalin personality cult and to do everything to ensure that this would never be repeated.

The exposure of the Stalin personality cult caused certain difficulties. But as a result we are now understood correctly; we hold the Leninist party position and the people realise this, they approve and uphold the Leninist course of our party.

We were not afraid that some people may not have understood us, or may not have understood at once, and that we may have had to pay for it with our prestige and position. We told the party everything, we submitted everything for the judgment of the party, for the judgment of its 20th Congress. The congress said those correct things it had to say. The difficulties are now over, the party has become even stronger and more united and its prestige has risen higher than ever.

OUR CREATIVE INTELLIGENTSIA IS ON THE RIGHT ROAD

CONSISTENTLY implementing Lenin's behests, the party shows concern for the correct organisation of ideological work, for translating into life Lenin's principles concerning the party spirit in literature and art, and their kinship with the people. Assertions to the effect that inculcating the party spirit in literature and art allegedly paralyses the initiative of the creative intelligentsia are profoundly erroneous. The tales about "artistic freedom" and "freedom of the press" in capitalist society can be believed only by those unfamiliar with the morals and manners of the bourgeois world.

Literature, art and the press of the capitalist world are kept by the monopolies. I have already mentioned the interesting conversation I had with the big British newspaper publisher, Mr. Roy Thomson, during his recent stay in Moscow as a tourist.

Mr. Thomson has probably not studied Marxism-Leninism but he is a hard-driving man with a strong class instinct. He asked me whether I would allow his newspapers to be sold in Moscow. "This is quite a problem," I said. "It takes some thinking about."

"And what if I appoint *Izvestia's* Adzhubei as editor-in-chief of one of these papers?" the publisher asked. "That's another kettle of fish," I told him. "Take my word for it, if you appoint Adzhubei or some other

Soviet editor as editor-in-chief of your paper, this paper will be on sale everywhere in the Soviet Union."

"No, that wouldn't suit me," Mr. Thomson declared.

So that is how capitalists look at these things. What really matters to them in this case is not material interest, but purely ideological, class interest.

Or take, for example, such a big centre of the American film industry as Hollywood. Is there any artistic freedom there? No, not a shadow of it. Hollywood cast out even such a film worker of world renown as Charlie Chaplin. Though no communist, he is a progressive man, and that is why there was no room for him in Hollywood. There's the artistic "freedom" of "free" people in the U.S.A. for you!

The big United States newspaper trust of Hearst is notorious for its reactionary bent. Hearst publishes more than 100 newspapers. It would be naive to think that he takes no interest in the ideological and political trend of his newspapers and would allow the publication in them of any material running counter to the interests of his class, to imperialism. Just let him lay his hands on such a journalist and Hearst would show him what's what! So, you see, only naive people and inveterate simpletons can believe all sorts of tales about artistic "freedom" in capitalist countries.

Some of our simpletons, considering themselves very wise, cannot, or do not want to, understand the class essence of ideology. And Thomson, an old capitalist wolf, understands it only too well. Still, there are people who say that there is freedom of the press in Britain and America.

Well, let these people send an article to Hearst or Thomson. What will these publishers seek in the article? A nice literary style? They don't care a damn about style! They will regard this article from the viewpoint of politics, the interests of their class, they will assess it according to whom it serves and what it is aimed at. They are mainly concerned with the ideological side of the matter.

The ruling classes of the capitalist countries are very good at disguising their interests by discourses on freedom of art, freedom of speech and of the press, and even put that down in their constitutions. It would seem that "freedom of art" and "freedom of the press" do formally exist in some bourgeois countries. Every one is free to write what he wants, but whether publishers and magazine and newspaper owners want to accept material not corresponding to their class interests is quite another matter. If a publisher thinks an article does not enhance the capitalist system, he rejects it and it turns out to have been written for mice instead of people.

How is it that certain of our writers and publishers do not understand, or do not want to understand this? What do such people want? Apparently, they would like to make ideological work similar to Noah's Ark, so that all the aromas of all ideological trends and shades may be represented in this Noah's Ark. No, we shall never allow this! Our party stands at the head of the people and guides the people, and has given direction to and will continue to direct ideological activities; it has waged a struggle and will continue to fight against all manifestations of bourgeois ideology.

We are using every opportunity we have to ensure that all ideological

work is developed in the necessary direction, in the spirit of communist ideology.

It would be a good thing if each writer and each art worker began by realising that his activities should strengthen and not weaken the positions of communism. He would then be more exacting in appraising his creative work and would keep a more strict check on his activities, and then the public would have no need to criticise ideologically immature works. One may ask: "And who is the judge who will determine whether ideological work is being conducted in the correct direction?" The party is the judge, the party and the people; all ideological activities, every work of literature and art, should serve their interests, should serve the cause of communism.

Those who want to stand aloof from party policy and who deny partisanship in ideology, comprise, so to speak, a party of non-party people and voluntarily or involuntarily come out against our party, against our ideology, against our reality.

The policy of the Communist Party and its activities are determined and directed by party congresses, and between congresses by the central committee. Our party carries out collective leadership, the collective guidance of all activities. The party congress and the central committee elects determine what is in the best interests of the party, of the people, and what is harmful to them. And those who refute partisanship and collective leadership want to decide everything on their own. Such an author, let us say, writes a book or an artist paints a canvas and declares: "This is it; no one has the right to contradict me, I am my own judge!" Who should determine the artistic value and the ideological trend of such works? According to their authors they themselves should do this. They demand that their works be published, that they be provided with printshops, printer's ink, newsprint, that they be provided with everything. No, the party will never agree to this!

Is there any need to dramatise the situation? I think there is no need for this. We in the central committee are of the opinion that we have a very small number of people from among the intelligentsia who have given in to the bourgeois idea of non-partisanship in ideology. The absolute majority of our Soviet intelligentsia in general and the creative intelligentsia in particular, is imbued with Marxist-Leninist ideas and is waging the struggle for the victory of these ideas together with the party and under the leadership of the party.

The cinema is a very important and interesting field of ideological work for the party. Films are a sharp ideological weapon and an intelligible means of education. For instance, not everyone will read a book. Sometimes it is only within the grasp of the more educated reader, and more time is also required to read and understand it. But a film is more easily understood. This is why the cinema is the widest mass form of the arts.

Individual film workers have, so to speak, certain kinks, incorrect views on the role of the cinema. This, in particular, is so with such a prominent and experienced director as Mikhail Romm. Let us hope that he will think matters over and will take a firm stand on true positions.

The C.P.S.U. central committee has met the film workers half-way and

agreed that they set up their own creative union. We are for self-administration in art and for creative unions, if this helps to develop art in the right direction. But if anyone calculates on using the unions as a support in fighting against the party's policy in art, he is making a great mistake. We shall tell such people: We do not recognise the right of any union to play the leading part in our society, except a single union—our Communist Party. Any other unions that might try to direct their activities against the party's policy would invariably have to deal with the party and the people. I am saying this as a warning. It is better to give a warning in good time than to wait until matters get involved, and when a warning becomes insufficient. Therefore it is better to come to an understanding in advance.

We should devote more attention to our intellectuals—writers, composers, artists and theatre and film workers.

Speaking of music, we consider that it is developing in the right direction now. True, some composers also had certain kinks. We spoke about this at the time, and now things seem to be going well. I admit that I have a soft spot for music. When I rest, I always switch on the radio to hear some music. Some music programmes are excellent. There is less noisy and blaring music now.

Some literary programmes have become interesting. Recently I had a chance to hear over the radio a small excerpt from M. A. Sholokhov's *Virgin Soil Uplifted*. I was sorry when the reader finished, for I wanted to hear more and more. One could say there was nothing special in it. They were broadcasting the episode when Davydov was doing some ploughing with bullocks. It would seem that this was an ordinary everyday matter. But how remarkably it is all put! You listen and you seem to live through it. When Davydov finishes his work and lies sprawling on the grass, you seem to experience a pleasant feeling of tiredness as if you are stretching out your legs after some hard work. That's the kind of artist Sholokhov is. He has the ability to speak eloquently and truthfully about simple things and to make the readers believe him.

There are a great many fine works of fiction in our literature. Works such as A. Tvardovsky's *Vasily Terkin* and *Space Beyond Space* are worthy of praise. It is impossible to enumerate here all the fine works of fiction and all the prose writers and poets worthy of praise—we have hundreds of them.

Nowhere in the world will you find such a mighty, life-asserting literature and art as in the Soviet Union. That is why the ideologists of imperialism are trying so persistently to influence our creative intelligentsia, so as to lead it off the right road. They resort to various tricks in order to introduce among our writers, composers, artists and theatre and film workers a lack of confidence in the great force of their art.

The party is proud of the Soviet creative intelligentsia; it is ready to defend it and will never let it be wronged.

Comrades, I would like to remind you of the demands which Lenin set our agitation and propaganda work. "Our main policy," he said, "must now be the economic development of the state, so that we are able to gather additional poods of grain, produce additional poods of coal,

and to decide on the best way to use these poods of grain and coal. . . . And it is on this that all the work of agitation and propaganda should be based. There should be less flowery phrases, because you will not satisfy the needs of the working people with phrases."

Lenin dreamed of the time when the construction of communism would become a practical matter for all the working people, when all people would realise that our joint victory in building communism depends on their efforts, on the way in which every person fulfils in practice this or that task in our joint endeavour, though it might be the smallest and simplest of tasks.

We now live in the era of which Lenin dreamed. Everyone should study Lenin's works more and consult them more often. It is necessary to use skilfully Lenin's ideas in practical activities, in agitation and propaganda and in all our work.

Propaganda and agitation strike home if artistic imagery is skilfully used.

In my youth I read many books by Rubakin. I still remember his short novel *Book Salesman*. The purpose of the novel was to make the peasant lad interested in reading. A book salesman came to a village. He had been there more than once and he was known quite well. He went to a group of chaps who had settled in a hayloft for the night and told them all sorts of stories. He advised them to read books and said it was very useful. The young men grew interested.

"What are books about?" they asked.

"You read them and you'll know."

"What books should we read?" asked a young chap. "Can you read one book which teaches you everything and not have to waste time on other books?"

"You should read many books."

"Shall I learn how my dad is getting on in the other world?"

"You'll learn everything, but first you must know a certain word."

"What word?"

"I don't know it myself. There was a man who knew this word and he decided to write a book and put that word into it. But no one knows what the word is and in what book it is. Read all the books you can lay your hands on and you'll see what the word is and in what book." Rubakin knew how to write.

He has other good stories. For example, *Sparks*, or his stories about miners. Our workers in legal institutions would do well to read his lectures in the North Caucasus; he describes the old courts very well.

I want so say a few words about the state anthem.

We have long raised the question of a new anthem consonant with our times. We have been receiving many letters about this matter.

Comrade Brezhnev recently showed me a letter in which the writer criticises writers, poets and composers for having failed so far to write a new anthem. Why has only the music of the anthem been broadcast for so many years? he asks. He decided to write the words himself and he sent us his verses.

I think we must return to the question of composing a new anthem.

Poets and composers can show their talent and create an anthem worthy of our country building communism.

Comrades, we are working to bring into play all levers and means of ideological activity, in order to organise better the guidance of this important work. We must recognise that ideological work suffers seriously from the separation of different organs of leadership. This is impermissible. As a result of this practice it often happens that the author of a poor book goes to one publisher, and if he fails he goes to another. If he lives in Moscow or Leningrad and his manuscript has been rejected at the publishing houses there, he often makes for some remote area. There, in some town, his book will be published, because it is flattering for them to publish a book of an author from the metropolis.

We must put the guidance of ideological work in order. Competent personnel should attend to ideological work in the C.P.S.U. central committee and also in the central committees of Communist Parties of the Union republics and in the territorial and regional committees of the party. The services of qualified people should be enlisted who would get a deep insight into the activity of the press, radio and television, would read attentively the works of literature, study the art of composers, film directors and theatre producers, and correctly estimate the trends in literature and the arts. We have trusted literary critics and art scholars with this work. But experience has shown that they have not risen to the occasion, as sometimes they have evaluated works of literature and art not from high-principled but factional positions. We must overhaul this work and organise it better.

We have slackened attention recently to the work of publishing houses, film studios and theatres and as a result artistically inept and ideologically inconsistent works have appeared. That is why the situation must be remedied.

Ideological work is a very important and very delicate, complicated and crucial matter. It must be guided in accordance with party principles and with tact, enlisting the artistic intelligentsia in this work. Here there must be no administration by mere injunction.

In her speech at the plenary meeting, Comrade Furtseva related how an abstractionist sculptor had taken metal shavings twisted into a spiral and passed the thing off as a work of art. Evidently he was also paid for it.

Y. A. Furtseva: No, he was not paid.

Khrushchov: Who knows! Now it is difficult to find out whether he was paid or not. But what matters here is not just the money, although this of course is not the least detail.

You look at some paintings and wonder what is painted there and why. The trouble is that some artists reason something like this: If someone does not understand our work it means that he is not mature enough to understand this kind of art. In other words, the artist is wise and anyone who does not understand his daubing has not matured to his "high level".

Much has been said about the work of the sculptor Neizvestny. I want to believe that he is an honest and gifted man. Perhaps, when talking

about abstractionists, we should not reduce the whole matter to the sculptor Neizvestny. Let us see how he lives up to his promise, let him show by his creative endeavours how he serves the people.

Nevertheless, we are evidently to blame for not having noticed in time some unsound phenomena in art and for not having taken the necessary measures to prevent the spread of such phenomena.

Order should be introduced in all this.

I think, comrades, that after this plenary meeting, after the extensive work which has been done, we shall witness another advance on the ideological front. Life has shown that our intelligentsia stands on the correct party positions. We must not, on account of two or three or some dozen people who act incorrectly, see some kind of scum in everything and not notice the sound trend characteristic of the activities of our artistic intelligentsia. This would be very harmful to the party, to the development of our literature and art, to all ideological work.

Our artistic intelligentsia is on the right track, it is guided by the ideas of our Leninist party, the ideas of communist construction.

FOR BETTER PLANNING, FOR IMPROVED GUIDANCE OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

COMRADES, I want to discuss one more point. At first glance it does not seem to have a direct bearing on ideological work, but it is a question of great political and national economic importance. I am referring to the basic principles and trends in drawing up national economic plans. The central committee of the party and the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers have prepared a letter on this question to party, government, economic, trade union and Young Communist League organisations. This document has been distributed and most likely you have already read it.

The C.P.S.U. central committee's presidium attaches very great importance to the drawing up of the national economic plan for 1964-65 and for subsequent years, to the proper organisation of this work.

It is a fact that we have many shortcomings in planning. They are explained above all by the fact that the party organisations have largely kept out of this important matter and have entrusted it entirely to planning bodies. As a result, the plans do not always incorporate what is needed for rapid economic development.

You know, comrades, what serious mistakes were made in our five-year national economic development plan for 1956-60. We were compelled later, when drafting the Seven-Year Plan, to correct these mistakes.

Why were there miscalculations in the plans? Because planning, too, was affected by the consequences of the cult of Stalin's personality. The other members of the central committee's presidium know as well as I do that at that time no one but the State Planning Committee was engaged in drawing up national economic plans.

Let me cite the following fact, which shows how plans were approved at that time; it was shortly before Stalin's death. A meeting of the Council of Ministers was called to approve the annual plan. Stalin came

to the meeting. Usually he did not preside over the Council of Ministers but this time he took the chair, picked up the folder with the draft plan, and said: "Here is the plan. Who is against it?" The Ministers looked around and kept silent. "We accept it then," Stalin said. With this the meeting ended. When we left the hall Stalin said: "Let's go and see a film." He came into the cinema hall and said: "We properly fooled them!" The question is, who was fooled? It meant that the Ministers were fooled.

This plan, as the saying goes, was topsy turvy; there were big miscalculations in it, because the Ministers virtually took no part in preparing it and did not agree with it—and not only the Ministers, but also others who read it. Stalin himself never took up planning problems and did not wish others to take them up properly.

In recent years much work has been done to improve guidance of the national economy and perfect planning. But we still have serious shortcomings in planning economic development. The party has already criticised the practice of drawing up plans with planning bodies on the basis of average figures for the growth of production in previous years, establishing a definite rate of increase in gross output and making estimates for each branch. For example, if in 1963 capital investments in building and assembly work are fixed at 19,700 million roubles, these appropriations are allocated by branches on the basis of the established rates of growth. Thus, capital investments are determined by proportions established long before.

Such planning leaves no funds for new progressive branches whose rapid development is dictated by life itself. Moreover, these branches can yield a big economic gain in a short time. As a result of such practices everything new and progressive is still developing slowly in our country, because the main funds and material resources are allotted according to previously established proportions.

I will cite the following example in confirmation of this statement: The 21st Congress of the party laid down that means received as a result of plan overfulfilment should primarily go for the development of the chemical industry, agriculture and the construction of factories which produce consumer goods. What has actually happened? In the metallurgical industry, for example, the assignments of the Seven-Year Plan are being overfulfilled, while in the chemical industry they are not being fulfilled. Why has this happened? Because the cart of the State Planning Committee has not followed the direction we wanted, but has followed in the old rut.

Let us consider next the development of agriculture. If we employ the available funds and material resources rationally, we can achieve a still faster development of this important branch of the economy. The task is to create an abundance of foodstuffs. What is the most rational way to accomplish this? This problem should now be solved primarily not by extending the cultivated area, but by raising the efficiency of agriculture, by more intensive farming. For this we should above all have the necessary quantities of mineral fertiliser. This is clear to everyone, I am not disclosing anything new here.

I beg the Byelorussian comrades not to be offended by the fact that I am making public our polemic on this question. By the way, this applies not only to the Byelorussian leaders.

This is the point: When the memorandum on the specialisation of agriculture in Byelorussia, the Baltic republics and the north-west regions of the Russian Federation was made public, many comrades began to write to Moscow: Give us the money, assign capital investments for land reclamation and swamp drainage! The leaders of Byelorussia showed special initiative in this respect. They sent in a memorandum asking for 106 million roubles, or 1,060 million roubles in terms of the old currency, for the drainage of 550,000 hectares³ of marshland. Byelorussia now has 6 million hectares of arable land, but they ask for the money for the drainage of 550,000 hectares. We told the Byelorussians: It would be better to channel this money into the development of the chemical industry, then we could build capacities for the production of about 2 million tons of nitrate fertilisers a year. If these fertilisers are applied on the arable lands in the republic, yields would rise from 6 to 7 centners per hectare.⁴ Clearly, such an employment of capital investments would be very advantageous. In this case outlays would be made only for the construction of plants and there would be no need to spend additional funds for the ploughing, cultivation and harvesting of the crops on the lands being reclaimed.

It is possible to raise considerably the yield of grain and other crops, to develop animal husbandry and to provide the country with the necessary foodstuffs by increasing the amount of mineral fertilisers used.

We should concentrate capital investments in those branches which produce the maximum economic effect. It is necessary that all leading workers understand this policy of the presidium of the C.P.S.U. central committee and the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, that it be persistently carried out and that no funds be requested for the rapid development of those branches for which there is no economic expediency at the present stage.

We should in the first place ensure the priority development of the chemical industry. Why is this necessary? Because the most urgent tasks of communist construction are more rapidly and more easily fulfilled with the help of the chemical industry: the rise in labour productivity, the rapid growth of public wealth, and the creation of an abundance of foodstuffs and consumer goods.

Look at the situation which is taking shape in the manufacture of foodstuffs and consumer goods. The manufacture of foodstuffs is growing uninterruptedly and we are exerting efforts to increase more rapidly the quantity of agricultural produce. Foodstuffs in our country are cheaper than in the western countries, even cheaper than in America; rent is considerably lower. However, clothing and footwear, as yet, are somewhat expensive, and the requirements in these goods are not being fully met. Can we rapidly solve this problem? Yes we can. What is required to achieve this? It is necessary to develop the chemical industry,

³ One hectare equals 2.47 acres.

⁴ One centner per hectare equals 0.797 cwt. per acre.

which provides the widest opportunities for satisfying man's requirements in clothing and footwear and also in furniture and other household goods. Natural fibres can also be successfully replaced in technical goods by chemical fibres.

I have been told that enterprises manufacturing artificial wool repay all expenses entailed within 18 months or two years. Hence, by increasing the manufacture of chemical fibres the conditions will be created for a rapid rise in accumulations. Figuratively speaking, mills manufacturing man-made and artificial fibres produce money.

By developing the chemical industry, one of the major branches of heavy industry, we can speed up the fulfilment of the task set by the party, that of supplying the national economy with many valuable materials and goods as well as more fully meeting the requirements of the population in consumer goods. The development of the chemical industry will facilitate the mass output of consumer goods, and this will make it possible to reduce prices of them.

At present I will not speak about how we shall do this, although it would be pleasant to be able to say this now. The road to increasing the manufacture of livestock produce, to creating an abundance of meat, milk and butter and to reducing the prices of them also lies through the chemical industry. In order to achieve this it is necessary to supply the fields with mineral fertilisers. Today we are in a position to do this.

I recently spoke to Mr. Garst, the American farmer. He is a clever man and is friendly towards us. He said: "I am convinced, and I will speak about this in America, that within five to seven years you will catch up with us in the output of agricultural produce. What I have seen has amazed me."

Comrades, it is necessary to consider most seriously the letter of the C.P.S.U. central committee and the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers which was sent to the party organisations; it is necessary to study it and in a real way take part in drawing up the national economic plan.

Special attention should be given to capital construction. The incorrect practice, which is harmful to the state, of dispersing capital investments among many projects has not yet been eliminated. Every year capital investments are distributed more or less evenly among the projects already begun; the principal projects are not singled out. Often, new projects are started before those already under construction are completed. Huge funds are thus frozen for many years. As a result, we deprive ourselves of the possibility of putting important projects into operation on schedule, within a short span of time. This is the result of gross errors in planning.

In spite of the instructions of the C.P.S.U. central committee, the harmful tendencies of some economic, government and party workers to wheedle out as much money as they can and to squeeze into the plan as many construction projects as possible, have not yet been eradicated.

This desire to include more projects in the title lists is doing great harm to the economy. Some projects have been under construction for 10 or 12 years now, while, if the planning had been done intelligently, they would have been completed in a matter of three or four years, or

even sooner. Let us take a very simple example: 300 schools have to be built, but there is only enough money for 100. What is the present practice? We allocate the funds to start building all 300 schools; we begin building them, but the work goes on for many years. If we allocated funds to cover fully the construction of 100 schools, they would be completed within a year; the next year we would again allocate funds to cover fully the construction of another 100 schools, and then yet another 100; as much could be done during the three years as we are doing in five years under the present practice of funds dispersal. I have cited an example of projects which do not directly repay the money spent on them.

Now imagine the gain that would accrue if the funds were spent on industrial construction in a correct and concentrated way. If we concentrated our efforts on the key projects which should be put into operation this year, for instance, and allocated all the material and financial resources, machinery and manpower for this, these factories would start operating in a year's time, building up our economic potential, and would quickly yield accumulations.

In many cases, however, capital investments are still being used irrationally. Instead of being used in a rational, concentrated way, financial and material resources are dispersed, juggled about and frozen. This cannot be tolerated any longer.

As I have already noted, huge sums are allocated annually for capital construction in the Soviet Union; they run into thousands of millions of roubles. What is important for the country, however, is not only how much money is invested in construction, but in particular how many production capacities are put into service every year. The building up of production capacity is measured not only in terms of money invested but also—and this is most important—by the number of the factories going into production, power-generating units commissioned, new machines added to tooling facilities of factories, and so on.

Huge sums can be allocated and dispersed among a great number of projects, but no increase will be gained in terms of new production facilities, because the more projects there are in construction at one and the same time the fewer will be the new enterprises completed and put into operation.

This approach, far from being rational, is harmful and is inflicting serious damage to the state.

We have to choose now the most important construction projects and concentrate capital investments on them so as to commission them within the shortest time technically possible.

Work on a capital construction plan must begin with the title lists, with a thorough examination of every project, both those in the process of construction and those scheduled. In this way, it is possible to avoid miscalculations in planning capital construction. Funds must not be allocated among the different branches according to existing proportions and in such a way that the increase in each of them, in terms of percentage, is maintained at the average rate of growth in all branches of the economy, as was done in the past. Above all, funds must be allocated for develop-

ing the main, progressive branches, in the first place the chemical industry, for expanding substantially the manufacture of mineral fertilizers, plastics, synthetic fibres, fibreglass, new synthetic rubbers and other advanced and economic materials.

We should thoroughly examine all projects under construction, to assess the importance of each of them in the national economic plan, and to calculate for how many of them we have enough material resources. I stress material resources and not money. It is necessary to determine how many of the new projects we can supply with equipment so that both construction work and the installation of equipment at these new projects can be completed simultaneously, without interruptions or idle periods, so that the new enterprises can give returns to the country in the form of finished products at once and the money spent on their construction can be recouped speedily.

As for projects which cannot be supplied with material resources, under no circumstances must work on them be begun, so as not to repeat the mistaken practice which has existed to date. If calculations show that there is an insufficient supply of material resources to carry on at a fast pace the projects already started, we must resolutely "freeze" some of them, must postpone their construction to a later date. It is essential that the projects which are included in the title lists for 1964-65 be fully provided with all types of both building materials and equipment.

I think that if we approach the drawing up of the capital construction plan from this angle, we shall probably be able, with the same capital outlays, to double the production capacity put into operation in 1964 and 1965 as compared with that under the old system. And this is of decisive importance, because the resources we now have, and we possess huge resources, will be all the more quickly turned into completed factories which will return them to the national economy in the form of finished products, and this will enable us to increase accumulations and to raise still higher the country's economic potential.

An end must resolutely be put to parochialism. This requires persistence and will. It is essential to do away with self-seeking practices everywhere—from the Union republics down to every factory. It should be remembered that self-seeking practices are a great evil.

The letter of the C.P.S.U. central committee and the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers stresses the need to cut construction time considerably and speed up the commissioning of projects. It is vital to reduce the scope of unfinished construction to a minimum.

The presidium of the central committee has instructed me to draw up a report for the central committee's next plenary meeting on the development of the chemical industry, and we are thinking of preparing for that meeting more detailed data on the efficiency of capital investments.

In order to make the most rational use of money and, especially, material resources and concentrate them on the decisive sectors, we ought, perhaps, not to begin new constructions in 1964 and, I repeat, should even "freeze" some projects with a view to completing the faster the projects started. Exceptions can be made only for particularly

important projects, and their construction, moreover, should only be started by special permission of the C.P.S.U. central committee and the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers.

Comrades, we have to take these steps. If we don't do this, every year will see a further increase in dead capital which does not yield any return for many years.

The letter of the central committee and the Council of Ministers sets forth the principles which should be followed in drawing up plans. Economic planning is a matter of exceptional importance. The success of communist construction to a great extent depends on how correctly economic development plans are drawn up. Therefore the party must also tackle the problems of planning. The State Planning Committee alone cannot cope with this work.

It is necessary to draw the masses of the working people into the drafting of plans. The party's central committee and the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers are confident that the party, government, trade union and Y.C.L. organisations and all the working people will take an active part in the elaboration of plans and step up their efforts to ensure that the targets of the Seven-Year Plan are achieved ahead of time.

* * *

Comrades, I am concluding my speech. Our plenary meeting has discussed important issues. I think that its decisions will play a major part in the life of the party and the country. Ideological weapons should always be kept in perfect condition and ready for use. These weapons should be used to strike the enemy who is trying to carry on his subversive work. Our people are rallied closely around their Communist Party. Led by the party and under the banner of the party, the Soviet people will win new victories and accomplish new achievements.

Raising on high the banner of Marxism-Leninism, we shall advance with greater confidence and more quickly to the goal set in the decisions of the 22nd Party Congress and in our party's programme—the victory of communism!