Proletarians of all countries, unite!

THEORETICAL AND POLITICAL JOURNAL
of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)

SEPTEMBER
XXIX year of publication

№ 17

1952

Editorial Address: Moscow, Leningradskoe Highway, Pravda St., 24. Tel. D 3-36-38.

This is a publication of STC — SPC — DD(CP).
November 2026.

Source:

Language: Russian

Produced by transcription, manually edited and prepared as an e-book. Translated into English using Gemini, Google Translate and Yandex Translate.

This is a publication of STC — SPC — DD(CP).

November 2026.

Direct Democracy (Communist Party)
Doğrudan Demokrasi (Komünist Parti)
Άμεση Δημοκρατία (Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα)
Прямая демократия (Коммунистическая партия)
www.directdemocracy4u.uk

Kıbrıs'ta Sosyalist Gerçek
Σοσιαλιστική Πραγματικότητα στην Κύπρο
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus
Социалистическая правда на Кипре
http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk

Kıbrıs Sosyalist Partisi
The Socialist Party of Cyprus
Το Σοσιαλιστικό Κόμμα Κύπρου
Социалистическая партия Кипра
https://st-cyprus.co.uk/kibris-sosyalist-partisi

ПРОЛЕТАРИИ ВСЕХ СТРАН, СОЕДИНЯЙТЕСЬ!

БОЛЬШЕВИК

№ 17 СЕНТЯБРЬ № 17

МОСКВА
Издательство «ПРАВДА»
1952

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

THEORETICAL AND POLITICAL JOURNAL
of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)

SEPTEMBER
XXIX year of publication

№ 17

1952

Editorial Address: Moscow, Leningradskoe Highway, Pravda St., 24. Tel. D 3-36-38.

Table of Contents

NEW FIVE-YEAR PLAN — DEMONSTRATION OF THE GREAT VITAL FORCE OF SOCIALISM.....6
THE ALL-CONQUERING IDEOLOGICAL WEAPON OF THE PARTY OF LENIN AND STALIN.....15
SOCIALIST PRODUCTION — SOURCE OF WELL-BEING OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE.....18
MECHANIZATION OF LABOR IN INDUSTRY AND THE RISE OF THE CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL LEVEL OF THE WORKING CLASS.....29
ON THE STATUTES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY.....50
CRITICISM AND SELF-CRITICISM — A TESTED METHOD OF TRAINING CADRES.....74
FIRST VOLUME OF SELECTED WORKS OF MAO ZEDONG. 93
A. N. RADISHCHEV — GREAT PATRIOT AND REVOLUTIONARY.....115

NEW FIVE-YEAR PLAN — DEMONSTRATION OF THE GREAT VITAL FORCE OF SOCIALISM

The draft directives of the 19th Congress of the Party on the new five-year plan for the development of the USSR demonstrate to the entire world the mighty and irresistible vital force of socialism. Each of its sections, each figure is evidence of the fundamental advantages of the socialist economic system over the capitalist system.

Stalinist five-year plans have had and continue to have not only the greatest organizing and transforming significance for our country, but also a world-historical, international significance. They visually and clearly show the entire humanity the triumph of the all-conquering ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

Already in the first five-year plan, the economic foundation of socialism was created in the USSR. Thereby, the fabrications of the enemies of Marxism-Leninism, the enemies of our party, regarding the 'impossibility' of building socialism in a single country were refuted and scattered to the winds. The possibility of such construction was proven practically, in deeds.

Moreover: the results of the five-year plan showed that the capitalist economic system is untenable and fragile, that it is outliving its age and must yield place to another, higher, socialist economic system. In the second and third five-year plans, the socialist system was unreservedly established and consolidated in all branches of the national economy of the USSR, and the remnants of the exploiting classes were liquidated. On this basis, such driving forces of Soviet society as moral-political unity, the friendship of the peoples of the USSR, and life-giving Soviet patriotism unfolded and grew stronger, manifesting themselves with particular vividness in the Great Patriotic War.

Comrade Stalin, concretizing and further developing Lenin's theory on the possibility of building socialism in a single country, came to the conclusion that it is possible to build communism in our country even if the capitalist encirclement persists. This conclusion of Comrade Stalin, which is a great contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory, has found its practical confirmation in the successes of communist construction in the USSR. This conclusion is now finding new confirmation in the draft directives of the 19th Congress of the Party on the fifth five-year plan.

'The fifth five-year plan,' the draft directives state, 'determines a new powerful upswing in the national economy of the USSR and ensures a further significant growth in the material well-being and cultural level of the people.

The fulfillment of the fifth five-year plan will be a major step forward along the path of development from socialism to communism.' The draft directives of the 19th Congress of the Party show once again that the Soviet State is conducting peaceful economic and cultural construction, while the economies of capitalist countries are feverish with the arms race, a frantic preparation for a new world war.

In all capitalist countries, and above all in the main citadel of imperialism—the United States of America—the entire economy is being transferred to a war footing at a rapid pace, which is fraught with the most severe consequences for the capitalist economy and can end only in its inevitable collapse. 'For,' Comrade Stalin points out, 'what does it mean to put a country's economy on a war economy footing? It means giving industry a one-sided, military direction, expanding to the utmost the production of goods necessary for war that are not connected with the consumption of the population, curtailing to the utmost the production and especially the output on the market of consumer goods for the population—consequently, reducing the consumption of the population and placing the

country before an economic crisis.' Facts show that no military boom is able to prevent such phenomena in capitalist countries as the continuous increase in unemployment, the rise in the cost of living, the catastrophic drop in purchasing power and living standards of the population, and the curtailment of enterprises engaged in the production of civilian goods.

In contrast to the capitalist economy with its one-sided, military development, in the Soviet Union all branches of the national economy develop on the basis of continuous expanded reproduction, which makes it possible to ensure an increasingly complete and comprehensive satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural needs of society. The socialist economic system provides full scope for the development of the country's productive forces and rapid technical progress in all branches of social production.

Capitalism cannot live without the enslavement and plunder of some countries by others. Having seized the economies of the capitalist countries of Western Europe and dependent countries of Latin America, the Near and Middle East, US monopolists ruthlessly strangle the national industry of these countries, artificially restrict their foreign trade, and impose upon them various trade and financial 'agreements' on the most enslaving terms. The socialist state creates fundamentally different relations between countries. These relations, based on equality and respect for other peoples, are steadily strengthening despite all obstacles raised by the American-British aggressors. The fifth five-year plan for the development of the USSR, as indicated in the draft directives of the 19th Congress, 'will contribute to the further consolidation and expansion of economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy and the development of economic relations with all countries desiring to develop trade on the basis of equality and mutual benefit.'

The new five-year plan is a striking demonstration of the great vital force of the Soviet social and state system. Only in the country of victorious socialism, only on the basis of the advantages of the socialist economic system is such rapid growth of all branches of social production, such a sweep of capital construction, and such giant technical progress possible. In our country—a country of victorious socialism—the development of social production leads to a systematic rise in the material and cultural level of the working people, to the growth of popular consumption, and ensures an increase in the real wages of workers and employees and the incomes of the peasantry.

One of the greatest advantages of the socialist economic system lies in its planned nature. The growth of the national economy, Comrade Stalin teaches, proceeds with us not blindly, not in the order of a simple quantitative growth of production, but in a known, strictly defined direction.

The national economy of the USSR is confidently moving toward the level of development that was outlined by Comrade Stalin in his historic speech on February 9, 1946—toward the annual production of up to 50 million tons of pig iron, up to 60 million tons of steel, up to 500 million tons of coal, and up to 60 million tons of oil. Caring for the further continuous expanded reproduction in all branches of the national economy, the party ensures the basis of such reproduction—the preferential development of the production of means of production. The draft directives on the new five-year plan outline an annual increase in the production of means of production by 13% and of consumer goods by 11%. Machine building—the basis of technical progress in all branches of the national economy and the strengthening of the defense capability of the USSR—will grow particularly during the five-year period. The output of engineering and metalworking will increase approximately twofold over the five-year period, with

a total growth of all gross industrial output of approximately 70%. Electric power production will increase by 80%, with the capacity of power plants increasing approximately twofold, and hydroelectric power stations threefold. Construction of a large number of new enterprises and expansion of capacities of existing ones—plants, factories, power stations, coal mines, oil fields—lies ahead.

The new five-year plan, providing for a huge growth in industry and above all heavy industry, opens up wide prospects for socialist agriculture as well. The main task in the sphere of agriculture, the draft directives state, remains the increase in the yield of all agricultural crops, a further increase in the social livestock population while significantly increasing its productivity, and an increase in the gross and marketable output of farming and animal husbandry through the further consolidation and development of the social economy of collective farms, improving the work of state farms and Machine and Tractor Stations (MTS) on the basis of introducing advanced machinery and agricultural culture in agriculture.

Agriculture will become even more productive and qualified, with developed grass sowing and proper crop rotations, a higher specific weight of sown areas of industrial, fodder, vegetable crops, and potatoes. Agricultural production over the five-year period will significantly increase, including grain by 40-50%. Animal husbandry products will grow even more. Thus, a major new step will be taken along the path of creating an abundance of agricultural products for the population and raw materials for industry in the country.

Of decisive importance for the continuous growth of social production is the circumstance that the national economy is increasingly equipped with new, most advanced machinery, while at the same time the cultural and technical level of the working people is rising. On this basis, labor productivity is

growing in all branches of the national economy, and socialist emulation is expanding ever wider.

The draft directives on the new five-year plan set the task: to basically complete the mechanization of heavy and labor-intensive work in industry and construction, as well as the mechanization of the most important agricultural operations. Only in the country of victorious socialism can such a task be set and successfully solved. Under capitalism, new machinery is used only in cases where it promises monopolies the highest profit. If it is more profitable for capitalists to use manual labor, they refuse to use machines and mechanisms, and in every possible way hinder the introduction of new technology. Under socialism, new technology serves as a powerful means of increasing labor productivity, expanding social production, improving and easing working conditions. The introduction of new technology, which was carried out systematically and consistently in the pre-war years, during the war, and in the first post-war five-year plan, now, in the new five-year plan, acquires even wider scope.

To ensure a new powerful technical progress in all branches of the national economy, the party shows special concern for the further development of the basis of this progress—Soviet machine building. In 1951–1955, it is planned to build and commission new and reconstruct existing plants for power engineering and rolling equipment, plants manufacturing equipment for the oil industry, hoisting and transport equipment, large machine tools, forging and pressing machines, precision measuring instruments, automatic process control instruments, etc.

The persistent introduction of new technology is combined in our country with the tireless rise in the cultural and technical level of the working people. This rise is one of the most important factors in the continuous growth of social production and the development of the entire socialist economy. To

manage modern technology, serious technical and general educational knowledge is required. The party takes all measures to arm the broadest masses of working people with such knowledge, to fulfill the task set by Comrade Stalin: to make all workers and all peasants cultural and educated.

In the new five-year plan, the transition from seven-year to universal secondary education is outlined in the capitals of the republics, cities under republican subordination, and in regional, territorial, and major industrial centers, so as to make such a transition in the remaining cities and rural localities in the next five-year plan. The draft directives set another task of immense importance: the implementation of polytechnical education in secondary schools, which will provide students graduating from secondary school with conditions for the free choice of professions. The network of correspondence and evening higher and secondary specialized educational institutions, as well as general education schools for training working people without interruption from production, will receive further development. The training and upgrading of workers in various courses and schools organized directly at enterprises is expanding. Millions of collective farmers will raise their qualifications in courses of mass agro- and zootechnical training on collective farms.

Taking measures to raise the cultural and technical level of the working people, the party thereby ensures a further powerful upswing in all-people socialist emulation. Precisely because the cultural and technical level of the masses is constantly growing, they raise emulation to an ever higher stage, reveal and bring into action new reserves hidden in the correct, most rational use of advanced technology and in the improvement of labor organization, raise and successfully solve fundamental issues of enterprise economics, and search for and find ways to improve qualitative indicators.

The strength of economic plans outlined by the Communist Party and the Soviet State lies primarily in the fact that these plans always rely on the enthusiasm and initiative of the masses. Enthusiasm and initiative, most vividly expressed in socialist emulation, make it possible to overfulfill plans, shorten the deadlines set by the plan, and find new sources of accumulation. In order that the mighty organizing and mobilizing force of socialist emulation be used to the full and yield the greatest fruits, it is necessary to persistently improve the management of emulation in the future as well, eradicate the slightest elements of formalism in this matter, and prevent the replacement of genuine mass initiative by all sorts of far-fetched, official undertakings.

A great driving force of our development from socialism to communism is criticism and self-criticism. The significance of socialist emulation lies in the fact that it is, by definition of Comrade Stalin, an expression of businesslike, revolutionary self-criticism of the masses. Participants in emulation boldly break outdated technical norms and methods of labor and production organization, make amendments to design capacities and economic plans, designs of machines and mechanisms, and frequently correct economic managers, engineers, economists, technologists, and designers. Criticizing and casting aside everything that is obsolete, lagging behind life and Stakhanovite practice, and fighting for the introduction of the new and advanced, participants in emulation push social production and its technical progress forward.

The most important conditions for the successful implementation of the tasks outlined by the draft directives of the 19th Congress on the fifth five-year plan are all-round support—on the part of party, economic, and trade union organizations—for production innovators and broad criticism of shortcomings. Both of these conditions stem from the very nature of the Soviet State, which always and in everything

relies on the new and advanced, and warmly and effectively supports the bearers and champions of this new in their struggle against the old, obsolete, and hindering forward movement.

Comrade Stalin points out in his works that the essential features and requirements of the basic economic law of socialism consist in ensuring the maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural needs of society through the continuous growth and improvement of socialist production on the basis of higher technology. The draft directives on the fifth five-year plan are a new vivid confirmation of these essential features and requirements of the basic economic law of socialism.

THE ALL-CONQUERING IDEOLOGICAL WEAPON OF THE PARTY OF LENIN AND STALIN

October 1, 1952 marks fourteen years since the publication of the classical work of I. V. Stalin, 'History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks): Short Course', which occupies an outstanding place in the treasury of Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism is the scientific expression of the vital interests of the working class, its mighty ideological weapon in the struggle for the victory of communism. Comrade Stalin teaches that Marxism is the science of the laws of development of nature and society, the science of the revolution of the oppressed and exploited masses, the science of the victory of socialism in all countries, and the science of building communist society.

The all-conquering ideas of Marxism-Leninism, set forth in Stalin's 'Short Course of the History of the CPSU(B)', have had and continue to have a tremendous impact on all aspects of public life in our country and on the development of the revolutionary movement throughout the world. Under the banner of the ideas of the party of Lenin and Stalin, Soviet people are successfully carrying out the gradual transition from socialism to communism. Under the banner of these ideas, the working people of the countries of people's democracy are building a new, socialist life, and the oppressed masses in capitalist countries are waging a struggle for peace, democracy, and socialism.

Comrade Stalin's book enjoys immense popularity among the cadres of the Communist Party and the Soviet State, all Soviet people, and fighters in the international camp of peace, democracy, and socialism. It is the most widespread Marxist book in the world. It has been published in 47 languages of the peoples of the USSR and translated into many foreign

languages; its total circulation exceeds 41 million copies. 'Short Course of the History of the CPSU(B)' has become a desk book for many millions of people.

In this work by Comrade Stalin—the brilliant continuator of the immortal cause of the great Lenin—the giant experience of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), the like of which no party in the world has had or has, is theoretically generalized. It gives a profoundest analysis of the historical path traversed by the CPSU(B) from the first small Marxist circles and groups to the great Bolshevik party leading the world's first socialist state of workers and peasants.

'Short Course of the History of the CPSU(B)' is a truly scientific history of Bolshevism, a code of great ideas and great deeds of the party of Lenin and Stalin. By creating this remarkable book, Comrade Stalin put an end to arbitrariness and confusion in expounding the history of our party, eliminated the gap between Marxism and Leninism, as well as between the theory and practice of Bolshevism, which had taken place in previous textbooks on the history of the CPSU(B).

Stalin's 'Short Course of the History of the CPSU(B)' is a remarkable work of creative Marxism, a veritable encyclopedia of fundamental knowledge in the field of Marxism-Leninism. It masterfully summarizes and sets forth the new elements introduced into Marxism by Lenin and Stalin, with whose names the era of the triumph of Marxism and the embodiment of its ideas in life are inextricably linked.

The history of the CPSU(B) teaches that the Bolshevik party owes all its successes to the wise leadership of Lenin and Stalin. They armed it with an indestructible weapon of victory —Marxist-Leninist theory, which allows one to orient oneself in the situation, understand the internal connection of surrounding events, foresee the course of events, and recognize

not only how and where events are developing in the present, but also how and where they should develop in the future.
The Communist Party is strong in its loyalty to Marxist-Leninist teaching, by which it is steadily guided in all its activities. While all ruling parties in capitalist countries live without prospects and cannot find ways to get out of the quagmire of political and economic crisis, the Bolshevik party looks confidently into the future, boldly leading the Soviet people along the path of gradual transition from socialism to communism.
Throughout its history, the party of Lenin and Stalin developed criticism and self-criticism as a special, Bolshevik method of training cadres and as a most important means of strengthening and developing the party. Stalin's 'Short Course of the History of the CPSU(B)' helps to understand the immense significance of criticism and self-criticism for uncovering and eliminating shortcomings in work...
The appearance of the 'Short Course of the History of the CPSU(B)' created a fundamental turning point in the organization of propaganda of Marxism-Leninism and initiated a new powerful upswing in the ideological and political life of the party and the Soviet people.
The twentieth century is the century of Lenin and Stalin, the century of the triumph of Marxism-Leninism. The great ideas of Marxism-Leninism are embodied in the world-historical successes of the Soviet Union, in the successes of the countries of people's democracy; these ideas inspire the working class and working people of the whole world in a selfless struggle against imperialism, for peace, for democracy, for socialism, and strengthen their confidence in the ultimate victory of communism.

SOCIALIST PRODUCTION — SOURCE OF WELL-BEING OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE

G. Sorokin

The draft directives of the 19th Congress on the fifth five-year plan outline a new powerful upswing in socialist production and, on this basis, a further improvement in the well-being of the Soviet people.

The production of material goods plays the main and determining role in the development of any social system. This fully applies to socialist society as well. But the goals and regularities of production are not identical in different historical epochs.

The essential features and requirements of the basic economic law of modern capitalism, Comrade Stalin teaches, consist in securing maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin, and impoverishment of the majority of the population of a given country, through the enslavement and systematic plunder of the peoples of other countries...

Lenin and Stalin teach that concern for the welfare of the people is the first and main duty of the party and the state. 'Socialism,' Comrade Stalin points out, 'can be built only on the basis of a stormy growth of the productive forces of society...'

As a result of the fulfillment of pre-war five-year plans, the national income in the USSR increased in 1940 compared to 1913 by more than 6 times. Despite the unprecedented destruction of the war years, in 1950 as a result of the fulfillment of the fourth five-year plan...

Exceptionally rapid rates characterize the development of socialist culture. By the end of the fifth five-year plan, the task is set to complete the transition from seven-year education to universal secondary education...

Despite the heavy losses inflicted on our national economy by the war, the socialist economy already as a result of the fourth five-year plan not only liquidated the consequences of the war, but also significantly exceeded the pre-war level. In 1950, gross industrial output was 73% higher than that of 1940.
The directives on the fifth five-year plan envisage an increase in the level of industrial production of the USSR over five years by approximately 70%; the average annual rate of growth of gross industrial output should be approximately 12%. At the same time, a further serious improvement in the quality of production will be achieved. For comparison, it should be noted that during 1946–1951, the average annual rate of growth of US industry, despite huge government military orders, amounted to only 1.3%.
The fifth five-year plan defines higher rates of growth in the production of means of production than the rates of growth in the production of consumer goods. The priority development of the production of means of production compared with the production of consumer goods is a necessary prerequisite for expanded reproduction and equipping the national economy with advanced technology.
The new five-year plan for the development of the USSR requires a further upswing in metallurgy and a significant increase in the production of non-ferrous metals. Major tasks have been set before the fuel and energy sectors, which, like metallurgy, determine the growth of the entire national economy.
Machine building, one of the decisive branches of industry for the development of the national economy, must expand its production at particularly high rates. Our machine building is obliged to provide equipment for all branches of the national economy in accordance with their production assignments. At the same time, a particularly important task is the full provision of equipment for electric power stations, ferrous and non-

ferrous metallurgy enterprises, and the construction of oil refineries and plants for the production of synthetic liquid fuel. Of great importance for the upswing of agricultural production, the automotive industry, non-ferrous metallurgy, light and food industries will be the development of the chemical industry outlined by the five-year plan. An indispensable condition for the further growth of the national economy is the elimination of the lag in the timber industry and a sharp increase in the production of basic building materials.

The fifth five-year plan ensures high rates of growth in the production of mass consumer goods and provides for an increase in the output of light and food industries by at least 70%. Previous work on the construction of heavy industry, as well as on the restoration and development of socialist agriculture, makes it possible in the fifth five-year plan to achieve further powerful development of light industry.

Under socialism, unlike capitalism, coordinated development of industry and agriculture is ensured, without which a serious increase in social production for the purpose of satisfying the needs of the whole society is impossible. In the field of agriculture of the USSR, the main task remains to increase the yield of all agricultural crops, further increase the social livestock population with a simultaneous significant increase in its productivity, and increase the gross and marketable output of farming and animal husbandry by further strengthening and developing the social economy of collective farms, improving the work of state farms and MTS (Machine and Tractor Stations) on the basis of introducing advanced machinery and agricultural culture.

Over the five-year period, the gross grain harvest will increase by 40–50%, the gross harvest of industrial crops will significantly increase, and animal husbandry output will grow. The growth of collective farm and state farm production will provide the population with agricultural products to an even

greater extent, provide light and food industries with raw materials, and allow increasing state food reserves.
In accordance with the growth of industrial and agricultural production, the commodity turnover of state and cooperative trade increases, and transport receives the necessary development. Retail trade turnover will be expanded over the five-year period by approximately 70% due to an increase in the sale of the most valuable food products, major light industry goods, as well as cultural and household items.
In the national economic plans of the USSR, which determine the growth of social production, special attention is paid to ensuring specified rates and proportions by preparing the production apparatus: building factories and plants, electric power stations, transport routes, irrigation and land reclamation structures, etc. Capital construction plans determine the increase in fixed assets and production capacities. They provide for measures for the accelerated upswing of leading branches of the national economy. In the fourth five-year plan, the tasks of restoring the economy of areas affected by the war were of paramount importance. These tasks have been successfully solved. The fifth five-year plan outlines a broad program of new construction in all branches of the national economy.
Compared with the fourth five-year plan, the total volume of state capital investments increases across the entire national economy by approximately 90%, including approximately 2 times in industry, 2.1 times in agriculture, and 63% in transport and communications. In industrial construction, the expansion of existing enterprises is viewed as the most important reserve for increasing production at minimal cost. A feature of the capital construction plan in the fifth five-year period is also the creation of reserves ensuring further growth of production beyond the fifth five-year plan. The directives on the fifth five-year plan oblige the creation of reserves in the construction of

metallurgical enterprises, electric power stations, oil refineries, coal mines, and mineral fertilizer plants in order to ensure the necessary development of these sectors in subsequent years.
The continuous growth of socialist production, which forms the basis for the maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural needs of society, can occur only on the basis of higher technology and its systematic improvement.
The entire historical path of development of the national economy of the USSR is a path of technical progress. The fulfillment of the fifth five-year plan will lead to a further increase in the technical level of socialist production.
Lenin and Stalin repeatedly pointed out the great importance of electrification in building a communist society. Electrification is the basis for the mechanization and automation of production, a mighty factor in increasing labor productivity. Technical progress in transport and agriculture is also largely connected with electrification.
In the fifth five-year plan, high rates of increasing the capacity of electric power stations are envisaged. Special attention will be paid to hydroelectric power stations. Large hydroelectric power stations ensure the mass generation of cheap electric energy. Their construction is a necessary condition for the comprehensive use of the country's richest water resources. Large hydroelectric power stations serve as powerful strongholds for the economic development of new areas possessing grandiose mineral reserves. During the years of the fifth five-year plan, the capacity of hydroelectric power stations should approximately triple. The Kuibyshev hydroelectric power station on the Volga, as well as the Kama, Gorky, Mingechaur, Ust-Kamenogorsk, and other hydroelectric power stations will be put into operation. Construction of the Stalingrad and Kakhovka hydroelectric power stations will expand, and construction of the Cheboksary station on the Volga, Votkinsk on the Kama, Bukhtarma on the Irtysh, and a

number of others will begin. Work will begin on harnessing the energy resources of the Angara River to develop major industries on the basis of cheap electricity and rich sources of raw materials. Alongside the construction of hydroelectric power stations, existing thermal district and factory power plants using local fuel will be expanded and new ones built on a large scale.

The expansion of power station construction projected by the five-year plan will make it possible to expand the electrification of industry and other branches of the national economy even further, as well as to more fully satisfy the household needs of the population. As indicated in the draft directives on the fifth five-year plan, one of the most important tasks in agriculture is the introduction of electric tractors and agricultural machines operating on the basis of electric power, especially in areas of large hydroelectric power stations. It is envisaged to increase fourfold, compared to the fourth five-year plan, the commissioning of electrified railways.

Of great importance in further raising the technical level of the national economy will be the development of mechanization and automation of production. In the fifth five-year plan, the mechanization of heavy and labor-intensive work in industry and construction will be basically completed. The mechanization of main field operations on collective farms will be completed, and on state farms, the comprehensive mechanization of all the most labor-intensive operations in field cultivation, animal husbandry, fodder procurement, and feed preparation will be basically completed. All this will lead to the elimination of professions requiring heavy manual labor.

In ensuring technical progress, including the development of electrification of the national economy and the mechanization of heavy and labor-intensive work, the decisive role belongs to Soviet machine building. The fifth five-year plan, envisaging high rates of development of machine building, ensures the

priority upswing of those of its branches on which the supply of equipment to leading sectors of the national economy depends.

The fifth five-year plan outlines measures for introducing advanced technology into all branches of our national economy, including agriculture. Further raising the agrotechnical level of agriculture is connected with the consistent application of a proper farming system, broad water management construction, and the expansion of mechanization, chemicalization, and electrification of agricultural production.

In the fifth five-year plan, new, very significant work will be done to fulfill the Stalinist plan for the transformation of nature. Farming will become even more productive and skilled, with developed grass sowing and proper crop rotations, and a higher proportion of sown areas of industrial, fodder, vegetable crops, and potatoes.

In the fifth five-year plan, the technical level of transport will significantly increase. This will contribute to solving the most important task—increasing the carrying capacity of railways. The demand of railway transport for modern steam locomotives, electric locomotives, diesel locomotives, freight, isothermal, and passenger cars will be fully met. In the field of river transport, work on the reconstruction of the Volga-Baltic waterway will be completed. All this, together with the hydraulic structures on the Volga and Kama, will allow completing the creation of a unified deep-water transport system. The rivers of the European part of the USSR will be transformed into first-class navigable highways.

Five seas are united into a single transport system: the White, Baltic, Black, Azov, and Caspian seas.

The development of means of labor during the transition to communism makes it possible to increasingly subordinate the mighty forces of nature to the interests of society and transform natural conditions in a direction desirable for man.

The development of the national economy in accordance with the requirements of the economic laws of socialism, and the use of known economic laws for the purpose of building a communist society, cannot proceed spontaneously and require the active work of all state organs under the leadership of the Communist Party. The socialist state plays a special, outstanding role in the development of the economy; it organizes planned cooperation of working people on a nationwide scale and is a mighty instrument for building communism. As is known, the state is a political superstructure over an economic basis; the character of the economic basis is reflected in the organizational structure and functions of the state.

The bourgeois state grew up on the basis of antagonistic relations of production. Relations of private property and exploitation of the proletariat, constituting the economic essence of bourgeois society, determine the character of the capitalist state. The bourgeois state, or, as Marx calls it, a committee for managing the common affairs of the bourgeoisie, has as its main function the protection of private ownership of the means of production and the suppression of resistance by the exploited classes. The economy is of little concern to the capitalist state; it is not in its hands. Defending private property, the bourgeois state acts as a reactionary force hindering the development of productive forces, and this ultimately dooms the capitalist state to inevitable destruction. The conflict between the production relations of capitalism and the productive forces that have grown within its depths forms the economic basis of the proletarian revolution, which shatters the state machine of capitalism to smithereens and establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The socialist state arose and strengthened as a result of the overthrow of the exploiters and the liquidation of capitalist property, on the basis of establishing public ownership of the

means of production, on the basis of socialist relations of production. Now the working class in alliance with the working peasantry acts as the leading and ruling class. The position of the working people, who have become masters of the state, coincides with their position as owners of the means of production and the main productive force of society.

The organization of all social production under socialism can only be a state organization, since the implementation of the socialist principle—'from each according to his abilities, to each according to his work'—requires centralized state management of social production and distribution of products. V. I. Lenin emphasized that socialism is inconceivable 'without planned state organization which keeps tens of millions of people to the strictest observance of a unified standard in production and distribution of products' (Works, Vol. 27, pp. 306–307).

The main task of the Soviet state inside the country consists in peaceful economic-organizational and cultural-educational work. When the proletariat rises to the position of the ruling class and the means of production are transformed into public property, the state of the proletariat acts as the organizer of social production according to a single plan.

The socialist state protects and multiplies public property as the sacred and inviolable foundation of the Soviet system, and strengthens and develops socialist relations of production in full accordance with the character of the productive forces. Comrade Stalin teaches that the superstructure is not indifferent to the fate of its basis, to the fate of classes, to the character of the social system: 'On the contrary, having come into being, it becomes an exceedingly active force, actively assisting its basis to take shape and consolidate itself, and doing everything it can to help the new system finish off and eliminate the old basis and the old classes' ('Marxism and Problems of Linguistics', 1952, p. 7). The political superstructure over

socialist relations of production—the Soviet state—is the greatest active force in the development of the socialist economy.

The guiding core of all public and state organizations of the working people is the party of Lenin and Stalin. The Communist Party directs all economic, political, and cultural activities in the country, arming the Soviet people ideologically and theoretically in their struggle for the victory of communism. The policy of the Communist Party is the vital foundation of the Soviet system. 'Without the Party as the main leading force,' says Comrade Stalin, 'a dictatorship of the proletariat of any durability and firmness is impossible' (Works, Vol. 8, p. 36).

'Today,' states the draft amended Statutes of the Party, 'the chief tasks of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are to build a communist society by gradual transition from socialism to communism, to continuously raise the material and cultural level of society, to educate the members of society in the spirit of internationalism and the establishment of fraternal ties with the working people of all countries, and to strengthen in every way the active defense of the Soviet Motherland against the aggressive actions of its enemies.'

For the realization of these tasks, the implementation of the new five-year plan will be of great importance. Party organizations are called upon to mobilize the working people for the fulfillment of the fifth five-year plan, for ensuring a further upswing in socialist production and technical progress in the national economy, and for the widespread implementation of a regime of economy, increasing labor productivity, and reducing production costs.

The great power of socialist emulation, the unanimous striving of the workers, collective farmers, and intelligentsia of the USSR to uphold the cause of peace, and the unshakable determination of the working people to build a communist

society must be directed toward the fulfillment and overfulfillment of the new five-year plan.

The Soviet Union is steadily developing toward the gradual transition from socialism to communism. The new five-year plan ensures the necessary proportionality in the national economy, the strengthening of public socialist property as a whole, and the enhancement of the importance of state property. It is imbued with the great ideas of communism. The fulfillment of the fifth five-year plan will bring us even closer to the realization of the great goal of building a communist society.

MECHANIZATION OF LABOR IN INDUSTRY AND THE RISE OF THE CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL LEVEL OF THE WORKING CLASS

A. Grigoriev

Socialist industry, as envisaged by the draft directives of the 19th Congress of the Party on the fifth five-year plan, must yield a large increase in output. This increase will be obtained mainly through increased labor productivity. The draft directives outline an increase in labor productivity over the five-year period in industry by approximately 50% and in construction by 55%. Labor productivity will grow on the basis of an even broader introduction of advanced technology, improved organization of labor, and raising the cultural and technical level of the working people.

In a socialist society, these three main sources of labor productivity growth are interdependent. Raising the level of technical equipment of labor requires corresponding changes in the organization of labor and a further growth in the culture and technical knowledge of the working people. Only under the condition of a proper solution of all these tasks can the full utilization of new technology and the successful fulfillment of the plan for increasing labor productivity be ensured.

In the field of mechanization of production processes and advanced organization of labor, in the matter of utilizing new technology to the fullest and raising the cultural and technical level of the working class, serious successes have already been achieved. In the fifth five-year plan, an even greater scope of mechanization and automation is planned in the most diverse branches of the national economy. In industry and construction, the mechanization of heavy and labor-intensive work will be basically completed within the five-year period. Extensive

measures will be taken to further raise the cultural and technical level of the working class.

The basis of mechanization is the introduction of machine technology into production. The essence of mechanization lies in replacing labor operations performed manually with operations performed by a working machine under human control. The use of a machine in one area of production requires the mechanization of adjacent areas supplying raw materials and semi-finished products for this machine or processing its output. Thus, in coal mines, the mechanization of a number of basic coal mining processes—cutting, delivery, haulage, loading—urgently required the mechanization of surface operations. A modern mechanized blast furnace requires the mechanization of charge preparation and furnace loading, etc.

The transition to the machine method of production in one branch of the economy entails a similar transition in other branches, primarily in those connected with the mechanized branch. Backward sections preserved alongside mechanized ones in the general system of machine production turn into unbearable fetters and hinder the improvement of production organization even in those branches equipped with high technology.

Thus, being applied to one operation, in one branch, the machine creates a technical necessity for the restructuring of all interconnected operations, and ultimately all processes of social production. As Marx pointed out, 'a combined working-machine, which now forms an articulated system of various kinds of single working-machines and of groups of single working-machines, is all the more perfect the more the process as a whole becomes a continuous one, that is, the less the raw material is interrupted in its passage from its first phase to its last; in other words, the more its passage from one phase to another is effected not by the hand of man, but by the

machinery itself' ('Capital', Vol. 1, 1949, pp. 386–387). Every system of machines contains the potential to develop into a system of automatons. However, this potential, like the potentials of technological progress in general, is realized only under favorable social conditions.

Production is always social production. It encompasses both the productive forces of society and the production relations of people. The decisive force of production is the productive forces. Developing in accordance with the development of productive forces, production relations in turn influence the development of productive forces, accelerating or slowing it down. Productive forces can develop to their full extent only if production relations correspond to the character and state of productive forces and give scope to their development.

Modern capitalist production provides an example of the discrepancy between production relations and the character of productive forces, a conflict between them. Capitalism is characterized by an irreconcilable contradiction between the social character of production and the private, capitalist mode of appropriation. Under such social conditions, machine technology cannot develop freely. The production relations of modern decaying capitalism have become an insurmountable obstacle to technical progress. Technological development in capitalist countries has acquired a distorted, one-sided direction, concentrating on the creation of instruments of destruction and devastation. Armaments are the most profitable 'commodity' for monopolists, since prices for them are actually set by the monopolists themselves through the apparatus of the capitalist state subordinated to them. The capitalist state plunders the working people through high taxes, subsequently pumping these funds, under the clamor of war propaganda, into the bottomless pockets of the monopolists.

Unlimited scope for technical progress and for the development of machine production in all branches of the economy is

opened up only by socialist relations of production. Large-scale machine production is the natural material basis of socialism. Under socialism, the social character of production, based on machine technology, corresponds to public ownership of the means of production. Broad and continuous development of mechanization constitutes not only a possibility, but also an objective necessity of the socialist economy. 'To think that one can manage without mechanization given our pace of work and scale of production means hoping that one can bail out the sea with a spoon,' Comrade Stalin pointed out (Works, Vol. 13, p. 77).

The draft directives of the 19th Congress of the Party on the fifth five-year plan condemn the practice of those economic organizations that underestimate the tasks of introducing new technology and mechanizing labor and allow improper use of the labor force. Further technical improvement of production and comprehensive mechanization of labor are among the most important tasks of the new five-year plan.

* * *

The growth of technical equipment and mechanization of production achieved in the post-war period has created the possibility for a further accelerated upswing of the socialist economy during the years of the fifth five-year plan.

As is known, already in 1950, with a continuous increase in the number of workers, the electric power available per worker in industry increased one and a half times compared to 1940. Fixed production assets of industry increased by 58% over the same period. There are no sectors in our country where an increase in fixed assets and a strengthening of the technical equipment of labor have not occurred in the post-war years. Further expansion of production capacities and technical equipment of all branches of the national economy in the new five-year plan is ensured by high rates of development of electric power and leading branches of heavy industry.

The total capacity of electric power stations will approximately double over the five-year period, and hydroelectric power stations will triple. Major hydroelectric power stations will be commissioned, including Kuibyshev, Gorky, Kama, Mingechaur, Ust-Kamenogorsk, and others. Production capacities of the metallurgical and fuel industries will increase significantly, and the output of engineering and metalworking will approximately double.

In leading branches of heavy industry, mechanization and automation of production processes will be implemented. The draft directives on the new five-year plan outline extensive automation of power plants. Full automation of district hydroelectric power stations is expected to be completed. Telemechanization will be introduced in power systems.

In the coal industry, the mechanization of a number of basic processes has been practically completed. Back in 1949, the first mines with comprehensive mechanization of coal mining and delivery processes appeared. Simultaneously with the completion of mechanization, automation is developing: thousands of machines in mines are already remotely controlled. Based on mechanization, coal extraction from the stope increased one and a half times in 1949–1951. The most important task of the coal industry in the new five-year plan is to more widely introduce the latest mining machines and mechanisms for comprehensive mechanization, to mechanize the most labor-intensive coal mining processes in every possible way, and to more widely introduce mechanized methods of longwall roof support. Further technical re-equipment of coal extraction and transportation processes places new demands on mining methods as well.

In ferrous metallurgy, comprehensive mechanization of main shops is also being carried out with the widespread introduction of automatic control machines and instruments. In blast-furnace and open-hearth production, charging, blast

regulation, maintaining a given temperature, regulating pressure in the open-hearth working space, etc. are being automated. In the new five-year plan, the intensification of metallurgical processes, automation, and mechanization of metallurgical units and labor-intensive work at ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy enterprises will be enhanced.

Important qualitative shifts occurred during the fourth five-year plan in the branches of machine building. While the machine tool fleet more than doubled by the end of the fourth five-year plan compared to 1940, the share of specialized semi-automatic and automatic, as well as multi-spindle unit-type machine tools, increased within its composition. Equipment specialization became the basis for applying flow-line methods in all branches of machine building—from wristwatch production to the manufacture of steam locomotives and ships. In recent years, advanced machine-building enterprises have successfully applied flow-line methods in the production of machines and instruments of medium and even small batch sizes; here, the advantages of flow production are combined with a wide variety of manufactured machines. In 1950 and 1951 alone, Soviet machine builders mastered and produced more than 800 new types of machines and mechanisms. In a socialist society, flow-line production directly prepares the automation first of individual sections, and then of the entire production process of a given product.

In recent years, dozens of automatic lines have been installed in the USSR at enterprises in the automotive, tractor, aviation, agricultural machinery, ball-bearing industries, etc. Paveing new paths in technological development, Soviet machine builders created the world's first automatic plants for the production of concrete, pistons, and instruments for controlling machine systems. Automatic factories will be built in the most diverse branches of the national economy.

Machine building—the basis of technical progress in all branches of the national economy—is assigned responsible tasks in the new five-year plan. A particularly important task is the full provision of equipment for electric power stations, ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy enterprises, and the construction of oil refineries and plants for the production of synthetic liquid fuel. Production of rolling, chemical, hoisting and transport equipment, cargo and passenger vessels for sea and river transport, and high-performance machinery and equipment for timber harvesting and other sectors of the national economy must be significantly increased.

Our timber harvesting industry has become a highly mechanized branch of industry. In 1951 alone, the volume of mechanized work at enterprises of the Ministry of the Timber Industry of the USSR increased compared to 1950 by 1.7 times for timber felling and skidding, 2.2 times for timber loading, and 1.2 times for timber hauling. Yet the timber industry still lags behind the growing needs of the national economy of the USSR. In the new five-year plan, this lag must be eliminated. An important role in solving this task will be played by the comprehensive mechanization of timber harvesting operations, improving production organization, and the utilization of mechanisms.

Machines have become the decisive force in all major construction operations. Unprecedented results are achieved when using new powerful machinery at construction sites. Thus, the total capacity of machines at the construction of the V. I. Lenin Volga-Don Shipping Canal reached the capacity of the Dnieper Hydroelectric Station. Full comprehensive mechanization of earthmoving, concrete, reinforcement, and installation work was carried out during the canal's construction. Mighty Soviet machinery in the hands of people who mastered it ensured the completion of the Volga-Don Canal construction in the shortest possible time.

The growth of technical equipment in construction across the USSR as a whole is evident from the fact that in 1951 alone, the available fleet of excavators increased by almost 40%, scrapers by more than 30%, and bulldozers by more than 80%. The new five-year plan envisages increasing the fleet of excavators approximately 2.5 times, scrapers and bulldozers 3–4 times, and mobile cranes 4–5 times. Doubling the capacity of plants producing metal structures and building large plants for manufacturing precast reinforced concrete structures ensure the further expansion of industrial construction methods, the completion of mechanization of major construction works, and the transition from mechanization of individual processes to comprehensive mechanization of construction.

The draft directives on the five-year plan provide for extensive mechanization and automation of production processes for manufacturing food and industrial goods.

In all branches of industry, the technical equipment of labor is continuously growing, and an increasing number of production processes are being mechanized and automated, occurring not only through centralized supply of new machinery, but also by utilizing the increased capabilities of their own repair and mechanical shops.

The mighty flow of new technology and extensive mechanization of production processes in all branches of the national economy will create even greater opportunities in the fifth five-year plan for saving both living and materialized labor. The task is to fully utilize these opportunities and ensure further significant savings of material resources by eliminating excesses in the expenditure of materials and equipment, intensifying the struggle against rejects, introducing economical types of materials, full-fledged substitutes, and widely applying progressive production technology.

* * *

The development of social production begins with changes in productive forces, and above all with changes and development of the instruments of production. Changes and development of the instruments of production cause corresponding changes in the labor skills and production experience of the people who set these instruments in motion and carry out the production of material goods. In turn, the accumulation of production experience becomes a condition and source for further progress of the instruments and means of labor.

The development of means of production and technology continuously increases opportunities for labor productivity growth. However, these opportunities are not realized by themselves, not automatically. The use of new, more advanced instruments of labor places new, higher demands on the cadres organizing production. The richer and more powerful the production technology, the higher the cultural and technical level of the working class must be.

This dialectical process of development of productive forces proceeds freely only in a socialist society, where the instruments and means of production are in public socialist ownership and belong to the working people themselves. Technical progress under capitalism is subordinated to the capitalists' pursuit of maximum profit. Capitalists use only those machines that, under given conditions, promise them increased profits and place the least demands on the knowledge and experience of workers, and therefore can be operated by cheaper labor. As Marx pointed out, the most profitable thing for capitalists would be general intellectual brutalization, 'produced by the transformation of immature human beings into mere machines for the fabrication of surplus-value...' ('Capital', Vol. I, p. 405).

In a socialist society, where the immediate producers themselves are the masters of production, the development of technology is inextricably linked with raising the cultural and

technical level of the working people. Socialist relations of production, being relations of comradely cooperation and socialist mutual assistance of workers free from exploitation, have radically changed the social orientation and consequences of technical progress. All the mighty means of modern science and technology in our country have become means of easing labor, increasing well-being, and fostering the all-round cultural development of Soviet citizens. Technical progress under socialism contributes to transforming all working people into cultured and educated people.

The steady rise in the cultural and technical level of the working class constitutes a necessary aspect of technical progress in the USSR and a most important regularity of the gradual transition from socialism to communism.

Only along this path will the essential differences between mental and physical labor be overcome, and the cultural and technical level of workers raised to the level of engineering and technical personnel.

'It would be ridiculous to think that such a rise is impossible,' said Comrade Stalin. 'It is entirely feasible under the Soviet system, where the productive forces of the country are freed from the fetters of capitalism, where labor is freed from the yoke of exploitation, where the working class is in power, and where the young generation of the working class has every opportunity to secure an adequate technical education. There is no reason to doubt that only such a cultural and technical rise of the working class can undermine the basis of the antithesis between mental labor and physical labor, that only it can ensure that high labor productivity and that abundance of consumer goods which are necessary in order to begin the transition from socialism to communism' ('Problems of Leninism', 11th ed., pp. 495–496).

The first rudiments, still weak, it is true, yet rudiments of precisely such a cultural and technical rise of our country's

working class were discovered by Comrade Stalin with brilliant foresight in the Stakhanovite movement that originated in 1935—a new, higher stage of socialist emulation.

Analyzing the conditions that gave rise to and advanced the Stakhanovite movement, Comrade Stalin singled out and emphasized four points: a radical improvement in the material position of the working class, free labor for oneself and for society rather than for exploiters, the presence of new technology in our country, and the presence of cadres of male and female workers capable of taking the lead in technology and moving it forward.

Since then, especially in the post-war period, the power of these factors has been continuously growing. The material position of the working people is steadily improving, and their socialist consciousness, political activity, and labor activity are growing. Under these conditions, technical progress is increasingly being transformed from the narrow professional affair of a relatively small stratum of engineering and technical workers into the creative endeavor of millions of workers, engineers, and technicians. That is why in our country, in the country of victorious socialism, technical progress is impossible without the continuous cultural and technical rise of the working class. The inextricable connection between these processes manifests itself with particular force in growing socialist emulation and the Stakhanovite movement.

The initiators of new forms of emulation in various branches of industry laid the foundation for a persistent struggle by broad strata of the working class to raise professional knowledge and skill. The struggle to raise professional mastery is the basis of emulation for excellent product quality, for excellent performance of every production operation, and for the introduction of high-speed operating modes.

The possibilities for intensifying and accelerating technological processes inherent in modern technology are revealed and

uncovered by advanced, most experienced, and knowledgeable workers. A number of facts speak to the serious significance of reserves mobilized as a result of better utilization of technology. Improving equipment utilization based on scheduled operations increases coal output in mines by up to 40%. Due to better utilization of production capacities of blast-furnace and steel-smelting shops in 1951, the country received an additional 1,300,000 tons of pig iron and 1,350,000 tons of steel. In the cement industry, cement output increased by accelerating the rotation of rotary kilns and improving equipment maintenance. In construction, proper use of mechanisms sharply increases output per man-day.

However, high-speed operating modes have not yet become a mandatory method of work. Huge reserves for increasing production based on the full utilization of new technology are still hidden here.

A conference of high-speed metallurgists, convened in early 1952 by the Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, called upon all metallurgists to strive to make every heat a high-speed one. Mastering high-speed modes more fully is an important task for metallurgists and workers in other industries in the new five-year plan. A decisive condition for achieving this goal is raising the qualifications of workers. The ability to use a machine does not yet indicate a deep mastery of technology: experience is sufficient to operate a machine, but in order to uncover and maximally utilize the capabilities of this machine, knowledge is needed in addition to experience.

Under conditions of modern production equipped with powerful and complex machinery, where the main machine is combined, as a rule, with a number of servicing, control, and transport mechanisms and instruments, the task of mass mastery of technical knowledge arises in full stature.

New forms of emulation based on raising professional mastery met with the support of the broadest masses of workers. Tens

of thousands of metalworkers have mastered high-speed cutting. The number of high-speed operators is steadily growing in metallurgy, oil-well drilling, and railway transport. In all branches of industry, a struggle has unfolded to select and master the best working methods according to Engineer Kovalev's method. In Moscow, about 13,000 brigades—more than 150,000 workers—are competing for excellent product quality. More than 17,000 brigades participate in this competition at enterprises in the Moscow region.

The growth of the cultural and technical level of the working class in the post-war period is also reflected in the fact that successes in socialist emulation are increasingly measured not only by quantitative, but also by generalized qualitative indicators: reducing production costs at each operation, increasing labor productivity, better utilization of production equipment, etc.

A characteristic feature of socialist emulation in the post-war years is the struggle to raise the culture of production and for the organized dissemination of advanced experience. Advanced collectives of workers boldly put forward and successfully solve complex organizational, technical, and economic tasks, setting as their goal not only better utilization of equipment at their own work area, but also improving the organization of labor and raising the culture of production as a whole. Cleanliness at the enterprise, accounting methods, ways to prevent defects—all aspects of enterprise life are subjected to the fire of workers' criticism and self-criticism. Ever more actively, employing diverse forms, the working class fights for the full mastery of new technology.

Under conditions of highly mechanized, complex production, demands on production discipline—the basis of labor organization and all production—rise sharply. First of all, demands on technological discipline increase: without firm and well-thought-out technological discipline, modern large-scale,

highly mechanized production is impossible; only on the basis of strict adherence to the technological plan are the calculation of production over time and the full utilization of the capacities of new technology possible. Of course, strict adherence to established technology does not mean that it must remain unchanged, and presupposes the necessity of its organized improvement.

Demands on labor discipline are also changing. According to departmental instructions of earlier years, 'minor' downtimes—up to 10–15 minutes—were not even subject to accounting. Now the situation has changed: even a one-minute downtime of a powerful machine inflicts greater damage on production than an hour-long downtime did at the previous level of technical equipment. The struggle for full mastery and utilization of new technology requires raising labor discipline. Without this elementary condition, it is impossible to achieve consistent implementation of a regime of economy in all areas of economic construction, uncover reserves hidden in the depths of production, maximally utilize existing production capacities, systematically improve production methods, and reduce production costs, as required by the draft directives of the 19th Congress of the Party on the fifth five-year plan.

* * *

The development of Soviet technology, mechanization, and the transition to automation of production processes already require now, and in the near future will require to an even greater extent, that workers approach engineers and technicians in their cultural and technical level. Under modern conditions of technical equipment of labor, the transfer of advanced experience as a sum of working methods must be supplemented by a serious increase in technical knowledge. In this connection, new, heightened tasks arise in organizing the training of new workers and raising the qualifications of those currently employed.

In the post-war years, the party and the government have extensively expanded the training of new cadres and the upgrading of qualifications of employed workers. Industry and transport are systematically replenished with young workers graduating from trade and railway schools and schools of the Ministry of Labor Reserves. Annually, 5–7 million people undergo on-the-job training through individual, brigade, and course instruction. The number of individuals trained in schools and courses and those who raised their qualifications on the job far exceeds the net increase in the number of employed workers.

On the basis of an extensively developed system of vocational education and on-the-job training, serious changes have been achieved in the occupational composition and qualifications of workers. Thus, in the coal and mining industries, machine operators of all specialties have become the overwhelmingly predominant occupational group; in a number of sections, professions requiring manual labor have been completely eliminated.

No less significant shifts have occurred in the occupational composition of metallurgy workers based on the growth of labor mechanization. Labor expenditure for smelting a ton of pig iron in a modern mechanized blast furnace is approximately 10 times less than in a non-mechanized blast furnace. However, on a mechanized blast furnace, labor of a different quality is required: here the worker must be able to operate an entire complex of intricate mechanisms. Ferrous metallurgy of the USSR has created its own cadres who rapidly master powerful new technology. Thanks to this, the utilization of the useful volume of blast furnaces increased by 25% in 1950 compared to 1940, and steel output per square meter of open-hearth furnace floor area increased by 33%.

In the timber industry, in 1951 alone, the number of workers operating machinery increased by 47%, and compared to 1949,

by more than 2.5 times. Heavy labor professions—lumberjack, sleeper-hewer, feller—are disappearing. They are being displaced by new professions: electric saw operator, tractor driver, skidding winch operator, etc.

The qualitative changes achieved in recent years in the level of technical equipment of production—in particular, comprehensive mechanization, growth of automation, and massive application of new powerful mechanisms—urgently require further improvement in the training of new cadres and raising the qualifications of employed workers on the job. In the draft new five-year plan, special attention is paid to improving the quality of training young skilled workers in the state labor reserves system, and to training and upgrading workers through individual and brigade instruction and through a system of courses and schools organized at enterprises.

Given the vast scale of technical training in the USSR during the fourth five-year plan, issues of quantity often prevailed over issues of training quality. Thus, for example, main administrations and trusts of the timber industry, striving to train machine operator cadres as quickly as possible and failing to properly expand their own network of training bases, entrusted the training of logging tractor drivers in a number of districts to agricultural mechanization schools. Tractor drivers were trained in the summer under field conditions, whereas they had to work in the winter in the forest. They were forced to complete their training on the job. Plans for training highly skilled workers, most important in the modern environment, were sometimes underfulfilled, while assignments for training mass professions were overfulfilled. The quality of training was not always sufficiently high. Today, a thorough study of technology is becoming essential for an ever wider circle of workers.

Broad masses of workers take their cue from the new generation of Stakhanovites who achieve success on the basis

of serious knowledge in technology and the theory of their subject, and who are connected with scientific institutes. Just two years ago, at the Magnitogorsk Combine, it was barely possible to fill adult schools, whereas in 1951 so many applications were submitted that new premises for study had to be urgently found; in 1952, an additional 5 adult schools were opened and fully staffed. The creation of a network of schools for working youth facilitates every young worker obtaining a general secondary education. At many enterprises in our country, thousands of young production workers study in schools for working youth. To characterize the shifts occurring in this area, let us cite the following example: in Shop No. 1 of the 'Serp i Molot' (Hammer and Sickle) plant, among young workers (under 25 years of age), only 4.3% have a 4-grade education, 15.7% have a 5–6 grade education, while 80% of young workers (including graduates of trade schools) have a 7–10 grade education.

As the general educational level of the working people rises, the nature of on-the-job cadre training inevitably changes toward a deeper study of engineering and technology and the reduction, as unnecessary, of the simplest forms of training—such as, for instance, technical minimum courses.

Among the diverse forms of industrial training currently operating, long-term (4–6 month) targeted courses best meet the new, heightened demands of workers. Thus, at one ferrous metallurgy plant, in connection with the transition of open-hearth production to more advanced technology, workers were trained specifically in targeted courses whose curriculum devoted substantial space to teaching theory: physical metallurgy, chemistry, and physics. In connection with the introduction of automation, targeted courses on control and measuring instruments were organized; classes in these courses were also held at a high theoretical level. In the very first months after the completion of the courses, instances of

furnace roof burning decreased by 60–80%, and the number of high-speed heats increased by 30%.

The most widespread form of training—Stakhanovite schools—is also evolving toward extending the study period and more deeply studying theory, for which consultants—engineers or technologists—are attached to the schools.

The increasing complexity of equipment and the introduction of various auxiliary mechanisms require additional familiarity with electrical engineering, metalwork, and repair and installation operations. In this regard, elements of polytechnicism are growing in the training and retraining of cadres. Courses for mastering second and third trades are successfully used to broaden technical horizons and master additional knowledge and skills. Even now, a skilled worker capable of operating machine tools of various types is no rarity. Mastering a second and third trade not only broadens the worker's technical horizon and thereby enables him to more deeply master the technology in his own area, but also expands the sphere of application of the worker's labor—as it were, pushing back the boundaries of the profession. Mastering second and third specialties significantly increases an enterprise's maneuverability in combating equipment downtime, shortens repair times, improves repair quality, etc. Having studied repair metalwork, the basics of electrical engineering, and so on, machine operators, machinists, and crane operators adjust equipment better, eliminate and prevent minor downtimes, actively participate in repairing the serviced mechanism, and easily master technological changes.

The experience of the Magnitogorsk Metallurgical Combine, where mass training in repair metalwork was conducted for more than 2,000 operators of hoisting and transport mechanisms, demonstrated the possibility of improving the utilization of hoisting and transport mechanisms on this basis,

reducing their downtime, and thereby improving the servicing of main units.

It is also advisable to introduce changes into the work of factory and plant apprenticeship schools of the Ministry of Labor Reserves for training workers in mass professions. The new level of technical equipment of labor requires extending the training period in these schools in order to enhance the training of machine operators, mechanizers, and assemblers.

The vast possibilities of independent technical study are far from being fully utilized. Meanwhile, people have grown up at enterprises who are sufficiently prepared and willing to work independently on improving their technical knowledge. Independent work on mastering technical knowledge can and must be given broad scope.

Technical study rooms established at many advanced factories will bring great benefit in this matter. This valuable initiative deserves wide dissemination. A technical study room can become a center for both individual and group independent work on mastering technical knowledge. In the study room, one can find lists of technical literature available in factory libraries for those studying technology independently. Technical study rooms can become an important link connecting science with production, a center for assisting correspondence students of technical schools and higher technical educational institutions (VTUZes), and a center for patronage work by party and Komsomol organizations of VTUZes and technical schools with workers' technical circles.

A number of enterprises have technical councils or methodological bureaus; their functions include guiding the upgrading of cadre qualifications. However, not all councils have yet actively developed work in this direction. Alongside technical study rooms and technical councils, experimental workshops of enterprises could play a major role in raising the

level of technical knowledge by uniting worker-rationalizers and inventors around themselves.

The rapid growth in the number of rationalization proposals, technical improvements, and inventions is a vivid indicator of the rising qualifications, technical literacy, and initiative of production workers. While in 1949 over 450,000 proposals aimed at improving and radically perfecting production processes were introduced, in 1950 their number exceeded 600,000, and in 1951—up to 700,000. At the same time, the technical and economic effectiveness of rationalization proposals steadily increased.

In the fifth five-year plan, the task is set to elevate the mass movement of inventors and rationalizers from among engineers, technicians, workers, and collective farmers for further technical improvement and expansion of production, for comprehensive mechanization, and for further improvement and easing of working conditions. This will serve as a stimulus for a new rise in the educational and cultural-technical level of the broadest masses of working people.

The unprecedented sweep of socialist emulation, rising professional mastery, growing demands of the workers themselves regarding the quality and scope of on-the-job technical training, and the intensifying aspiration for polytechnical knowledge—all this serves as a clear indicator of the general rise in the cultural and technical level of the working class of the USSR.

The party and the Soviet government are creating all necessary conditions to fully satisfy the growing thirst of the working people for knowledge and for raising their education. The directives on the fifth five-year plan envisage completing by the end of the five-year plan the transition from seven-year education to universal ten-year secondary education, primarily in the capitals of the republics, cities under republican subordination, and in regional, territorial, and major industrial

centers. Polytechnical instruction will be developed in secondary schools, ensuring students conditions for a free choice of professions.
'We want,' said Comrade Stalin, 'to make all workers and all peasants cultured and educated, and we shall do so in time.'
The fifth five-year plan brings closer the deadlines for fulfilling this historic task.

ON THE STATUTES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

S. Abalin

The party of Lenin and Stalin approaches its regular 19th Congress mighty, invincible, and rallied around its Central Committee, around the inspirer and organizer of all our victories, Comrade Stalin. Thirty-five years ago, on the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Lenin brilliantly characterized our party as the mind, honor, and conscience of our epoch. The entire history of the party, the entire heroic path traversed by it, confirms these words of Lenin. Having organized the alliance of the working class and the working peasantry, the party achieved, as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the overthrow of the power of capitalists and landlords, the organization of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the liquidation of capitalism, the abolition of exploitation of man by man, and ensured the building of a socialist society.

The peoples of the Soviet Union, having built socialism under the leadership of their party, have already entered the path of gradual transition to communism. 'Today,' states the draft text of the amended Statutes of the Party, 'the chief tasks of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are to build a communist society by gradual transition from socialism to communism, to continuously raise the material and cultural level of society, to educate the members of society in the spirit of internationalism and the establishment of fraternal ties with the working people of all countries, and to strengthen in every way the active defense of the Soviet Motherland against the aggressive actions of its enemies.'

Our party was created by Lenin and Stalin as a revolutionary party, implacable toward the enemies of the working people, sufficiently bold, experienced, and flexible; it is tempered in

battles for the cause of the working class, for communism. In all its activities, it is guided by the most advanced, genuine science of the laws of development of nature and society—the teaching of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. This great teaching is the banner of the Communist Party and enables it to properly orient itself in complex historical conditions, understand the internal connection of events, foresee their course, and unerringly determine its policy in the interests of the people and for the people. 'Only a party which has mastered the Marxist-Leninist theory can confidently advance and lead the working class forward' ('History of the CPSU(B): Short Course', p. 339).

The party fulfills its role as leader and organizer of the masses not only thanks to its revolutionary theory and correct policy. A distinguishing feature of the Bolshevik party—a party of a new type, a living, growing party—has always been and remains its recognition of the exceptional role of organization in the struggle for socialism, for communism. In organization, cohesion, discipline, unity, and high combat readiness lies the strength of the Bolshevik party. We are people of organization, Lenin said. He taught that without organization the action of millions is impossible, and no success is possible. 'Organization increases strength tenfold.'

The immense importance of organization and party unity is emphasized by Comrade Stalin: 'The Party can lead the struggle of the working class in practice and direct it toward one goal only if all its members are organized into a single common detachment, welded together by unity of will, unity of action, and unity of discipline' ('History of the CPSU(B): Short Course', p. 46).

In their organization and organizational principles, communists see an instrument for implementing a consistent revolutionary program and tactics, a means of carrying out party policy and mobilizing the masses. The world-historical victories of the

peoples of our country were achieved not only thanks to carrying out the party's consistently revolutionary program and tactics, but also thanks to its organizational work. At all stages of the historical path traversed, the party was able to successfully lead the masses and organize them only because it itself was and is the personification of organization and discipline, an organized detachment of the working people. Faced with new tasks in building a communist society, our party is further strengthening the cohesion and organization of its ranks and raising the combat readiness of its local organizations even higher. This found vivid expression in the draft text of the amended Statutes of the Party submitted by the Central Committee of the CPSU(B) for consideration by the 19th Party Congress, and in the theses of Comrade N. S. Khrushchev's report 'Changes in the Statutes of the CPSU(B).'
The unshakable foundation of the organization of the Bolshevik party is the Leninist-Stalinist organizational principles determined by the goals of the party and its leading role in the struggle for these goals. Lenin and Stalin, in fierce struggle against the Mensheviks, Trotskyites, Bukharinites, and national-deviationists, forged the most perfect revolutionary type of party organization.
Even at the dawn of Bolshevism, in his remarkable work 'One Step Forward, Two Steps Back,' which constituted the organizational preparation of the Bolshevik party, Lenin was the first in the history of Marxism to develop the doctrine of the party as the leading organization of the proletariat, without which it is impossible to win in the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship. Lenin's book formulated organizational propositions that later became the organizational foundations of the Bolshevik party. These are propositions on the party as the advanced, class-conscious detachment of the working class, armed with knowledge of the laws of development of social life; on the party as an organized detachment of the working

class; on the party as the highest form of class organization of the proletariat, called upon to lead all other organizations of the working class, closely linked with the masses, and consisting of the best, most conscious people; on the party built on the principles of democratic centralism, with a single discipline equally binding on all party members without exception, both leaders and rank-and-file.

Comrade Stalin advanced the organizational science of Bolshevism and developed Lenin's doctrine of the party in such works as 'The Proletarian Class and the Proletarian Party,' 'Foundations of Leninism,' 'Problems of Leninism,' 'Short Course of the History of the CPSU(B),' and in a number of speeches at party congresses, conferences, and Central Committee plenums. Comrade Stalin comprehensively developed propositions on the Communist Party as a revolutionary party of a new type and specifically on its leading role in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, on inner-party democracy, on the scientific organization of selection, training, promotion, and deployment of cadres, on organizing verification of execution, on vigilance, on criticism and self-criticism, on combining economic and political work, and on mastering Bolshevism.

Leninist-Stalinist organizational principles find their embodiment in the Party Statutes. One of the most important guiding documents—the Statutes—provides a concise, scientifically formulated exposition of the party's structure, defines the methods of its practical activities, the organizational forms of its construction, the basic rules of its internal life, and its work among the working people. The Statutes state what the party is, what goals it sets for itself, who is admitted to the party and how, what the rights and duties of communists are, how inner-party democracy is exercised, establish the structure of party organizations—from primary organizations up to and including the Central Committee and

the Party Congress—and define their functions and tasks. For every party organization and for every communist, the Statutes are law. Strictest observance of the Statutes ensures the organization of the party and creates that unity of action of all communists without which the fulfillment by the party of its role as leader, teacher, and organizer of the masses is inconceivable. The party has always suppressed any attempts by anyone to undermine the Statutes, the rules and laws of party life, the unity of the party, or to weaken its will, its discipline, and inner-party democracy.

The Statutes are the unbreakable foundation of party life. Yet the party did not turn once-established organizational forms and methods of party work into dogma or a dead scheme. In organizational matters, as in all its activities, our party stands on the ground of creative Marxism. The organizational principles of the party remained unshakable, while the forms of party organization and methods of work were boldly restructured in accordance with concrete historical conditions and the party's new tasks. Delving into life, grasping new phenomena, new needs and demands, and taking accumulated experience into account, the party solved its organizational tasks in accordance with the political tasks arising at a given stage, establishing such forms and procedures as best ensured the achievement of the set goal. By the entire course of historical events, by life itself, it has been proven that thanks to such a creative approach, our party has always found and continues to find the best forms of organization and methods of work, creating the most perfected, honed organizational weapon helping it fulfill the most difficult tasks in the most complex conditions, steadily advance toward its ultimate goal, and lead the popular masses forward. No party in the world has ever had or has such gigantic experience in organizational work as our party has accumulated.

Naturally, the development of the Leninist-Stalinist doctrine of the party and the improvement of organizational forms and methods of party work found expression in the Party Statutes, in their amendments and additions. The history of our party knows many examples of such amendments and additions connected with major turning points in the life of the country and new political tasks.

Let us recall the Statutes adopted by the 6th Party Congress in August 1917, when the tasks of preparing and carrying out the socialist revolution stood in full stature. The Statutes provided for the construction of all party organizations on the principles of democratic centralism. The introduction under the Statutes of the procedure for admission to the party by recommendations—a procedure preserved to this day—made it possible to protect the party from an influx of unstable, alien, accidental elements capable of weakening its combat readiness, and at the same time made it possible to ensure the admission of the best, most conscious people from among the working class, working peasants, and working intelligentsia.

At the 7th Party Congress (March 1918), a decision was made to change the name of the party. It became known as the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks). Lenin proposed calling our party Communist, as this name corresponds to the goal that the party sets before itself—the realization of communism.

The amendments and additions introduced into the Statutes adopted by the 8th Party Conference in December 1919 reflected the experience of party building under conditions when the party had come to power and new tasks stood before it—the defense and strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the creation of new forms of public life. Due to the fact that various people, including careerists and self-seekers, were drawn to the party as the ruling party, the institution of candidate members of the party was introduced to

ensure the admission of people truly worthy of this high title. The introduction of the institution of candidates, the clause on the strictest party discipline, the definition of a new structure of party organizations—from the party cell up to the Central Committee and the Party Congress—their functions and tasks, and the establishment of forms of mutual relations between party organizations on the one hand and state and public organizations on the other, contributed to raising the leading role of the party in the life of the country. This was the first Statutes of the Bolshevik party as a ruling party. The Statutes made it possible to strengthen the party and increase its combat readiness.

The transition to peaceful work on restoring the national economy along the lines of the New Economic Policy and the fierce struggle that the party waged against Trotskyites and other anti-Leninist groupings required new changes to the law of party life—the Statutes. In his famous letters to Comrade Molotov on the conditions for admitting new members to the party, Lenin pointed out the necessity of a particularly careful approach when admitting members to the party, and demanded the establishment of a stricter admission procedure to protect the party from the infiltration of petty-bourgeois and hostile elements. Lenin noted the insufficient political level of many party members and emphasized the danger of such a situation under the conditions of NEP.

The Statutes adopted by the 12th All-Russian Party Conference (August 1922) provided for important measures to regulate the composition of party membership. One such measure was the clause recorded in the Statutes, in accordance with the decision of the 11th Party Congress, on admitting members to the party in three categories—depending on social status. For each category, a specific candidate probationary period, number of recommendations, and party standing of the recommenders were established. New in the Statutes was the clause on control

commissions, established by decision of the 10th Party Congress. Concern for the unity and cohesion of the party, which found expression in the amendments and additions to the Statutes, helped improve the qualitative composition of the party and mobilize it for the struggle against anti-Leninist groupings attempting to destroy the party and divert it from the Leninist path.

The amendments and additions introduced into the new Statutes, approved by the 14th Party Congress in December 1925, were conditioned by the course toward the socialist industrialization of the country, the experience of party work accumulated during the restoration period, and the struggle against the Trotskyites and the 'New Opposition.' Beginning with the 14th Congress, the party became known not as the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), but as the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)—CPSU(B). Bringing the structure of the party organization into conformity with the administrative division of the newly formed Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, raising the standards for those joining the party, and other measures for the organizational strengthening of party organizations raised the combat readiness of the party even further, which, having accumulated forces and means, led the country to a new historical stage—the stage of socialist industrialization.

Communists came as victors to their 17th Congress in January 1934. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the Soviet Union had transformed radically: it became an industrial country, a country of collective, large-scale, mechanized agriculture, covered with a vast network of schools operating in the languages of the peoples and nationalities of the USSR. The 17th Congress, which entered history as the Congress of Victors, adopted new Statutes with such amendments and additions as were meant to ensure the implementation of the

party's general line—the line toward strengthening and developing the socialist system in our country.
Comrade Stalin set the task at the Congress—to raise the level of organizational leadership to the level of political leadership. High exactingness toward communists in connection with the new tasks found reflection in the Statutes primarily in a more detailed formulation of the duties of a party member. The title of party member was raised even higher. The Statutes worked out in greater detail the question of the organizational structure of the party, formulated anew the clauses on the former party cells—primary organizations, as they came to be called from the 17th Congress onward—and also formulated anew the clauses on inner-party democracy and party discipline. Granting the Central Committee of the CPSU(B) the right to establish political departments and assign Central Committee party organizers to individual sectors of socialist construction acquiring special importance for the national economy, transforming the Central Control Commission into the Party Control Commission under the Central Committee of the CPSU(B), and other measures provided for in the Statutes improved the organizational work of the party.
The first Stalinist five-year plan was fulfilled ahead of schedule, by the beginning of 1933—a year before the 17th Party Congress convened to hear reports on the second five-year plan for the development of the national economy. The new, even more complex tasks of the second five-year plan posed in full acuteness the question of improving the quality of work in all sectors, primarily the quality of organizational and practical leadership. The 17th Congress noted this in its resolutions on organizational issues.
In March 1939, the 18th Party Congress convened and approved the currently operating Statutes. The amendments and additions introduced into the Statutes were called forth by fundamental changes in the economy and class structure of

Soviet society in connection with the building of socialism, as well as by the tasks stemming from Comrade Stalin's report at the Congress—a report that became the program for completing the construction of a classless socialist society and the gradual transition from socialism to communism. The new Statutes provided for the abolition of categories upon admission to the party and uniform admission conditions for all those joining the party; supplementing the provision on party members and their duties with a provision on the rights of party members; a course toward expanded inner-party democracy; and granting primary party organizations of production enterprises the right to supervise the activities of the administration. These and other amendments and additions significantly improved the organizational forms and methods of party work, further strengthened the party, and contributed to fulfilling the political tasks that arose before the party both during the Great Patriotic War and in the post-war period of peaceful development of the USSR.

For consideration by the 19th Congress of the CPSU(B), convened on October 5, 1952, the Central Committee submits the draft text of the amended Statutes of the Party. This draft Statutes provides for a number of exceptionally important amendments and additions on issues of the organizational structure of the party and inner-party life—additions that must be introduced into the currently operating Statutes of the CPSU(B).

Why are these amendments and additions necessary, and what has called them forth? The 19th Congress of the CPSU(B) is convening under conditions when the Soviet people, under the leadership of the Communist Party headed by Comrade Stalin, have achieved new world-historical victories. In the Second World War, the Soviet socialist power won a brilliant victory over fascist Germany and imperialist Japan. In the post-war years, major successes have been achieved in restoring and

developing socialist industry, agriculture, culture, and science, and in raising the material well-being of the Soviet people. The party is rallying the Soviet people to fulfill new grandiose plans of communist construction.

Naturally, under the new conditions, certain forms and methods of party work have become outdated, while new tasks arising before the party require changing these forms and methods. Understandably, some clauses of the Statutes have also become outdated. The draft text of the amended Statutes and the theses of Comrade N. S. Khrushchev's report at the 19th Congress, 'Changes in the Statutes of the CPSU(B),' generalize the richest organizational experience of the party accumulated since the 18th Congress, and further develop the organizational principles of the party in accordance with the new tasks of building communism.

* * *

The world-historical role of the Communist Party, its lofty goals, and its unshakable organizational principles require that the party consist of the most advanced fighters for the people's interests, for communism. Comrade Stalin called our party a fortress whose doors open only to the tested. The party cannot admit into its ranks everyone who wishes to join it. Let us recall the heartfelt words of Comrade Stalin when, during the days of mourning for Lenin, on behalf of the entire party, he took an oath to fulfill with honor Lenin's commandment—to hold high and keep pure the great title of member of the party. Comrade Stalin said then: 'We, Communists, are people of a special mold. We are made of a special stuff. We are those who form the army of the great proletarian strategist, the army of Comrade Lenin. There is nothing higher than the honor of belonging to this army. There is nothing higher than the title of member of the party whose founder and leader is Comrade Lenin.'

The draft text of the amended Statutes of the Party gives a concise definition of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as a voluntary militant union of like-minded communists. 'The Communist Party of the Soviet Union,' states the draft Statutes, 'is a voluntary militant union of like-minded communists, organized from people of the working class, working peasants, and working intelligentsia.' This definition indicates that only unity of views can unite party members into a single cohesive, centralized, militant organization. Lenin and Stalin teach that without unity of programmatic, tactical, and organizational views, there can be no party as a militant union of like-minded communists capable of realizing its goals. The working class, working peasantry, and working intelligentsia, who constitute our socialist society and from whose best representatives the Communist Party is organized, are united by common interests and goals in the struggle for communism.

The question of party membership—the question of who can be a member of the party, what the duties and rights of party members are, and what the conditions for admission to the party are—is central in the Statutes. It is well known that the cohesion, organization, and combat readiness of the party depend primarily on its composition.

Lenin was the first in the history of Marxism to define, in 1903 at the 2nd Party Congress, who can be a member of the working-class party, giving the Bolshevik formulation of the first paragraph of the Statutes—on party membership. Recognition of the party's program, participation in one of its organizations, and material support of the party—such, in Lenin's thought, are the necessary conditions for party membership. This definition, wrote Comrade Stalin, 'follows entirely from the view according to which our party is a centralized organization, and not an accumulation of individuals. Herein lies the greatest merit of this formulation' (Works, Vol. 1, p. 68).

Lenin's definition of party membership was given about half a century ago. Much has changed in our party during this time, yet Lenin's formula has proven immutable and vital to this day. The party has always steadily guided itself and continues to guide itself by this definition.

The draft amended Statutes of the Party submitted for consideration by the 19th Congress of the CPSU(B) states that 'any working person who is a citizen of the Soviet Union not exploiting the labor of others, who accepts the Program and Statutes of the Party, actively assists in their implementation, works in one of the Party organizations, and carries out all decisions of the Party may be a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. A Party member pays the established membership dues.'

The stipulation in the Statutes that any working person who is a citizen of the Soviet Union not exploiting the labor of others may be a member of the party consolidates the achievements attained by the party and reflects the fact that the Communist Party consists of people from the working class, working peasants, and working intelligentsia. In our country, as a result of the victory of socialism, exploiting classes have been liquidated, and exploitation of man by man does not exist. On this basis, the moral-political unity of Soviet society—one of its mighty driving forces—has taken shape. The people and communism in our country have merged into one. Soviet people love their party, trust it completely, and rely on it, for it knows no other interests than the interests of the people.

To be a member of the party is a great honor, yet it is not given to everyone to become one. Membership in the party requires conscientious fulfillment of the duties placed upon a communist. The currently operating Statutes of the CPSU(B) obligate party members to work tirelessly to raise their consciousness; strictly observe party discipline; actively participate in the political life of the party and the country; put

party policy and the decisions of party organs into practice; be an example in observing labor and state discipline; and strengthen ties with the masses daily.

However, life does not stand still. The new tasks of building a communist society, the practice of party work, and the necessity of raising the responsibility of communists for the party's cause and their activity in combating shortcomings and unhealthy phenomena occurring in the life and work of party organizations require a fuller definition of the duties of party members. Therefore, in the draft Statutes, the corresponding paragraph has been supplemented with new clauses.

First of all, this paragraph emphasizes the duty of a communist to guard the unity of the party in every way as the main condition of its strength and might. The party is strong in its unity. It does not tolerate opportunists, traitors, people of little faith, or capitulators in its ranks. Having expelled Trotskyites, Bukharinites, Zinovievites, national-deviationists, and other enemies who sought to split the party and disrupt the building of socialism in the USSR from its midst, the party achieved the greatest unity and cohesion of its ranks. Under conditions of a socialist society, in which there are no antagonistic classes and which is united morally and politically, there is no social base for deviations in the party. However, survivals of capitalism and remnants of bourgeois ideology still exist. They exert their pernicious influence on individual elements in the party who, under this influence, slide onto an anti-party path. The party does not tolerate such people in its midst, fights decisively against them, and tirelessly strengthens its ranks. Concern for the purity of the party's ranks and guarding its unity is the foremost duty of a communist.

A party member is obliged to conscientiously fulfill everything prescribed by its Program, Statutes, and decisions. Even during the birth of our party, Lenin and Stalin pointed out that the party of the working class is a party of struggle, and every

member of it must be an active fighter for the party's cause. Comrade Stalin wrote in 1905:

'...Everyone knows that there are quite a few windbags in the world who will gladly "accept" the Party program, tactics, and organizational views, yet are capable of nothing but chatter. It would be a desecration of the Party's Holy of Holies to call such a windbag a Party member (i.e., a leader of the army of proletarians)! Moreover, our Party is not a philosophical school or a religious sect. Is not our Party a party of struggle? And if so, is it not self-evident that our Party will not be satisfied with a platonic acceptance of its program, tactics, and organizational views, and will undoubtedly demand that its member carry out the accepted views? Hence, whoever wants to be a member of our Party cannot rest content with accepting our Party's programmatic, tactical, and organizational views, but must set about realizing these views, putting them into practice' (Works, Vol. 1, p. 65).

Even today, there are quite a few people in our party who agree with party decisions, yet in practice treat them formally and passively, failing to put them into effect. This is a great evil against which the party fights. A communist is obliged to be an active fighter for the fulfillment of party decisions, and mere agreement with them is insufficient for him. The draft text of the amended Statutes states that a passive and formal attitude of communists toward party decisions weakens the combat readiness of the party and is therefore incompatible with remaining in its ranks.

Discipline is the first condition of any organization, all the more so of one like our party. Lenin and Stalin teach that in the Communist Party there must be an iron discipline uniform for all members without exception. 'In its practical work, if it wishes to preserve the unity of its ranks, the Party must enforce a single proletarian discipline equally binding on all Party members, both leaders and rank-and-file. Therefore, there must

be no division in the Party into "the chosen," for whom discipline is not binding, and "the unchosen," who are obliged to submit to discipline. Without this condition, the integrity of the Party and the unity of its ranks cannot be preserved' ('History of the CPSU(B): Short Course', p. 49). The Leninist-Stalinist proposition on discipline uniform for all party members without exception played a huge role in strengthening the unity and monolithic nature of the party, in its struggle against Mensheviks, Trotskyites, and Bukharinites.

Our forward movement is inextricably linked with the further strengthening of discipline in party organizations—a discipline binding on all communists. However, to this day, some communists erroneously believe that there are two disciplines in our party—one for rank-and-file members, and another for leaders. The party cannot tolerate such a lordly, anti-party attitude toward discipline, as it undermines party and state discipline and inflicts serious damage on the interests of the party and the state. The draft amended Statutes require observance of party and state discipline, equally binding on all party members—both leaders and rank-and-file: 'The Party has one discipline, one law for all communists, regardless of merits or posts occupied. Violation of party and state discipline is a great evil inflicting damage on the Party, and is therefore incompatible with remaining in its ranks.'

The law of development of our party and our society is the unfolding of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism. Without criticism and self-criticism there is no forward movement, Comrade Stalin teaches. The strength of Bolshevism consists precisely in the fact that it does not fear criticism of its shortcomings and draws energy from it for further forward movement. Herein lies the secret of the successes of our development.

Considerable harm is inflicted upon the party by those who shout about their devotion to the party while in practice stifling

criticism from below. A disdainful attitude toward criticism breeds conceit, arrogance, boasting, and detachment from the masses. The party and Comrade Stalin demand a merciless struggle against this evil, for to persecute criticism and self-criticism means killing all independent initiative in the party organization, undermining the authority of leadership among the party masses, corrupting the party, and establishing in the life of the party organization the anti-party manners of bureaucrats, sworn enemies of the party. Therefore, the draft amended Statutes record that a party member is obliged 'to develop self-criticism and criticism from below, expose shortcomings in work and strive for their elimination, and fight against ostentatious well-being and complacency over successes in work. Suppression of criticism is a grave evil. He who stifles criticism and replaces it with ostentation and glorification cannot remain in the ranks of the Party.'

In the theses of Comrade N. S. Khrushchev's report at the 19th Congress of the CPSU(B), 'Changes in the Statutes of the CPSU(B),' it is pointed out that among some communists there exists the harmful opinion that party members should not report shortcomings in work to leading party organs up to the Central Committee. Frequently, responsible officials prevent communists from exposing an unsatisfactory state of affairs before leading party organs and before the Central Committee on the grounds that this allegedly interferes with their work. A merciless struggle must be waged against such dignitaries. Party members make insufficient use of the right granted them by the Party Statutes to submit any statement to any party body, up to the Central Committee. Therefore, the draft amended Statutes obligate communists to report shortcomings in work to leading party organs up to the Central Committee of the Party, regardless of persons. A party member has no right to conceal an unsatisfactory state of affairs or pass by improper actions that harm the interests of the party and the state.

Anyone who hinders a party member from fulfilling this duty must be severely punished as a violator of the party's will.
The party educates party and Soviet officials, and all communists, in the spirit of honesty and truthfulness. In his speech at an election meeting on December 11, 1937, Comrade Stalin pointed out that figures of the Leninist type must be as truthful and honest as Lenin was. Untruthful and dishonest behavior toward the party is impermissible. Deceivers who undermine trust in the party and morally corrupt the ranks of communists cannot be tolerated in the party. Therefore, the draft amended Statutes make it the duty of a party member to be truthful and honest before the party and not to permit concealment or distortion of the truth. Untruthfulness of a communist before the party and deception of the party are the gravest evils and are incompatible with remaining in its ranks.
Political vigilance is a constant weapon of the party in the struggle against its enemies. The history of the party and the history of the Soviet state teach high vigilance. To be vigilant means, above all, knowing how to keep party and state secrets, and knowing how to unmask the enemy, no matter what mask he wears. The draft Statutes obligate a party member to observe party and state secrets and display political vigilance, remembering that the vigilance of communists is necessary in any sector and under any circumstances. Divulging party and state secrets is a crime against the party and is incompatible with remaining in its ranks.
'Policy is conducted through people...' Lenin said. He pointed out: 'We have reached the point where the crux of the situation lies in people, in the selection of people.' Success or failure in work depends on what kind of workers occupy posts. In selecting and deploying cadres, the party strives to ensure the implementation of its political line. Comrade Stalin teaches us to select cadres not on the basis of greatest convenience for a particular leader, and not out of friendly considerations, but on

a political basis, that is, whether a given worker deserves political trust, and on a business basis, that is, whether this worker is suited for the given specific work. This directive has retained and retains its full significance. Meanwhile, in many party, Soviet, and economic organizations, a vicious approach to selecting cadres is still practiced—based on friendly relations, personal devotion, localism (fellow-countrymanship), and kinship. According to the draft Statutes, a party member is obliged, at any post entrusted by the party, to steadily carry out the party's directives on the proper selection of cadres according to their political and business qualities. Violation of these directives—the selection of workers on the basis of friendly relations, personal devotion, localism, and kinship—is incompatible with remaining in the party.

Along with the duties of a party member, the draft also defines his rights. In the currently operating Statutes, they are somewhat narrowed and imprecisely formulated. According to the draft amended Statutes, a party member has the right to participate in free, businesslike discussion at party meetings and in the party press of questions of party policy, to criticize any party official at party meetings, to elect and be elected to party organs, to demand personal participation in all cases where a decision is made regarding his activities or conduct, and to address any question or statement to any party body, up to the Central Committee.

The tasks facing the party and the necessity of further strengthening its ranks impose upon party organizations the duty to intensify even further their attention to selecting the best people from among the working people for the party, and to educate communists in the spirit of high ideological commitment and devotion to the party's cause.

* * *

The entire Statutes of the Communist Party are permeated from beginning to end with the Leninist-Stalinist organizational

principle of democratic centralism. What is the essence of democratic centralism? It lies in the fact that the party is built as a single organization, with a single Statutes, a single program, a single party discipline, and a single leading body at the head—represented by the Party Congress, and in the intervals between congresses, by the Central Committee—with subordination of the minority to the majority, individual organizations to the center, lower organizations to higher ones, and party members to their organization.

Building our party on the principles of democratic centralism means that every communist belongs to one of the primary party organizations, which are created on the production principle—at factories, plants, collective farms, state farms, institutions, and educational establishments where there are communists. Primary party organizations are united on the territorial principle—into a district or city party organization. District and city party organizations belong to a regional or territorial party organization, and all party organizations of a Union republic belong to the Communist Party of the Union republic. All party organizations of the Soviet Union are united into the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The party, Comrade Stalin teaches, 'is not merely the sum of party organizations. The party is, at the same time, a single system of these organizations, their formal unification into a single whole, with higher and lower leading organs, with subordination of the minority to the majority, and with practical decisions binding on all party members. Without these conditions, the party is unable to be a single organized whole capable of exercising planned and organized leadership of the struggle of the working class' (Works, Vol. 6, p. 175).

Centralism is called democratic because centralism of leadership and iron discipline are combined in the party with inner-party democracy. 'Inner-party democracy,' Comrade Stalin teaches, 'means raising the activity of the party masses

and strengthening the unity of the party, strengthening conscious proletarian discipline in the party' (Works, Vol. 8, pp. 145–146). The Party Statutes ensure broad independent initiative and autonomy of all party organizations in resolving local issues, provided these decisions do not contradict party decisions, active participation of communists in party life and in party leadership, and the unfolding of criticism and self-criticism. All leading organs of the party from bottom to top are elected by the members of the organization and report to the party organizations.

The historical experience of the party testifies that democratic centralism is the only correct principle of the organizational structure of the party, ensuring the ideological and organizational cohesion of all members into a single common organization, high activity and consciousness of communists, and planned leadership of the masses. With the growth of the party and the activity and consciousness of its members, inner-party democracy develops and democratic centralism grows stronger. The draft amended Statutes of the Party are imbued with concern for the further development of inner-party democracy and raising the consciousness and activity of communists.

The party has always defined the structure of party organizations in full accordance with the principles of democratic centralism. Depending on its accumulated experience and depending on the tasks facing it, it modified and clarified the structure of organizations while leaving the provisions of democratic centralism unchanged. And now, taking into account accumulated experience and the new situation in the country and the party, the draft amended Statutes provide for a number of clarifications and additions to the currently existing structure: under present conditions, there is no need to convene All-Union Party Conferences; the Politburo is transformed into the Presidium of the Central

Committee of the Party; the Party Control Commission is reorganized into the Party Control Committee under the Central Committee of the Party, etc.

Of essential importance is the directive of the draft Statutes regarding the forms of mutual relations between party organizations on the one hand, and state and public organizations on the other. The party is the leading force, the guiding core of all public and state organizations of the working people; it gives them a political line and direction, carrying out its directives through communists working in state and public organizations. At all congresses, conferences, and in elective organs of Soviet, trade-union, cooperative, and other mass organizations, under the Statutes of the CPSU(B), party groups are organized whose task is to comprehensively strengthen the party's influence and carry out its policy among non-party people, strengthen party and state discipline, combat bureaucracy, and verify the execution of directives. Practice has shown that sometimes local leading party organs violate the principle of party leadership, acting not through communists working in state and public organizations, and not through party groups in these organizations, but bypassing them. Party groups do not exist everywhere in non-party organizations. Recently, the party has repeatedly corrected such mistakes of party organs. To prevent the vicious practice of leadership from being permitted in the future, the draft amended Statutes specifically note that Central Committees of Communist Parties of Union republics, territorial committees, regional committees, area committees, city committees, and district committees ensure the steady fulfillment of party directives and direct the activities of local Soviet and public organizations through the party groups within them.

The draft amended Statutes retain the section of the operating Statutes on party groups in non-party organizations, according to which at all congresses, conferences, and elective organs of

Soviet, trade-union, cooperative, and other mass organizations where there are at least three party members, party groups are organized. Party groups are subordinate to the corresponding party organizations (Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Central Committee of the Communist Party of a Union republic, territorial committee, regional committee, area committee, city committee, district committee). On all questions, the groups are obliged to strictly and steadily guide themselves by the decisions of the leading party organs.

In the sections on local party organizations, the draft Statutes indicate their tasks in developing criticism and self-criticism, educating communists in the spirit of an uncompromising attitude toward shortcomings, the tasks of communist education of the working people, and directing the study of Marxism-Leninism by party members and candidate members. The draft amended Statutes more fully reflect the tasks and functions of party organizations. This manifests the tireless concern of the party for improving the work of party organizations, strengthening their ties with the masses, and strengthening discipline. The stronger the party's ties with the masses, the stronger the party itself, and the greater its successes.

Our party successfully exercises its leading role because it is wholeheartedly supported by the people. Every appeal of the party finds a warm response among the working people. Without direct assistance from the masses, the party would not have been able to carry out its policy and achieve the tremendous accomplishments to which it has led the country. The party is linked with the masses by thousands of threads, and this ensures the success of its policy. Bolsheviks, Comrade Stalin says, are strong because they maintain connection with their mother, with the masses who gave birth to, nurtured, and educated them. And as long as they maintain connection with

the people, they have every chance of remaining invincible. Herein lies the key to the invincibility of Bolshevik leadership. The guarantee of further growth of the strength and authority of the Bolshevik party and the strengthening of its ties with the non-party masses is the consistent implementation of the Leninist-Stalinist principle of democratic centralism. This is the guiding principle of the organizational structure of the Communist Party, the inviolable law of its life. Strictest centralism, conscious discipline, inner-party democracy, and the unfolding of criticism and self-criticism—such are the most important requirements of the Statutes by which our party is guided in its daily work.

* * *

The draft directives of the 19th Congress of the CPSU(B) on the fifth five-year plan once again demonstrate the great vital force of the Soviet system. In fulfilling the tasks set by the five-year plan, the role of the Communist Party as the leading and guiding force of Soviet society will increasingly grow. This will require further intensification of the political and organizational work of the party and all its local organizations. Our party—a militant union of like-minded communists—is honing its organizational weapon in order to fulfill the upcoming truly gigantic tasks in building communism.

CRITICISM AND SELF-CRITICISM — A TESTED METHOD OF TRAINING CADRES

L. Brezhnev,
Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Moldavia

The Communist Party is leading our Motherland to a new powerful upswing in economy and culture. The draft directives of the 19th Congress of the CPSU(B) on the fifth five-year plan vividly express the great Stalinist designs for the further construction of communism in our country. The fulfillment of these grandiose plans requires improving the political and organizational work of party organizations. The draft amended Statutes of the Party deeply reflect the strength and monolithic unity of our party, its boundless devotion to the all-conquering teaching of Lenin and Stalin. The Communist Party raises higher and higher the title of party member and the responsibility of communists for the party's cause. The draft Statutes clearly formulate the duties of a party member, including such an important duty as developing self-criticism and criticism from below. Before local party organizations, the draft Statutes pose in full stature the task of unfolding criticism and self-criticism and educating communists in the spirit of an uncompromising attitude toward shortcomings.

Criticism and self-criticism are the source of the greatest strength and invincibility of our party. It lies at the foundation of the entire life and activity of the party and is an indispensable condition for proper leadership of all links of party, Soviet, economic, cultural, and scientific work. Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism are the driving force in the development of Soviet society, a tested means in mobilizing the creative initiative and energy of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia in uncovering and correcting

shortcomings and errors in the work of party, Soviet, economic, and other organizations. '...Self-criticism,' writes Comrade Stalin, 'is an inalienable and permanently operating weapon in the arsenal of Bolshevism, inextricably linked with the very nature of Bolshevism, with its revolutionary spirit' (Works, Vol. 11, p. 128).

Of particular importance are criticism and self-criticism in forming and educating leading cadres of the party and state. Educating cadres in the spirit of criticism and self-criticism, the party boldly and decisively uncovers errors and shortcomings in the practical activities of officials. On the basis of a comprehensive analysis of these shortcomings, the party outlines practical measures for their elimination, activates the party masses in the course of correcting shortcomings, and thereby raises the level of party leadership.

The most important task of the immense educational work carried out by the party consists in ensuring that our cadres become imbued with an understanding of the necessity for the all-round development of criticism and self-criticism and use it daily, mastering the methods of Bolshevik leadership of the masses.

For a Bolshevik, for a party, Soviet, or economic worker, there is nothing more dangerous than the fear of openly acknowledging one's own errors and shortcomings, attempts to persist in them, and unwillingness to analyze and expose them before the broad masses of working people. Such false shame leads officials to inevitable failures in practical activity. Not without reason did V. I. Lenin point out that 'by analyzing yesterday's mistakes, we thereby learn to avoid mistakes today and tomorrow' (Works, Vol. 26, p. 32).

Comrade Stalin constantly reminds our cadres of the necessity, in lively practical work, to learn to overcome errors and shortcomings, not to succumb to the idiotic disease of complacency, conceit, and boasting, not to rest content with

achieved successes, and not to rest on one's laurels. The healing remedy for all these errors and shortcomings is criticism and self-criticism; it helps our cadres properly and soberly assess the situation, strictly take existing possibilities into account, and treat their own activity critically. Criticism and self-criticism help many officials get onto the right path and rid themselves of serious vices in work and in personal conduct. Emphasizing the importance of criticism and self-criticism in forming and educating Bolshevik cadres, Comrade Stalin says: 'Whoever thinks of sparing the self-esteem of our cadres by glossing over their mistakes ruins both the cadres and the self-esteem of the cadres, because by glossing over their mistakes he facilitates the repetition of new, perhaps more serious mistakes, which, it must be supposed, will lead to the complete failure of the cadres to the detriment of their "self-esteem" and "peace of mind."'

Comrade Stalin revealed in full the main features and peculiarities of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism—those principles by which our cadres must be guided in their daily work. These are party-mindedness and adherence to principle; truthfulness and objectivity; straightforwardness and publicity; a businesslike, comradely approach; mass character of criticism and self-criticism, reinforced from above and from below; and its effectiveness, creative, and constructive character.

Comrade Stalin's brilliant directives on the significance of criticism and self-criticism for our great cause and for training cadres found full reflection in the draft amended Statutes of the Party. This historic document states that a party member is obliged to develop self-criticism and criticism from below, expose shortcomings in work and strive for their elimination, and fight against ostentatious well-being and complacency over successes in work. Suppression of criticism is a grave evil. He who stifles criticism and replaces it with ostentation and glorification cannot remain in the ranks of the Party. A party

member has the right to criticize any party official at party meetings.

The draft amended Statutes of the CPSU(B) record that every communist must observe party and state discipline, equally binding on all party members. Violation of party and state discipline, just like deception of the party and untruthfulness before the party, is the gravest evil and is incompatible with remaining in the ranks of the party. Bold, principled criticism and self-criticism are the surest means of educating communists in the spirit of high, conscious discipline, strict observance of the interests of the party and state, and crystal honesty and truthfulness before the party. Where the role of criticism and self-criticism is belittled, officials face the danger of sliding from principled positions, losing their sense of responsibility for the cause entrusted by the party, and becoming narrow-minded practitioners and petty-minded accumulators. Such officials easily resort to deceiving the party and state and lose the indispensable qualities of a Bolshevik—honesty and truthfulness.

Criticism and self-criticism are of the greatest importance for the Moldavian party organization—one of the youngest within the CPSU(B). Thanks to the daily assistance and attention of the All-Union Government, the Central Committee of the CPSU(B), and Comrade Stalin personally, the Moldavian people have achieved significant successes in economic and cultural construction. Within a short time, radical socialist transformations have been carried out in the republic, which completely changed its economy and created inexhaustible opportunities for further development. Industry equipped with advanced Soviet technology is growing at a rapid pace, socialist agriculture is steadily advancing, and culture—national in form, socialist in content—is flourishing. The working people of Moldavia, in their creative work, constantly

feel the fraternal assistance of the peoples of the Soviet Union, and primarily of the great Russian people.

The broad sweep of socialist construction in the republic required numerous cadres for various branches of Soviet, party, economic, and cultural work. Many new people came to leading work in Soviet, party, and economic organs. In 1951–1952 alone, over 8,000 people were promoted to posts included in the nomenklatura of the Central Committee, area committees, city committees, and district committees of the CP(B) of Moldavia. These new leading cadres, boundlessly devoted to the cause of Lenin and Stalin, are full of energy and desire to work tirelessly for the good of the beloved Fatherland. However, they frequently lack knowledge and proper experience in leading work. Due to the youth of the republic itself, many of our enterprises and collective farms, as well as the tenacity in the consciousness of part of the population of survivals and traditions of the old bourgeois order, our cadres encounter serious difficulties in practical work.

In this connection, the most important task of the party organization of the republic is to daily and painstakingly, as Comrade Stalin teaches, nurture and educate cadres, tempering them politically and ideologically—so that they are capable, in the interests of the state and with knowledge of the matter, of solving the tasks of economic and cultural construction. The Central Committee of the CPSU(B) has repeatedly pointed out to us the exceptional importance of the task of cultivating national cadres. Two years ago, the Central Committee of the CPSU(B), in its decision on the accountability report on the work of the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia, uncovered serious shortcomings in the leadership of economic and cultural construction. The Central Committee of the CPSU(B) pointed out the roots of these shortcomings: weak development of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism in the party organizations of the republic and in the Bureau of the

Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia itself, weak ties of the Central Committee with district committees, city committees, and primary party organizations, and errors in the selection and training of cadres. Shortcomings in leadership on the part of the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia weakened party and state discipline and engendered complacency and conceit among certain leading officials.
Discussing the resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU(B), the plenum of the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia subjected the work of the Central Committee Bureau and its secretaries, as well as leaders of republican Soviet and economic organizations, to sharp criticism. In their speeches, members of the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia pointed out that the atmosphere of complacency and self-delusion over certain successes achieved in the republic had sharply weakened discipline in the organization. Self-satisfaction and complacency, which had infected a number of republican officials, began to spread to district leaders as well. All this inflicted great harm on the proper Bolshevik training of leading cadres.
Such was the case, for example, in the Dubossary district. Throughout all the post-war years, the work of the district committee had never once been thoroughly inspected. The situation in the district was judged by laudatory summaries and biased reports from the first secretary of the district committee. The very first thorough inspection of the district committee's activities and discussion of its report at the Bureau of the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia revealed very major shortcomings in the district committee's leadership of economic and cultural construction, in the selection of cadres, and in the training of communists. The Central Committee Bureau tried to help the secretary of the district committee correct his errors, but he was so intoxicated with his imaginary successes that he began to reject criticism, persisted in his

mistakes, and thereby completely undermined his authority in the party organization.

And here is a fact showing how beneficial it is for a leading official to heed criticism. For about five years, Comrade Kosorukov worked as first secretary of the Bulboaca district party committee. His leadership of the party organization undoubtedly had positive aspects, yet he also had many shortcomings. As a result of an uncritical attitude toward his work, shortcomings gradually began to gain the upper hand with him and grow into major errors. In particular, significant errors were committed in selecting leading collective-farm cadres. At first, Comrade Kosorukov reacted painfully and with offense to criticism of these shortcomings. Rejecting criticism, he cited the fact that the Bulboaca district is located closer to Kishinev than others, so republican officials visit it more frequently, yet they allegedly notice only shortcomings and do not want to see successes. A serious inspection of the activities of the Bulboaca district party committee showed that the situation in the district had begun to deteriorate ever since the district committee secretary began straying from the right path, detaching himself from the party aktiv, displaying arrogance, and treating his work uncritically. Discussion of the district committee's report at the Central Committee Bureau, and subsequently in the district party organization, helped Comrade Kosorukov to acknowledge in a Bolshevik manner, and then eliminate, serious shortcomings and major errors in the district committee's leadership of the most important sectors of work. What is positive is that Comrade Kosorukov found the courage to criticize the shortcomings of his leadership with all straightforwardness before the district party organization. The Bolshevik stand of the district committee secretary strengthened his authority as a political leader. Soon he was promoted to the post of secretary of a larger district party committee.

The cited facts vividly testify to the significance that Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism hold for training leading cadres. In the first case, we showed a district committee secretary who grew conceited and ceased to reckon with the opinion of officials of higher party organs, the opinion of the aktiv, and the party masses. Persisting in his mistakes and unwillingness to admit and correct them led him to major errors and failure. In the second case, a district committee secretary who had strayed from the right path recognized his mistakes with the help of criticism, set about correcting them in a Bolshevik manner, and not only preserved himself as a leader, but also proved capable of heading a larger sector of party work. The power of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism lies in the fact that it protects cadres from conceit and self-satisfaction, promotes rapid ideological and political growth, and helps them improve their work.

The draft amended Statutes of the Party emphasize the demand for a decisive struggle against suppressors and stiflers of criticism and self-criticism. It must be said that instances of suppressing criticism occur in our republican party organization as well. Thus, for example, the director of the Bendery Cannery, Comrade Bobrov, having surrounded himself with sycophants, stifled in every way the initiative of workers submitting rationalization proposals, and as a rule dismissed from the plant those who dared to criticize him. This suppressor of criticism was supported by certain officials of the city party committee. When the secretary of the cannery's party organization wanted to speak about the director's anti-party behavior in his report at the report-and-election party meeting, a member of the city party committee bureau present at the meeting forbade criticizing the director. As a result, the party meeting proceeded ostentatiously, without criticism. Instead of severely punishing the stiflers of criticism, the city committee bureau confined itself to simply pointing out to Bobrov the

'impermissibility of such facts.' The Bureau of the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia rescinded the decision of the Bendery city committee as incorrect and not conducive to unfolding Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism. Bobrov was removed from the post of plant director with a strict party reprimand; a serious reprimand was imposed on the representative of the city party committee who participated in the report-and-election meeting.

There are still officials who treat the unfolding of criticism and self-criticism formally. They talk a great deal about its usefulness, yet in practice fail to create an atmosphere for communists to freely criticize shortcomings in the work of a given leader or organization. Fear of criticism, as is known, is a very dangerous disease. He who fears criticism of his work and hinders it is a despicable coward unworthy of the people's respect.

Other officials turn criticism into empty talk, grow accustomed to coming forward with admissions of their mistakes, yet in practice repeat those mistakes. Such was the case with the secretaries of the Romanovka district party committee, who were repeatedly subjected to serious criticism for errors and shortcomings in selecting and deploying cadres; each time the secretaries repented of their mistakes and... repeated them. Mere acknowledgment of criticism is insufficient: one must not only admit one's shortcomings, but also immediately correct them.

A considerable share of the blame for the state of affairs in the Romanovka district also falls on the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia, whose officials, while frequently visiting the district, passed by negative aspects in the work of the district party committee. Moreover, even after discussing the district committee's report at the Bureau of the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia, verification of the execution of the adopted decision was not organized.

An analysis of the errors of the leaders of the Romanovka district party committee is highly instructive: it shows that some leading officials display tolerance toward shortcomings —impermissible for a party member—and even hush them up, forgetting that the direct duty of every communist is the bold and decisive exposure of shortcomings and making them public. Bolsheviks are strong precisely because they always act as exposers of shortcomings, boldly break everything old and obsolete, and blaze a trail forward. Of inestimable importance for cultivating such Bolshevik qualities is the duty of every communist recorded in the draft amended Statutes: 'to report shortcomings in work to leading party organs up to the Central Committee of the Party, regardless of persons. A party member has no right to conceal an unsatisfactory state of affairs or pass by improper actions that harm the interests of the party and the state. Anyone who hinders a party member from fulfilling this duty must be severely punished as a violator of the party's will.' Practice has shown that passivity and tolerance toward shortcomings in work are frequently not only the result of insufficient consciousness on the part of individual communists. The fact is that some party organs attach no significance to signals from communists and thereby kill the desire to expose shortcomings and report them. Yet critical signals from communists and non-party working people bring great benefit. Thus, for example, statements received by the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia last year from collective farmers regarding violations of the Agricultural Artel Statutes in a number of districts helped the republican party organization restore order on collective farms. Based on signals from communists, anti-state actions by officials of certain republican institutions were uncovered.

By reporting shortcomings in work to leading party organs, communists and non-party working people thereby manifest a desire to rectify matters. This is one expression of the concern

of Soviet people for the interests of the party and the state. In confirmation, the following fact may be cited. The Minister of Forestry of Moldavia, Shinkarev, embarked on the path of deception and eyewash, grossly abused his official position to serve personal, mercenary ends, violated party and state discipline, and stifled criticism and self-criticism in the ministry apparatus. Great, invaluable assistance in uncovering this anti-state practice was rendered by signals sent to the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia by rank-and-file employees of the ministry. Upon verifying the received statements, it became clear that the ministry failed to ensure proper state order in forestry and permitted the squandering of forest products and land funds. The slightest critical remarks were met with hostility by Shinkarev and his entourage; honest employees were expelled from the ministry and its subordinate organizations. Striving to conceal the disorders, the minister deceived party and Soviet organs of the republic and the Ministry of Forestry of the USSR by systematically submitting inflated figures. Shinkarev was severely punished.

The ministry's party organization proved unequal to the task. The secretary of the party organization took no measures to eliminate shortcomings in the work of the ministry apparatus, failed to report serious errors in the minister's activities to higher party organs, and frequently stifled criticism and self-criticism himself.

Along with taking strict measures against violators of party and state discipline, the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia drew appropriate conclusions for itself. The fact is that the decision on signals regarding shortcomings and errors in the activities of the Minister of Forestry and certain other officials was adopted belatedly. Leading party and Soviet organs must react promptly to signals and criticism from below, striving to prevent shortcomings or eliminate them in

the very embryo, and not allowing major errors to grow out of individual shortcomings.

The successes of Bolshevik leadership are determined, first and foremost, by the proper selection of cadres. 'After a correct political line has been worked out and tested in practice,' says Comrade Stalin, 'the Party cadres become the decisive force in the leadership of the Party and the State' ('Problems of Leninism', 11th ed., p. 595).

Comrade Stalin developed the most important propositions on the role of Bolshevik cadres in the system of the Soviet state and defined the scientific principles for selecting and deploying cadres.

Steadily guided by Stalinist directives, the Bolshevik party carries out the selection and deployment of cadres according to political and business qualities. Any violation of this inviolable principle in selecting cadres entails serious errors. A great evil is represented by the incorrect, vicious practice of selecting cadres that has not yet been eradicated in the work of many party, Soviet, and economic organizations.

In the draft amended Statutes, every communist is charged with the duty 'at any post entrusted by the Party, to steadily carry out the Party's directives on the proper selection of cadres according to their political and business qualities.' Violation of these directives, the draft states, 'the selection of workers on the basis of friendly relations, personal devotion, localism, and kinship is incompatible with remaining in the Party.' Criticism and self-criticism serve as a mighty weapon in combating all kinds of violations and distortions in the selection of cadres.

The Central Committee, area committees, city committees, and district committees of the CP(B) of Moldavia steadily guide themselves by the Stalinist principle of selecting cadres according to political and business qualities. However, many leaders violate these principles and commit major errors in selecting cadres. Thus, for example, serious errors in selecting

and deploying cadres committed in the Ministry of Light Industry of the republic were uncovered, as a result of which people who did not inspire political trust and possessed no value in business terms frequently ended up in the ministry apparatus as well as in leading work at enterprises. Quite a few officials found themselves in leading posts in the ministry solely because they had once worked together with the minister, Comrade Demin, or were his fellow countrymen or relatives. Such an approach to selecting and deploying cadres led to a decline in discipline in the ministry and at a number of enterprises, a tolerant attitude toward the squandering of state property, and instances of deception and eyewash.

Having consigned the Bolshevik rule of cadre selection to oblivion and surrounded himself with friends, fellow countrymen, and relatives, Comrade Demin created an atmosphere of servility and sycophancy in the ministry that precluded a businesslike approach and principled criticism of shortcomings. Inspection showed that criticism and self-criticism were not held in esteem in the ministry or at a number of enterprises, and the role of the collegium was belittled. Collegium meetings were held rarely, questions of cadre selection and deployment were not discussed, and collegium members did not come forward with criticism of shortcomings in the ministry's work.

The Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia did not allow these errors in the ministry's work to grow, took measures to eliminate them, and subjected Comrade Demin to sharp criticism. In turn, Comrade Demin drew appropriate conclusions from the criticism and began correcting his mistakes.

The slightest disregard for criticism and self-criticism on the part of both leaders and rank-and-file communists has a pernicious effect on practical work. The Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia strives to instill in cadres a deep

understanding that the method of persuasion must be placed at the foundation of leadership of the masses. Only through daily organizational and political work among the masses, through raising the activity of the masses, can genuine, lasting successes be achieved. However, not all leading officials yet observe this Bolshevik principle: sometimes in practice the method of persuasion is replaced by naked administrative fiat. Such a vicious style of work was exhibited, for example, by the first secretary of the Kaushany district party committee, Comrade Loshchinin. Carried away by administrative command, he tried to place the district party committee in the position of an organ replacing all others in the district. Disregarding the opinion of members of the district committee bureau and other leading officials, he took the resolution of all, even minor, economic issues into his own hands, 'directing' from his office via telephone orders and numerous written directives without delving deeply into the activities of district organizations.

This vicious style of work of the district committee secretary was exposed and subjected to severe criticism at the district party conference. Conference delegates, in their speeches on the district committee's accountability report, showed that the district's lagging behind was largely explained precisely by the incorrect style of work of the district committee secretary. Communists did not nominate Comrade Loshchinin to the new composition of the district party committee.

Bolshevik criticism is effective provided there is properly organized verification of execution, which creates a favorable environment for preventing shortcomings in work. Recently, the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia has taken a number of measures to improve verification of execution. In particular, a large place is given to discussing at the Central Committee Bureau reports of city and district party committees both on work as a whole and on the fulfillment of individual

major decisions of the party and government. Another form of verification of execution has also firmly entered the practice of the Central Committee's work: periodic conferences of secretaries of city and district committees on the most important questions of party work. These conferences serve as a good means for exchanging experience. As a rule, the conferences proceed in an atmosphere of businesslike criticism and self-criticism and bring great benefit to the training of cadres.

The foundation for developing criticism and self-criticism is inner-party democracy. Without unfolding inner-party democracy, Comrade Stalin says, self-criticism is zero, an empty shell, a phrase. Party meetings, plenums, conferences, and meetings of the party aktiv are one of the best arenas for unfolding criticism and self-criticism of shortcomings in our work. Regular holding of meetings and plenums makes the life of a party organization full-blooded, increases the activity of communists, and cultivates in them a sense of responsibility for the entrusted cause.

At party meetings, conferences, and plenums, communists hear reports from their leaders, criticize them, give them practical advice, and do not elect poor leaders to leading organs. This prevents our cadres from stagnating, broadens their horizons, and contributes to strengthening and expanding ties with the party masses, and through them with all working people.

The party demands of every communist, states the draft amended Statutes, 'to be an active fighter for the fulfillment of party decisions. For a party member, mere agreement with party decisions is insufficient; a party member is obliged to fight for the implementation of these decisions in life. A passive and formal attitude of communists toward party decisions weakens the combat readiness of the party and is therefore incompatible with remaining in its ranks.'

While placing high duties upon every communist, the party at the same time demands that party organizations take every care to increase the activity of communists, involving them in work to implement party decisions. The Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia devotes much attention to ensuring that the principles of inner-party democracy are strictly observed in every party organization, that collectivity constitutes an indispensable condition in party work, and that party meetings, plenums, and conferences proceed at a high level.

Plenums of the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia have begun to be convened more regularly. In the first half of the current year, 4 Central Committee plenums were held. More attention is paid to preparing plenums, Central Committee members are drawn into this more broadly, and this contributes to raising the level of criticism and self-criticism and the role of the plenum as an organ of collective leadership. At the recently held Central Committee plenum, which discussed the state of ideological work and measures for its further improvement, 30 people spoke. The speeches were imbued with an understanding of the immense importance of ideological work and analyzed shortcomings and errors on the ideological front.

The level and role of meetings of primary party organizations and plenums of city and district committees have noticeably risen. Statutory deadlines for holding plenums of party committees are violated considerably less often. Most city and district committees prepare seriously for plenums. The most important issues in the life of local party organizations are brought up for discussion more frequently, and the aktiv is drawn into preparing plenums.

District and city committees strive to improve work with the party aktiv. In organizations such as those in Kishinev and Bendery, meetings of the aktiv are convened regularly. This year, the Bendery city committee held 4 meetings of the party

aktiv; at one of the recent meetings, the decision of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia on the city committee's report was discussed. The meeting proceeded in an atmosphere of sharp criticism. Many just critical remarks were made against the city committee for poor ties with primary party organizations, superficial knowledge of the life of the city's enterprises, and an incorrect, liberal attitude toward instances of suppressing criticism.

Meetings of the party aktiv must be convened to discuss the most important decisions of the party and government, and specifically for genuine discussion of them, rather than for show and formal-ceremonial approval. However, some party organs, unfortunately, prepare poorly for meetings of the aktiv. In June 1952, a meeting of the party aktiv in Kishinev discussing the decision of the plenum of the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia on the state and measures for improving capital construction and the production of building materials proceeded at a low level. Some of the speakers sought not so much to uncover the reasons for the serious lag in capital construction as they were concerned with justifying their own shortcomings and getting off with empty promises. Neither the city party committee nor the aktiv derived anything instructive or useful from this poorly prepared meeting.

The development of criticism and self-criticism is closely linked with improving inner-party work. This was particularly evident in the results of the past report-and-election meetings and party conferences. Many communists participated in discussing the accountability reports of secretaries of primary party organizations. As a rule, the meetings and conferences proceeded in an atmosphere of sharp criticism and self-criticism. In cases where secretaries of primary party organizations and secretaries of district committees attempted to embellish the situation, communists boldly and decisively corrected them. To individual leaders who continued to persist

in their errors, conference delegates expressed no confidence by not electing them to the new composition of leading organs. Thus, for example, delegates of the Bendery district party conference subjected the second secretary of the district committee, Comrade Tkach, to sharp criticism for selecting cadres on the basis of friendly relations. Instead of honestly admitting his mistakes, Comrade Tkach tried to discredit the communists who criticized him. Seeing that this was not succeeding, he began assuring the conference that he would correct his mistakes. However, the communists no longer believed him and did not elect him to the new composition of the district committee.

At report-and-election meetings of primary party organizations and at conferences, much attention was paid to the methods and style of work of party organs. Delegates at a number of district conferences criticized district committees for inability to combine party-political work with economic work, and pointed out elements of replacing and petty tutelage over Soviet and economic organs not yet eradicated in the practice of party committees, as well as weak ties with primary party organizations.

Summarizing the results of the report-and-election party meetings and conferences, the Central Committee of the CP(B) of Moldavia considers its most important task to continue achieving strict observance of the principles of inner-party democracy in every party organization and the broad unfolding of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism.

Criticism and self-criticism are a tested method of training cadres and a mighty weapon of Bolshevik leadership. 'By failing to note and expose openly and honestly, as befits Bolsheviks, the shortcomings and errors in our work,' Comrade Stalin points out, 'we close off our own road forward. Well, we want to move forward. And precisely because we want to move forward, we must make honest and revolutionary self-criticism

one of our most important tasks. Without this there is no forward movement. Without this there is no development' (Works, Vol. 10, p. 331).

The Soviet people, under the leadership of the Communist Party, have achieved world-historical victories. Yet the party and our great leader Comrade Stalin teach communists and all Soviet people not to rest content with what has been achieved, but to move forward, see shortcomings in work, and decisively eliminate them. Bolshevik cadres must soberly assess the results of their work, not be deluded by them, and not indulge in complacency, but work even more energetically and solve the tasks facing them even more successfully. The all-round development of criticism and self-criticism is the most important condition for our steady forward movement toward communism.

FIRST VOLUME OF SELECTED WORKS OF MAO ZEDONG

M. Mitin

In Beijing, by decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, the selected works of Mao Zedong are being published in four volumes, including all the major works of the outstanding leader of the Chinese people devoted to various periods of the development of the Chinese revolution and the Communist Party of China. This edition has been prepared by a Commission of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and reviewed by the author. Two volumes have already been published in China. Recently, the Foreign Languages Publishing House in Moscow released the first volume of the selected works of Mao Zedong in Russian translation.

The publication of the works of Comrade Mao Zedong is of great importance not only for Chinese communists, but also for all communist and workers' parties fighting in the vanguard of peoples for peace, people's democracy, and socialism.

The works of Mao Zedong deeply reflect the activities of the glorious Communist Party of China, which for over 30 years has organized and directed the heroic struggle of the Chinese people against the imperialist yoke. Under the leadership of the Chinese communists and the leader of the Communist Party, Mao Zedong, the people's revolution triumphed in China, which—after the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia and the victory of the Soviet Union in the Second World War—is the most important historical event.

Directed against foreign imperialism—primarily American-British capital—against Chinese feudalism, and against the big bureaucratic, comprador bourgeoisie hostile to the interests of the Chinese people, the people's revolution led by the Communist Party brought the working masses to power. The

victory of the Chinese people's revolution dealt a powerful blow to the camp of imperialism and further sharpened the general crisis of capitalism.

The great leaders of working humanity, Lenin and Stalin, always attached immense importance to the revolution in China. V. I. Lenin pointed out: 'In the last analysis, the outcome of the struggle will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, China, etc., account for the overwhelming majority of the population of the globe. And during the past few years it is this majority that has been drawn into the struggle for emancipation with extraordinary rapidity, so that in this respect there cannot be the slightest doubt what the final outcome of the world struggle will be. In this sense, the complete victory of socialism is fully and unconditionally assured' (Works, Vol. 33, p. 458).

Having worked out the theory of the national-colonial question, discovered the paths, and outlined the specific features of the development of people's revolutions in the countries of the East, Lenin and Stalin armed communist parties with an invaluable ideological weapon for victory over imperialism.

It is well known that V. I. Lenin as early as 1900, and then in 1912 and 1913, published a number of articles on the Chinese question. In 1918–1920, that is, during the most intense period in the life of the young Soviet republic, Lenin and Stalin devoted great attention to issues of the national liberation movement and revolutionary struggle in the East. To this period belong V. I. Lenin's famous theses on the national and colonial questions, presented by him to the 2nd Congress of the Comintern. They are deservedly recognized as a classic document that armed the communist parties of colonial and semi-colonial countries with a clear perspective in the struggle for national and social liberation.

Especially great is I. V. Stalin's contribution to working out questions of the national-liberation struggle of the peoples of the East, including the most important problems of the Chinese revolution. On the basis of a profoundly scientific, comprehensive Marxist-Leninist analysis of the specific features of China's development, Comrade Stalin gave an unsurpassed characterization of the alignment and development of class forces in China and established the fundamental, decisive factors that determined the distinctive character of the Chinese people's revolution. These factors are: a) China's semi-colonial status and the financial and economic domination of imperialism; b) the oppression of feudal survivals, aggravated by the oppression of militarism and bureaucracy; c) the growing revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants against feudal-bureaucratic oppression, against militarism and imperialism; d) the political weakness of the national bourgeoisie, its dependence on imperialism, and its fear of the sweep of the revolutionary movement; e) the growing revolutionary activity of the Chinese proletariat and the growth of its authority among the millions of working people; and, finally, f) the existence alongside China, in the USSR, of a proletarian dictatorship.

All these factors determined, as Comrade Stalin pointed out, the character of the Chinese revolution as a bourgeois-democratic revolution with the specific feature that it would at the same time be an anti-imperialist, national-liberation revolution directed primarily against the domination of foreign imperialism in China.

A specific feature of the Chinese revolution, Comrade Stalin explained, also consisted in the fact that the big national bourgeoisie in China was extremely weak, and that the main threads of industry, railways, and banks were in the hands of foreign imperialists. From this it followed that the initiator and leader of the revolution, the leader of the peasantry, had to be

the Chinese proletariat and its party. With exceptional foresight, Comrade Stalin established that the main content of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in China would be an agrarian revolution. To Comrade Stalin belongs the credit for routing the counter-revolutionary directives of the Trotskyite-Zinovievite gang on the question of the Chinese revolution.
Mao Zedong—the tested leader of the Communist Party of China, consistently fighting for its strengthening and against all its secret and overt enemies—creatively applied the great principles of Marxism-Leninism to the conditions of the Chinese revolution. In his works and speeches, Comrade Mao Zedong invariably emphasizes the paramount significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the experience of the CPSU(B), the international character of Leninism, and the importance of Marxist-Leninist theory for the revolutionary struggle of the Chinese people. In his work 'On the People's Democratic Dictatorship,' Mao Zedong wrote: 'The salvoes of the October Revolution brought us Marxism-Leninism. The October Revolution helped progressives in China, as throughout the world, to adopt the proletarian world outlook as the instrument for studying a nation's destiny and considering anew their own problems. Follow the path of the Russians—that was their conclusion.' 'The theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin is universally applicable,' Mao Zedong points out in his work 'The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War.'
The first volume includes works written by Comrade Mao Zedong from March 1926 to July 1937, relating to the period of the First Revolutionary Civil War in China (1924–1927) and to the period of the Second Revolutionary Civil War (1928–1937).
Those were years of major revolutionary events in China. In 1924–1927, the national-liberation struggle of the Chinese people acquired an unprecedented scope. The revolution swept

the entire country; all classes were set in motion. The working class of China, carrying out a consistent militant line, conducted a number of important political actions.
Initially, this was a revolution of an all-national united front directed chiefly against the domination of foreign imperialists in China. At that stage of the revolution, alongside the workers and peasants, the national bourgeoisie also took part in it, naturally striving to use the revolution for its own ends. Subsequently, however, as is well known, the national bourgeoisie crossed over into the counter-revolutionary camp. A turn began from a revolution of an all-national united front to an agrarian revolution.
Ever broader strata of the peasantry rose to struggle for land and bread, against landlords and usurers. A fierce class struggle flared up in the Chinese countryside. Owing to the weakness of the Communist Party, insufficient organization of the revolutionary forces, and the treachery of the national bourgeoisie, the Chinese revolution suffered defeat at that time, yet this defeat was temporary.
The revolutionary movement in the country did not die out or cease.
A new stage began in the revolutionary struggle of the Chinese workers and peasants. The Chinese Red Army emerged, grew, and gained strength; entire revolutionary bases were created with which neither internal reaction nor foreign imperialists were able to cope. Having firmly established itself in a number of regions, the Chinese Red Army successfully repelled several campaigns of Chiang Kai-shek's troops and significantly replenished its armaments at their expense—more precisely, at the expense of the foreign imperialists who lavishly supplied the numerous armies of their mercenary.
In October 1934, the main forces of the Red Army of China began their great Northwest March covering over 12,000 kilometers. By relocating to the northwestern regions of China,

they strove to secure a strong, reliable rear in the person of the Soviet Union and to rebuff the incipient predatory intervention of Japanese imperialism and its attempts to completely enslave China.

While fighting against the external and internal enemies of the Chinese people, the Communist Party simultaneously unmasked right and 'left' deviationists within its own ranks, and routed traitors and defectors to the side of foreign imperialists and internal reaction. Under the leadership of Mao Zedong, communists came out against incorrect directives, excesses, and errors, and energetically fought to strengthen their ranks, for iron discipline and organization, and for transforming their party into a genuinely revolutionary Marxist party of the Bolshevik type.

All these major events are reflected in the works of Mao Zedong published in the first volume. Opening the first volume, the work 'Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society' (March 1926) gives a Marxist characterization and assessment of China's class forces and unmasks two deviations that existed at that time in the Chinese Communist Party. The right deviation, headed by Chen Duxiu, surrendered the positions of the Communist Party to the national bourgeoisie, cared only about cooperation with the Kuomintang, and ignored the question of the necessity of an alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry. The other deviation was represented by Zhang Guotao. This 'leader' demagogically shouted about the working class while forgetting its ally—the peasantry. Both of these opportunistic deviations from the correct line of the Chinese Communist Party were expressions of the pressure of the petty-bourgeois element and disbelief in the internal forces of the revolution. Both deviations denied the hegemony of the proletariat in China and the significance of the alliance of the working class with the broadest masses of the working peasantry.

In order to establish accurately and clearly who the friends and who the enemies of the party were, and to rally its true friends around the party—which naturally was of paramount importance—Comrade Mao Zedong analyzed the various class forces of Chinese society and their political role in the impending events. On the basis of a Marxist analysis, Comrade Mao Zedong established that society in China at that time consisted of the following class strata:

1. The landlord class and the comprador bourgeoisie, who in economically backward and semi-colonial China were vassals of the international bourgeoisie, personified the most reactionary relations of production and hindered the development of the country's productive forces in every way.
2. The middle, or national, bourgeoisie personified capitalist relations of production in China. Comrade Mao Zedong lays bare the entire contradictoriness of the national bourgeoisie's position. On the one hand, it seems to be against foreign imperialism, yet on the other hand, it is against the proletariat. It is torn by doubts, fears, and vacillations. On the one hand, it would like to establish a state in which the leading role would belong to it. On the other hand, it is incapable of doing so by virtue of the prevailing domestic and international situation, and by virtue of the gigantic struggle taking place on the world arena between revolution and counter-revolution. In this connection, Mao Zedong demonstrates the futility of the aspirations of the middle bourgeoisie, 'which dreams of an "independent" revolution in which this class would act as the main protagonist...'[1].

[1] Mao Zedong, Selected Works, Vol. 1. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1952, pp. 17–18. Hereinafter, page numbers of the volume are indicated in the text.

3. The petty bourgeoisie: owner-peasants, masters of handicraft enterprises, the lower strata of the intelligentsia, petty officials, and small traders. Mao Zedong analyzes the various strata of this extremely numerous group and its contradictory position, noting that part of this group gravitates toward the bourgeoisie, while another part gravitates toward the proletariat.

4. The semi-proletariat. This includes the overwhelming majority of semi-owner peasants, poor peasants, small handicraftsmen, shop assistants, peddlers, etc.

5. The proletariat, numbering in the 1920s, according to Mao Zedong's calculations, about two million people. These are primarily workers in five major branches of the economy: railway transport, mining, maritime transport, textiles, and shipbuilding. 'And although the industrial proletariat is not large in number, it is precisely this class,' writes Mao Zedong, 'that personifies the new productive forces, is the most progressive class in modern China, and has become the leading force in the revolutionary movement' (p. 24).

On the basis of an analysis of the political positions of these class groupings, Mao Zedong gave the following picture of the alignment of forces in China during that period: 'The industrial proletariat is the leading force in our revolution. All semi-proletarians and petty bourgeois are our closest friends. As to the vacillating middle bourgeoisie, their right-wing may become our enemy and their left-wing may become our friend —but we must be constantly on our guard and not let them create confusion within our ranks' (pp. 26–27).

Already in this work we see how politically clearly Mao Zedong defines the role of the proletariat as the leading force of the revolution, while emphasizing the necessity of a firm alliance of the working class with the peasantry and other non-proletarian strata of the working people.

Firmly following the teaching of Lenin and Stalin on the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, Mao Zedong views the question of the leading role of the proletariat as the central question, the decisive problem on which the development and outcome of the Chinese revolution depend. In subsequent works published in the first volume, Mao Zedong comprehensively develops the question of the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the role of the peasantry as an ally of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggle, and the position of the national bourgeoisie.

Of great interest is the 'Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan' (March 1927). In this work, a decisive battle is waged against opportunistic tendencies that existed among a section of the then leaders of the Communist Party of China. The position of that section of the leadership could have led to the complete collapse of the peasant movement. Mao Zedong shows the full seriousness and importance of the peasant question in China.

'We must,' he emphasizes, 'as quickly as possible put a stop to all talk directed against the peasant movement, and as quickly as possible rectify all erroneous measures taken by the revolutionary authorities with respect to this movement' (p. 36). It is necessary to develop the peasant movement in every way; when hundreds of millions of peasants rise in China, said Mao Zedong, they will, like a rushing hurricane, sweep away all obstacles on their path to liberation and dig the grave for all imperialists and their lackeys.

Mao Zedong shows what terrible feudal-patriarchal oppression fettered the Chinese people and especially the peasantry. Men in the countryside, he says, are subject to the domination of the state system, clan survivals, and religious notions, while women, in addition, are also under the domination of the husband. Landlord authority is the backbone in the countryside

on which all these forces of oppression rest. With the overthrow of landlord authority, 'the clan authority, the religious authority, and the authority of the husband all begin to totter.' Mao Zedong differentiates the peasantry, distinguishing three strata in the Chinese countryside: rich peasants, middle peasants, and poor peasants. He emphasizes the role of the poor peasants as the most important mainstay of the proletariat and the Communist Party in the countryside.
In 'Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society' and in 'Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan,' the momentous events of the period of the First Revolutionary Civil War in China are analyzed. On the basis of a Marxist analysis of the peasant movement in the country, Mao Zedong draws the indisputable conclusion that a peasant—that is, bourgeois-democratic—revolution is maturing in China. Mao Zedong, an outstanding proletarian revolutionary, instills in the hearts of millions faith in the coming revolution, outlines the paths of its development, and sets concrete political tasks before the Communist Party.
Devoted to the period of the Second Revolutionary Civil War in China (1928–1937) are the works included in the first volume: 'Why Is It That Red Political Power Can Exist in China?' (1928); 'The Struggle in the Jinggang Mountains' (1928); 'A Single Spark Can Start a Prairie Fire' (1930); 'On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism' (1935); 'Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War' (1936); 'The Tasks of the Chinese Communist Party in the Period of Resistance to Japan' (1937), and others.
In all these works, Mao Zedong examines and scientifically substantiates in a Marxist manner the question of the role of the Communist Party in the agrarian revolution, questions of creating and strengthening the armed forces of the revolution, the strategy and tactics of the Communist Party in the

unfolding events, and the creation of a united national front to fight against Japanese militarism.

Mao Zedong's remarkable formulations regarding the character of the Chinese revolution are based wholly and completely on Marxist-Leninist directives on the question of the revolutionary struggle in China. 'At the present time,' wrote Mao Zedong, 'China is indeed still passing through the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. A thoroughgoing democratic revolution in China entails, in external relations, the overthrow of imperialist rule so as to achieve complete national liberation, and, in internal relations, the liquidation of the comprador bourgeoisie in the cities, the completion of the agrarian revolution, the abolition of feudal relations in the villages, and the overthrow of the government of the warlords. Only through such a democratic revolution can a genuine foundation be laid for the transition to socialism' (p. 157).

Mao Zedong routed the 'left' adventurists who were pushing the party toward defeat by demanding the immediate launching of revolution throughout the entire country and launching offensives against large, heavily fortified enemy cities. In contrast to these 'leftists' and the rightists who sowed disbelief in the victory of the people, Mao Zedong worked out a different plan for carrying out the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Proceeding from the growth of the agrarian revolution and taking into account the weakness of the enemy in the countryside, Mao Zedong led the struggle to establish revolutionary support bases in rural areas. In the winter of 1927, on his initiative, the first revolutionary bases were created. At the new stage of the struggle in China, these bases became the most important force of the revolution, a serious threat to the counter-revolutionary rule of Chiang Kai-shek, and the greatest hope of the broad masses of the people. During that period, Comrade Stalin had already emphasized back in

1926, armed revolution in China was fighting against armed counter-revolution (see Works, Vol. 8, p. 363).
Following Mao Zedong's directives, Chinese communists based their revolutionary strategy on the necessity of creating revolutionary bases with the help of armed forces. As is well known, this strategy proved correct and led the Chinese revolution to victory across the entire country. Comrade Mao Zedong emphasized that such revolutionary bases, even if at their inception they occupied only a small patch of land, are of tremendous importance in China's life, as they instill firm hope for the final liberation of the popular masses. If we preserve these sparks, he said, a revolutionary prairie fire will blaze across all of China. 'Only thus can we build the confidence of the revolutionary masses throughout the country, as the Soviet Union has built it throughout the world. Only thus can we confront the ruling classes with immense difficulties, shake their foundations, and hasten their internal disintegration. Only thus can we really create a Red Army which will become the chief weapon for the great revolution of the future. In short, only thus can we hasten the revolutionary high tide' (p. 195). Mao Zedong shows deeply and thoroughly why, at a certain stage of the revolution, the prolonged existence of revolutionary bases proved possible and all attempts by internal reaction to destroy them were futile.
Analyzing in 'Why Is It That Red Political Power Can Exist in China?' (October 1928) the economic backwardness of semi-colonial China, its dependence on imperialism, and the wars between 'various groupings of representatives of White power' and between various cliques of new and old warlords, Mao Zedong noted: '...The possibility of the prolonged existence of small Red areas is beyond doubt; moreover, they will expand, gradually bringing closer the day when we win political power throughout the entire country' (p. 104). He considered the existence of a strong regular Red Army, led by a strong

Communist Party, to be the most important condition for the existence of the new, revolutionary power.

Of special significance is Mao Zedong's work 'The Struggle in the Jinggang Mountains'—a report submitted by him to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on November 25, 1928, devoted to a comprehensive examination of the question of creating a revolutionary base in the Jinggang Mountains, on the border of Hunan and Jiangxi provinces, and the August (1928) defeat suffered by this base. Time and again, Mao Zedong substantiates the necessity of creating and strengthening areas of people's power and the possibility of their existence in a country where continuous war rages between warring groupings of warlords subordinated to different imperialist cliques.

Despite great difficulties, the Red bases under Mao Zedong's leadership were preserved and strengthened, and revolutionary armed detachments dealt serious blows to the White troops making frequent attempts to liquidate the Red area.

'For a whole year,' wrote Mao Zedong, 'the Red flag has been kept flying over the Border Area... it is gradually becoming the hope of the workers, peasants, and soldiers in the nearby provinces... The invincibility of the Red flag in the Border Area testifies not only to the strength of the Communist Party, but also to the bankruptcy of the ruling classes, and this exerts a tremendous influence on the political situation throughout the entire country' (p. 165).

A correct assessment of the role and significance of revolutionary bases during the temporary ebb of the revolution for the purpose of preserving and strengthening forces for the subsequent upsurge of the revolution, practical leadership of the army and all economic life in the democratic areas, and the establishment of proper relations primarily with the broad masses of the peasantry—such are the features characterizing the revolutionary activity of Chinese communists headed by

Mao Zedong during that period. All these aspects of the party's activity are clearly expressed in his works.

Later, when the democratic areas of China became larger and the revolutionary struggle unfolded even more broadly, questions of economic work in these areas and questions of organizing their economic life acquired special importance for the Communist Party. Many of the democratic areas existed for several years. In such areas, landlords were liquidated and new administrative and judicial organs were established. As is well known, there existed a Central People's Government headed by Mao Zedong. Great attention is paid to the activities of the Communist Party in these areas in Mao Zedong's works. In particular, his speech 'Pay Attention to Economic Work' (August 1933) and his report to the 2nd All-China Congress of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies in January 1934 in the city of Ruijin, Jiangxi Province, are devoted to this.

'The principles of our economic policy,' said Mao Zedong in his report to the Congress, 'are as follows: to do everything possible and necessary in the field of economic construction; to mobilize economic resources to supply the front and at the same time to improve the living conditions of the popular masses to the maximum possible extent; to strengthen the economic bond between workers and peasants; to ensure leadership of the peasantry by the proletariat; to strive for the state sector of the national economy to win a leading position in relation to the private sector; and to create prerequisites for the future transition to socialism' (pp. 237–238).

With great force, Mao Zedong comes out against a bureaucratic attitude toward the needs of the popular masses. 'Such filth as bureaucracy,' he said, 'should be thrown onto the rubbish heap —nobody needs it. Our comrades must love mass forms of work, that is, forms that are dear to the heart of every worker and peasant' (p. 224).

Mao Zedong emphasizes the necessity of persistent agitation among the masses. One must persuade the masses; only on condition of continuous connection between communists and the masses will the democratic areas grow strong and become impregnable to enemies. Mao Zedong focuses the Communist Party's attention on the necessity of an active struggle to economize on funds and foodstuffs, and against waste and corruption.

Of exceptional interest is Mao Zedong's work 'Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War' (December 1936), which provides a serious theoretical generalization of the military experience of the two revolutionary civil wars waged by the Chinese Red Army. Although this work was not finished to the end by the author (he managed to write only 5 chapters at that time), in its content it encompasses the most important issues of the revolutionary war in China and constitutes an extraordinarily valuable and useful military manual. Here the results are summed up of the acute struggle between two lines in military affairs—a struggle that took place within the Communist Party of China. In January 1935, the Central Committee of the party confirmed the correctness of Mao Zedong's position and rejected the views contradicting it as erroneous.

The chapter 'How to Study War' contains the following subsections: 'The Laws of War Are Developmental,' 'The Aim of War Is to Eliminate War,' 'Strategy Is the Study of the Laws of a War Situation as a Whole,' and 'The Important Thing Is to Be Good at Learning.' In subsequent chapters, Mao Zedong examines the characteristics of China's revolutionary war, 'encirclement and suppression' campaigns and counter-campaigns as the main forms of civil war, questions of active and passive defense and preparation for counter-campaigns, strategic retreat, the start of the counter-offensive,

concentration of forces, maneuverability and swiftness in military operations, and battles of annihilation.
In this work, Mao Zedong reveals himself not only as a major military figure and leader on a grand scale, but also as a military theoretician skillfully and creatively applying Leninist-Stalinist ideas to the concrete conditions of the revolutionary war in China. A military commander of the revolutionary war, Mao Zedong makes broad use of the Marxist dialectical method to generalize the richest experience of the Chinese Red Army. He uncovers the specific features of the revolutionary war in China. Differences in the circumstances of war, he notes, also determine differences in the laws of conducting war, which change depending on time, place, and the character of the war. Mao Zedong emphasizes that the history of the revolution and civil war in Russia, as well as the experience of the revolutionary war in China, teach that a correct political and military line does not develop spontaneously and peacefully, but is born and develops in struggle against 'left' opportunism on the one hand, and right opportunism on the other.
'Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War' provides a detailed analysis of the campaigns of Chiang Kai-shek's reaction against the Chinese Red Army, the victories won by the Red Army, and its counter-campaigns, and illuminates the conditions of guerrilla warfare in China and its basic principles. 'As early as May 1928,' writes the author, 'simple basic principles of guerrilla warfare corresponding to the conditions of that time were born. They are expressed in the following sixteen-word formula: "The enemy advances, we retreat; the enemy camps, we harass; the enemy tires, we attack; the enemy retreats, we pursue"' (p. 361). As Mao Zedong points out, these military principles were recognized in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China prior to the emergence of the Li Lisan line. Later, however, the Central Committee departed

from these principles, and much effort was required for the Central Committee of the Communist Party to return to the correct decision. Only at the enlarged plenum of the Central Committee in 1935 in Zunyi was the bankruptcy of the erroneous Li Lisan line noted and the correctness of the previous line in military matters—Mao Zedong's line—once again recognized.

In the same work, Mao Zedong noted that the Red Army was supplied with weapons and ammunition to a considerable extent at the expense of its adversary; it did not yet have its own munitions factories and arsenals. He wrote: 'Our basic policy is to rely on the war industries of the imperialist countries and of our domestic enemy. We have a claim on the output of the arsenals of London as well as of Hanyang, and, what is more, it is to be delivered to us by the enemy's own transport corps. This is the sober truth, not a jest' (pp. 420–421).

Of tremendous importance for the Communist Party of China are Mao Zedong's works belonging to 1936–1937, that is, to the period of preparation and formation of the Anti-Japanese National United Front. These works include: 'A Statement on Chiang Kai-shek's Statement' (December 28, 1936), 'The Tasks of the Chinese Communist Party in the Period of Resistance to Japan' (a report delivered at the National Conference of the Communist Party of China in the city of Yan'an in May 1937), and 'Win the Masses in Their Millions for the Anti-Japanese National United Front' (concluding speech at the same conference). These works comprehensively substantiate the main task of that period—organizing the struggle against the Japanese imperialists.

The duty of the party, Mao Zedong emphasized, consists in linking the actions of the Red Army with all the laboring activities of the workers, peasants, petty bourgeoisie, and national bourgeoisie to establish an Anti-Japanese National

United Front in China. Its difference from the united front that existed in 1924–1927 lies in the fact that now a strong, battle-hardened Communist Party participates in the united front, and there exists a powerful revolutionary people's army that has accumulated vast experience in military struggle against counter-revolution.

In May 1937, the National Party Conference took place. It discussed and approved the political line of the party pursued since 1935 under Mao Zedong's leadership, and worked out political and organizational measures for further unfolding the anti-Japanese war. In his report at the conference, 'The Tasks of the Chinese Communist Party in the Period of Resistance to Japan,' included in the first volume, Mao Zedong pointed out that Japanese militarism was striving for the complete enslavement of China, and therefore an urgent task stood before the party—to organize an Anti-Japanese National United Front within the country, as well as to establish a connection 'between China's Anti-Japanese National United Front and the world peace front.' Guided by the principles of proletarian internationalism, Mao Zedong viewed the struggle of the Chinese people as part of the common struggle of the international proletariat, calling upon China to unite 'with the Soviet Union, the constant and best friend of the Chinese people.'

The leader of the Chinese Communist Party dwelt especially on the necessity of establishing democratic order in China as the main and indispensable condition for victory in the war against the Japanese invaders. Striving to draw all national forces into the struggle against the Japanese aggressors, Mao Zedong put forward the demand for the establishment of a People's Republic of China. He emphasized that the struggle for a republic would be able to rally all strata of the population into an Anti-Japanese National United Front, and that only a democratic republic would help China throw off imperialist

oppression. At the same time, Mao Zedong emphasized the responsibility of the Communist Party for the united front and the necessity of ensuring its leading role in this front.
Giving a Marxist-Leninist assessment of the events of that time, Mao Zedong said: '...The tasks of China's anti-imperialist and anti-feudal bourgeois-democratic revolution can be accomplished only if leadership is exercised not by the bourgeoisie, as determined by the course of history, but by the proletariat. Moreover, only if the proletariat displays genuine firmness and consistency in carrying out the democratic revolution will it be possible to overcome the vacillation and inconsistency inherent in the bourgeoisie and prevent the revolution from ending in a miscarriage. Should the proletariat follow the bourgeoisie, or should the bourgeoisie follow the proletariat? The outcome of the Chinese revolution depends on which of them leads it. The experience of 1924–1927 showed how successfully the revolution unfolded when the bourgeoisie followed the political leadership of the proletariat, and what a defeat the revolution suffered when the proletariat (for which the Communist Party bears responsibility) trailed politically behind the bourgeoisie. History must not be allowed to repeat itself' (pp. 465–466).
Mao Zedong came out resolutely against closed-doorism, adventurism, and tailism that existed in the Communist Party of China, and warned against tendencies toward narrow closed-doorism, conceited sectarianism, and adventurism present within it. These harmful tendencies hindered the party from forming an anti-Japanese united front and winning over the majority of the people. Mao Zedong noted that only liberation from such harmful tendencies would enable Chinese communists to win the majority of the people to their side. Mao Zedong concluded his report with the following words: 'To overcome all the harmful tendencies mentioned above, it is absolutely necessary to raise the level of Marxist-Leninist

theoretical training in our party, for only Marxist-Leninist theory is the compass that points out to the Chinese revolution the path to victory' (p. 470).

Under Mao Zedong's leadership, Chinese communists, under harsh conditions of terror and the domination of reaction, held high the banner of revolution and led the masses in the struggle for a people's republic, for freedom, and for land. The Communist Party of China won the love and trust of the people and grew into a mass, militant Marxist party of the Chinese proletariat. It led the Chinese people to the victory of the revolution and is today successfully leading the building of a new China.

The first volume of the selected works of Mao Zedong concludes with the philosophical work well known to the Soviet reader, 'On Practice: On the Relation Between Knowledge and Practice, Between Knowing and Doing' (July 1937). In this work, Comrade Mao Zedong exposes, from the standpoint of Marxist philosophy, the subjectivist errors of adherents of dogmatism and empiricism, which at the time inflicted great harm on the development of the Chinese revolution.

In 'On Practice,' in clear and vivid form, simply and concisely, an outline of the materialist theory of knowledge as a theory of reflection is set forth. Mao Zedong notes that the theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism, in contrast to pre-Marxian materialism, emphasizes the decisive role of practice in cognition. Touching upon the role of practice in cognition, Mao Zedong points out that only social practice can be the true criterion of human knowledge of nature and society. Only objective social practice determines truth. Mao Zedong comes out against all attempts to divorce theory from practice and against violating the unity of theory and practice.

Mao Zedong characterizes two features of dialectical materialism: 'Marxist philosophy—dialectical materialism—

has two most outstanding characteristics. One is its class nature: it openly avows that dialectical materialism is in the service of the proletariat. The other is its practicality: it emphasizes the dependence of theory on practice, emphasizes that theory is based on practice and in turn serves practice' (p. 508).

Further in his work, Comrade Mao Zedong analyzes two stages of the process of cognition: the first stage he calls the stage of perceptual knowledge; the second stage he assigns to rational, logical knowledge. The transition from the first stage of cognition to the second is viewed by the author as a transition from the simple to the complex.

Mao Zedong notes that all genuine knowledge originates from experience and consists of two parts: personal, direct experience and indirect—that is, socio-historical—experience. Citing many vivid and interesting examples illustrating complex theoretical propositions, the author demonstrates with great scientific force the untenability of idealism in the theory of knowledge. In his work, Mao Zedong, proceeding from the directives of Lenin and Stalin, repeatedly emphasizes the active role of cognition, views revolutionary theory as a guide to action, and notes the growing importance of theory for the practical activities of the Communist Party.

The concluding part is devoted to the Marxist-Leninist proposition on absolute and relative truth, and on the unity of the objective and subjective in cognition. Summing up briefly, Mao Zedong writes: 'Discover the truth through practice, and again through practice verify and develop the truth.' And further: 'Practice, knowledge, again practice, and again knowledge. This form repeats itself in endless cycles, and with each cycle the content of practice and knowledge rises to a higher level. Such is the whole of the dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge, and such is the dialectical-materialist view of the unity of knowing and doing' (p. 528). Undoubtedly,

this philosophical work by Comrade Mao Zedong contributed to educating the communists of China in the spirit of Marxist-Leninist philosophical principles.

* * *

Great is the historical significance of the Chinese revolution. Its soul and organizer is the glorious Communist Party of China. The strength of the party and its tested leader Mao Zedong consists in fidelity to the theory of Marxism-Leninism. The works included in the first volume of the selected works of Mao Zedong represent new testimony to the greatness and invincibility of the theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. Communist and workers' parties and fighters for peace will study with the deepest interest the works of the leader of the Communist Party of China, Comrade Mao Zedong, and will once again be convinced of the unfading strength of Marxist-Leninist theory, the inevitability of the victorious march of history, and the inevitability of the final victory of the cause of peace, democracy, and socialism.

A. N. RADISHCHEV — GREAT PATRIOT AND REVOLUTIONARY

V. Kruzhkov

September 24, 1952 marks 150 years since the tragic death of the great Russian revolutionary writer, author of the famous book 'A Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow,' A. N. Radishchev.

V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin defined Radishchev's role and significance in the history of the liberation movement of our Motherland. 'It hurts us most of all to see and feel the outrages, oppression, and humiliation to which the tsarist hangmen, the nobles, and the capitalists subject our beautiful Motherland,' wrote V. I. Lenin in 1914. 'We are proud that these outrages have met with resistance from our midst, from the Great Russians; that this midst has produced Radishchev, the Decembrists, and the revolutionary raznochintsy of the seventies; that the Great-Russian working class in 1905 created a mighty revolutionary party of the masses; and that the Great-Russian muzhik has at the same time begun to become a democrat, and has begun to overthrow the priest and the landlord' (Works, Vol. 21, p. 85). Characterizing revolutionary Russia, which stood opposed to reactionary Russia, Comrade Stalin, in a letter to Demyan Bedny, spoke of the Russia of the Radishchevs and Chernyshevskys. Thereby Comrade Stalin placed Radishchev's name alongside the names of outstanding representatives of revolutionary Russia.

A. N. Radishchev was a loyal son of the Russian people, an ardent patriot, a fearless fighter against autocracy and serfdom, and a passionate defender of the interests of the millions-strong masses of the oppressed serf peasantry.

* * *

Radishchev's literary and revolutionary activity began in the 1770s. That was a time when feudal-serf relations in Russia

had entered a period of crisis. At the center of all public life stood the peasant question. Brutal exploitation of serf peasants and savage arbitrariness and despotism of landlords gave rise to spontaneous peasant uprisings. Peasant unrest intensified particularly in the second half of the 18th century. In 1773, a peasant war against the landlords began under the leadership of Yemelyan Pugachev, lasting almost two years. World history up to that time had not yet known such a powerful peasant movement. It was, in A. S. Pushkin's remark, a rebellion 'that shook the state from Siberia to Moscow and from the Kuban to the Murom forests.'

The growth of peasant unrest, especially the movement headed by Pugachev, terribly frightened the ruling noble-landlord class headed by Catherine II, and at the same time exerted considerable influence on the growth of anti-serfdom ideology both among the progressive section of the nobility and in circles of the raznochintsy intelligentsia. This spontaneous peasant movement also determined the growth of Radishchev's revolutionary sentiments.

After graduating from Leipzig University (in 1771), during his service in St. Petersburg—in the Senate, in the military procurator's office, in the Commerce Collegium, and in the Customs Administration—Radishchev became convinced firsthand of how disgusting it was to be an official in tsarist service, where every kind of freethinking was ruthlessly suppressed, and where lawlessness, self-interest, servility, bribery, and bureaucracy reigned. Here Radishchev gained experience and learned much of what he needed for criticizing the autocratic-serf system.

During these years, Radishchev's worldview was fully formed, and his socio-political, economic, and philosophical views took shape. From the writer's pen emerged during these years the famous ode 'Liberty,' 'Letter to a Friend Living in Tobolsk,' 'The Life of Fyodor Vasilyevich Ushakov,' and 'A Discourse on

What It Means to Be a Son of the Fatherland,' and in 1790 his famous book 'A Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow' was published. Radishchev paid dearly for this great revolutionary work. In June 1790 he was arrested, and in August the Senate confirmed the death sentence passed on him by the criminal chamber. In September, Catherine II, for the sake of ostentatious magnanimity, commuted the execution to ten years of exile in distant Siberia—to the Ilimsk fort, where Radishchev arrived at the beginning of 1792.

How obvious the revolutionary content of Radishchev's book 'A Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow' was and how deeply it frightened the Empress may be judged from the remarks she made while reading the book. The author, Catherine declared, 'inclines toward inciting the peasants against the landlords, the troops against their commanders,' 'threatens tsars with the executioner's block'; he 'places hope in a peasant revolt, wants to overthrow the monarchy...'; 'the writer does not love tsars, and wherever he can diminish love and respect for them, he eagerly latches on with rare boldness.' Her main remark, which sealed Radishchev's fate, read: 'He is a rebel worse than Pugachev.'

Only after the death of Catherine II was Radishchev permitted to return from his Ilimsk exile. Later, in 1801, he was drawn into work on the Commission for the Compilation of Laws and took part in compiling the history of the laws of the Russian Empire. Radishchev's works that appeared in the final, post-Ilimsk period of his life, especially those written on economic and legal topics, continued as before to contain an irreconcilable, passionate protest against serf oppression and tsarism. Exile had not broken the will of the courageous fighter for the people's interests. He wrote: 'My soul is within me, I am the same as I was'; 'My voice has not changed... my neck is not bowed and rises proudly...' Naturally, working on the laws, Radishchev could not treat this labor like an obedient tsarist

official. He protested as much as he could, once more attempting to raise a voice of protest against the existing social order in serf Russia, proposing to democratize the laws and effectively demanding the abolition of serfdom.

Yet what else could Radishchev expect besides the embitterment of the authorities? He was bluntly reminded that exile to Siberia could be repeated. Hounded by the autocracy, Radishchev committed suicide on September 24, 1802. Already on his deathbed, the revolutionary writer hurled a final challenge at the autocracy: 'Posterity will avenge me.'

Radishchev's works exerted a great influence on the development of the liberation movement and revolutionary social thought of our Motherland. No one before Radishchev had given such a comprehensive and profound critique of serfdom and autocracy, or drawn such revolutionary conclusions, as the author of 'A Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow'—the greatest work of the 18th century. In this work, Radishchev subjected to criticism not individual aspects, vices, or social injustices inherent in the serf system, but this entire system as a whole. Radishchev championed not merely improving the condition of the serf peasantry, but demanded a radical change in the existing economic and political order, and the liquidation of the monarchy and serfdom. Neither Russian nor Western European thinkers had yet risen to such a revolutionary solution of social questions.

'I looked around me—my soul was wounded by the sufferings of humanity,' Radishchev exclaims with bitterness in the very first lines of 'A Journey.' Radishchev told of the sufferings of the Russian peasantry boldly, vividly, and truthfully, without fearing the wrath of the serf-owning hangmen. Before readers of 'A Journey' rises the rightless lot of the serf peasantry, of which one cannot read without shuddering: the sale of an entire serf family, heavy, exhausting labor for the landlord, the greed of noble landlords, plunder, and despotism. Radishchev

describes how landlords starved their peasants to death, flogged them with birch rods, put stocks on their legs, and fettered them in chains; he tells of outrages committed against peasant girls and of the complete rightlessness of peasants—of everything that made up the cheerless, slavish life of the Russian serf peasantry. It was bitter for Radishchev to see that incalculable natural riches were in the hands of noble landlords and tsarist hangers-on, while millions of peasants lived in poverty, starved, and begged, giving all their forced, agonizing labor for the amusement, luxury, and debauchery of estate owners, the masters of peasant souls.

Deep pain is heard in Radishchev's words—pain for the Motherland, for millions of Russian people living under the oppression of serf-owners. 'Barbarian!'—addressing the landlord, Radishchev exclaims—'you are unworthy to bear the name of citizen.'

A courageous champion of the interests of the oppressed serf peasantry, Radishchev could not reconcile himself to the fact that the land had become for the toiler not a nurturing mother, but a stepmother; that the producers of bread remained without bread; and that their unhappy lot was to be 'an ox under the yoke.' The cry of a soul 'wounded by the sufferings of humanity' is heard in Radishchev's wrathful words addressed to cruel-hearted landlords: 'Greedy beasts, insatiable leeches...'

In Radishchev's works, the monarchical system in Russia was subjected to the same sharp, passionate criticism as serfdom. In Radishchev's view, the tsar is the chief culprit of all the people's calamities. In this respect, the revolutionary writer did not share the naive illusions of Stepan Razin and Yemelyan Pugachev, who were 'tsarists,' fighting against landlords yet for a 'good tsar.' Having thoroughly studied the entire system of state administration of Catherine's times, Radishchev arrived at the firm conviction that absolute monarchy is hostile to the people and inflicts terrible harm on the Motherland. 'Autocracy

is the state most repugnant to human nature,' he boldly declared.

It is well known that Radishchev's contemporaries, the French Enlighteners whose philosophical ideas Radishchev highly valued and critically reworked—Holbach, Diderot, Helvétius, d'Alembert, and others—considered autocracy a just form of social order provided an enlightened monarch stood at the head of the state. Radishchev could not reconcile himself to these views of the French Enlighteners. He denied in principle the right of the autocratic system to exist.

Naturally, Radishchev also arrived at recognizing the legitimacy of the people's indignation and vengeance against landlords and monarchs for all the atrocities committed. He considered peasant retribution against landlords for oppression, violence, and savage arbitrariness a completely just act. 'Tremble, cruel-hearted landlord, on the brow of each of your peasants I see your condemnation,' wrote the author of 'A Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow.'

Radishchev warned that the tsar would not relinquish power voluntarily, and that he would have to be deprived of this power by force, through an armed popular uprising. '...There is not, and until the end of the world there may never be, an example of a tsar voluntarily relinquishing anything of his power while sitting upon the throne.' From this, the revolutionary writer drew the conclusion that the revolutionary overthrow of autocracy was necessary and inevitable, and called for revolution.

Radishchev clearly envisioned that only after the destruction of autocracy would the liberation of the peasants from serf oppression be possible. Just as the tsar would not voluntarily give up the throne and power, so too would the landlord not give up his lands or grant freedom to serf peasants. At one time, it is true, Radishchev admitted the possibility that more progressive representatives of the nobility might understand

and realize the intolerability of the peasants' living conditions and the necessity of liberating them from serf oppression. In the chapter 'Khotilov' of 'A Journey,' he even outlined measures that nobles could carry out in favor of the peasants. Yet this illusion of Radishchev quickly dissipated.

Radishchev ardently rebelled not only against the rightlessness of working people in Russia, but also boldly came out against colonial slavery and against the oppression of Negroes and Indians by Europeans. He exposed the eulogies of bourgeois liberals regarding the alleged well-being of the population in bourgeois America. 'Having slaughtered the Indians at one stroke,' wrote Radishchev, 'the malicious Europeans, preachers of peaceableness in the name of the God of truth, teachers of meekness and philanthropy, graft onto the root of furious murder by conquerors the cold-blooded murder of enslavement through acquiring captives by purchase. These unfortunate victims of the sultry banks of the Niger and Senegal, torn away from their homes and families, resettled in lands unknown to them, under the heavy rod of order, plow up the abundant fields of America, which loathes their labors. And we call a country of devastation blessed because its fields are not overgrown with thorns and its cornfields abound with diverse crops. We call a country blessed where a hundred proud citizens drown in luxury, while thousands have neither reliable sustenance nor shelter of their own from heat and frost.'

A prominent place in Radishchev's political views is occupied by the revolutionary program of economic and political measures he put forward to ensure the liquidation of feudal-serf society.

One of Radishchev's first demands was the replacement of the serf order with a new order based on 'private liberty.' The land must belong to the one who tills it—that is, the peasant. For it is precisely the tiller of the soil, Radishchev pointed out, 'the feeder of our leanness, the satier of our hunger, the one who

gives us health and prolongs our life, who has the right to dispose neither of what he tills nor of what he produces.' Radishchev demanded that labor be free and that the products of labor be enjoyed by those who produce them.

Radishchev envisioned the future state system in the form of a democratic republic. In this republic, Radishchev dreamed, all citizens are equal among themselves, and the same laws apply to all. The republican state must provide the people with the broadest opportunities for developing education, enlightenment, and upbringing; then from the midst of the people will emerge their own scholars, poets, writers, statesmen, educators, and judges—in a word, all those who are to govern public life wisely and prudently.

Radishchev could not, of course, foresee that the program of social transformations he outlined would objectively lead to the domination of bourgeois orders; that small private ownership of the means of production would inevitably lead to large-scale ownership, to a struggle for economic domination in the countryside and in the city, to the ruin of some and the enrichment of others, to the concentration of all wealth in the hands of a minority and the impoverishment of the majority of society, to the intensification of exploitation of others' labor, to the emergence of the bourgeoisie and proletariat in the city and the kulaks in the countryside—in short, to everything inherent in bourgeois society that constitutes the law of its development.

Radishchev's political views, directed in defense of the working people—first and foremost in defense of the Russian peasant—are grounded in a deep, ardent feeling of love for the Motherland and for the Russian people. In his 'Discourse on What It Means to Be a Son of the Fatherland,' Radishchev clearly and expressively defines his view of patriotism. He convincingly explains who can and must be considered a patriot. A true son of the Fatherland, a patriot, and a sincere friend of the people is, in Radishchev's opinion, one who

boldly and courageously comes out against oppressors, fears no difficulties in performing a feat for the good of fellow citizens and overcomes all obstacles on the path toward this, and who selflessly serves his people in word and deed, always striving to be useful to the Fatherland.

A patriot, Radishchev affirmed, 'if convinced that his death will bring strength and glory to the Fatherland, does not fear to sacrifice his life; if, however, it is needed for the Fatherland, he preserves it for the utmost observance of natural and fatherland laws.' These remarkable words of Radishchev had exceedingly important significance; they exerted a great ideological and educational influence on the younger generation and inspired selfless struggle against enemies of the Russian people. These words have not lost their living significance even now, in our days.

Radishchev ardently loved the Russian people and firmly believed in their прекрасное [splendid] future. He saw in them 'firmness in undertakings, indefatigability in execution,' patience, wisdom, nobility, industriousness, humaneness, love of freedom, and readiness, when patience runs out, to rise courageously in defense of their rights within the Fatherland or in defense against an external enemy. 'O people, born for greatness and glory!' Radishchev exclaimed.

In the concluding lines of 'Songs Sung at Contests in Honor of Ancient Slavic Deities,' Radishchev, prophetically peering into the future of the Russian people, wrote:

"O people, most glorious people!
Your distant descendants
Will surpass you in glory
By their exquisite courage,
Godlike courage,
The marvel of the entire universe;
All barriers, all strongholds
They will shatter with a mighty hand,
They will conquer even nature,—

And before their mighty gaze,
Before their countenance illumined
With the glory of immense victories,
Prostrate will fall tsars and kingdoms."

* * *

In Radishchev's times, the theory of 'natural law' of man and the 'social contract'—that is, the contractual origin of the state—was quite popular in Western Europe and in Russia. Despite the fact that this theory was idealistic, and therefore unscientific, it undoubtedly bore a progressive character compared with preceding social views and played a certain positive role in the development of bourgeois sociology. It was directed against the reactionary idea of the divine origin of the state and of the eternal division of people into patricians and plebeians, into noble and 'base.' This theory, affirming the natural equality of people and their natural striving, regardless of origin, toward equality in the civil state, aided in the struggle against feudalism.

Radishchev skillfully used the positive content of the theory of 'natural law' in posing the economic and political tasks of Russian public life. At the same time, he by no means confined himself to blind acceptance of the theory of Diderot, Helvétius, and Rousseau, but critically approached the sociological views of these—at that time most advanced in Western Europe—thinkers and drew his own independent, far-reaching, more radical conclusions compared with foreign thinkers. Evidence of this, as noted, are Radishchev's calls for the revolutionary overthrow of autocracy, for the complete destruction of serfdom, and the program he outlined for the democratic reorganization of Russia.

From the idea of the natural equality of people, Radishchev drew very important conclusions of a practical nature. He resolutely rejected reactionary arguments about the unequal value or inferiority of individual peoples or races, and about

the inequality of people within society depending on estate origin. Among man's natural rights, Radishchev included freedom: 'all men are by nature free, and no one has the right to take this freedom away from them.'

Radishchev's passionate defense of the idea of equality had great progressive significance at that time. Lenin noted that 'the idea of equality is the most revolutionary idea in the struggle against the old order of absolutism in general—and against the old serf-owning, large-landed proprietorship in particular' (Works, Vol. 13, p. 214).

Radishchev persistently emphasized that 'education does everything,' and that 'the unfolding of popular reason depends on a confluence of fortunate circumstances.' 'Fortunate circumstances' take shape in the process of public life; man cannot and must not passively await this 'confluence of fortunate circumstances.' As an active, energetic being, man is not only educated by circumstances and perfects his reason, but also strives to create conditions for 'the march of human reason' and for 'the unfolding of popular reason.' Although these assertions of Radishchev were idealistic at their core, under the conditions of the social struggle of that time they played a progressive role.

Unlike Rousseau, Radishchev saw the well-being of society and the individual not in a primitive state, not in archaic times, and not in turning history backward, but, on the contrary, in the progress of public life, in the future toward which one must strive and for which one must fight. Faith in social progress constitutes an important feature of Radishchev's sociological views.

Radishchev's posing of the question of the influence of external social circumstances on shaping human character—and that before punishing criminals, the social basis of crimes must be destroyed—played a positive role. It is well known how highly Marx, in 'The Holy Family,' assessed the statements of 18th-

century French materialists on these questions. 'If man is shaped by environment,' wrote Marx, 'his environment must be made human.' Compared with the French materialists, Radishchev drew more decisive and radical conclusions. He called for a revolutionary change in the socio-political conditions of life in serf Russia.

In connection with the question of the shaping of human character and behavior under the influence of the social environment, Radishchev on the whole correctly approached the question of the emergence and significance of outstanding figures. Citing history, he noted that the circumstances of life serve as the cause for 'the unfolding of great talents,' while 'nature never grows sluggish in producing them.' From Radishchev's standpoint, 'circumstances make a great man.' The influence of outstanding figures on the popular masses, in Radishchev's opinion, depends on specific historical conditions, circumstances, and surroundings. 'Yet circumstances are needed, their assistance is needed,' writes Radishchev, 'and without it Jan Hus expires in the flames, Galileo is dragged into a dungeon, and your friend is incarcerated in Ilimsk.' At the same time, Radishchev believed that truth would triumph and obstacles to the triumph of reason would be removed. 'Yet time, preparation, takes away all barriers.'

Nevertheless, Radishchev assigns the main role in history not to individual outstanding personalities, but to the people. Precisely upon the people does he place all his hopes, believing in their strength and ability to turn life onto another path.

For the first time in the history of social thought, Radishchev links the future of the country with the historical activity of ordinary people—peasants—and predetermines for them an important role in the development of public life. It is well known that the majority of French materialists did not step beyond aristocratic views of the people as a rabble called upon

to submissively follow geniuses, leaders, and guides from noble circles.

Radishchev looked far ahead, believing in the spiritual forces of the people and their ability to join in active participation in governing public life: 'Oh! if the slaves, weighed down by heavy bonds,' Radishchev wrote with inspiration, 'raging in their despair, were to smash with the iron hindering their freedom our heads, the heads of their inhuman masters, and crimson their fields with our blood! What would the state lose thereby? Soon from their midst great men would arise to champion the beaten tribe; yet they would hold different thoughts of themselves and be deprived of the right of oppression. This is no dream, for my gaze pierces the thick veil of time concealing the future from our eyes; I see through a whole century.'

In Radishchev's social views, a significant place is occupied by advanced, progressive ideas of morality and ethics closely linked with his revolutionary views. The main thing Radishchev demanded was the cultivation of high moral qualities in man. Man is called upon to be useful to the Fatherland, a patriot, an irreconcilable opponent of serf oppression, violence, lawlessness, extortion, self-interest, acquisitiveness, bigotry, hypocrisy, etc. Radishchev's merit is that he laid the foundation for working out problems of a new, democratic ethics and revolutionary morality; this work was later continued by Belinsky, Herzen, and especially Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov. M. I. Kalinin noted in 1945 that in Radishchev's social views were given 'the first shoots of revolutionary morality,' and that his thoughts on upbringing 'can to this very day be considered progressive.'

* * *

The materialist trend in 18th-century Russian philosophy, whose founder was M. V. Lomonosov, received its further development in Radishchev's philosophical views.

Radishchev's philosophical works 'On Man, on His Mortality and Immortality' and 'The Life of Fyodor Vasilyevich Ushakov,' as well as certain statements from 'A Journey,' testify with all obviousness that their author fully shared Lomonosov's basic philosophical and natural-scientific ideas. Radishchev's particular attention was attracted by Lomonosov's discoveries in the field of the atomic-molecular theory of the structure of matter, the evolutionary theory of the origin of earth layers, the doctrine of the causes of earthquakes, of the infinity of the universe and plurality of worlds, of electricity, magnetism, and light as special forms of the state of matter, etc. Radishchev highly values Lomonosov's remarkable discoveries that brought glory to Russian science, and especially the law of conservation of matter and energy in nature. Nature destroys nothing, Radishchev declared: 'non-being or annihilation is a vain word and an empty thought,' 'no force in nature can perish or disappear.'

Radishchev firmly occupied a materialist position on the fundamental philosophical question: for him it was beyond doubt that the entire world surrounding us, nature, and the universe exist objectively outside man, independently of his 'sensibility' and reason. He affirmed that 'the being of things is independent of the faculty of cognition concerning them and exists by itself.' From this materialist assertion of Radishchev it follows that the spiritual, the mental is secondary, not primary, and that it depends on the physical, on the material. Radishchev's statements on this question are directed against idealism, dualism, and vulgar materialism.

In Radishchev's firm conviction, matter exists in space and in time, outside of which there is no matter. 'Everything that exists cannot have being otherwise,' wrote Radishchev, 'than by being located somewhere; for although space is an abstract concept, it exists in actual fact, not as substance, but as the absence thereof.' If one takes into account that several years

before Radishchev wrote his philosophical treatise 'On Man, on His Mortality and Immortality,' the German idealist Kant had published the book 'Critique of Pure Reason,' which argued that space and time represent not objective forms of the existence of matter, but are a priori, subjective forms of human cognition, it becomes clear how important Radishchev's intervention from the standpoint of materialism was in resolving this question.

As a materialist, Radishchev was convinced that the existence of matter, its development, motion, and diversity in the manifestations of its 'materiality' are conditioned by internal laws of its development. Radishchev recognized no special 'vital forces' or 'entelechies.' Nature is governed by its own laws, independent of anyone; hence it needs no outside interference from anyone. This conviction of Radishchev also stood opposed to Kant's idealist propositions that man, through his reason, imposes laws of development upon nature, thereby imparting to them the significance of subjective forms of cognition.

Radishchev viewed the motion of matter as its inalienable property, as a law of development without which nature cannot be imagined. He considered absurd the assertion that inactivity is a property of nature. 'Senseless one!'—wrote Radishchev —'when you gaze into the heights and behold the revolution of radiant bodies; when you look around yourself and see life scattered in thousands upon thousands of forms everywhere, can you truly say that inactivity is inherent in materiality, and motion is alien to it? When everything moves in nature and everything lives, when the tiniest speck of dust and the hugest body are subject to inevitable changes, destruction, and once again composition, will you truly find a place for inactivity and expel motion? If you know nothing inactive, if you see everything in motion, is it not sophistry to speak of that which does not exist, and to suppose that what is, is not?'

Thus, Radishchev rejected absolute rest in nature as a state uncharacteristic of it. Motion, however, he said, is absolute, constant, and continuous. Yet Radishchev, like all his contemporaries, viewed motion metaphysically, believing that motion is a change of place. 'Motion is the property of changing place,' he wrote. Under those historical conditions, Radishchev could not understand the dialectics of motion. Therefore, he cited Leibniz and agreed with him that 'nothing happens by leaps.'

Radishchev showed inconsistency on the question of motion in nature when it came to the source of motion: what is the cause of motion, who is the originator of the beginning of motion if there was one, or does motion have no beginning just as it has no end? On this question, incidentally, quite a few philosophers stumbled, starting from ancient times. Radishchev stumbled on this too, making in a number of works a retreat from consistent materialism and allowing a certain concession to deism by recognizing God as the prime mover, the creator of the world who gave the first impulse to the motion of the universe, after which the latter had no further need of God.

True, in Radishchev's statements there were reservations testifying to his vacillations. Beyond doubt, in any event, Radishchev was hostile toward the church and religion. He clearly saw that autocracy, serf-owners, and the church were in close alliance and jointly oppressed the people. In the ode 'Liberty,' he wrote:

> "Tsarist power guards the faith,
> Faith affirms tsarist power;
> Together they oppress society:
> One strives to shackle reason,
> The other seeks to crush the will."

In Radishchev's works, clergymen and monks are subjected to sharp criticism for their acquisitiveness and bigotry, and for inventing fetters for human reason, clipping its wings in order

to arrest its flight toward greatness and freedom. It is well known how Radishchev ridiculed mysticism, obscurantism, and 'delirious philosophizing.'

Viewing motion in nature as a whole as mechanical motion, Radishchev at times also revealed elements of a dialectical approach to assessing phenomena occurring in nature. Thus, he notes that in the process of the eternal and irresistible motion of nature, everywhere are visible birth, growth, development—and destruction, death. Everywhere in life there are contradictions: life yields place to death, and the new is born only to die later as well. Supposing that in nature 'there are no leaps,' Radishchev nevertheless remarked: 'Whoever has delved into the workings of nature knows that she always acts instantaneously or all at once...'

Of indisputable value are Radishchev's views of nature as a process of constant perfection and development from the simple to the complex, from the imperfect to the perfect; these views diverged fundamentally from the notions of vulgar materialism. Radishchev saw qualitative difference in the diverse phenomena of nature and emphasized the essential difference between phenomena of inorganic and organic nature. He parted ways with hylozoists who asserted that sensibility ('the property of sensing') and 'mentality' are inherent in all nature without exception. In Radishchev's opinion, sensibility exists only where matter is better organized; 'ascending and perfecting itself,' sensibility gradually attains 'mentality,' reason. According to Radishchev, consciousness is a property of highly organized matter; only man possesses it, as the most perfected being in nature.

In Radishchev's times, biology was weakly developed; nevertheless, in this field of science as well, Radishchev showed profound knowledge of nature and boldly posed new scientific problems. He subjected to criticism Bonnet's idealist theory of preformation—later supported, as is well known, by

Weismannists-Morganists—according to which biological development represents an 'unfolding' of parts of the organism already existing in the germ. For from this was drawn the conclusion of the pre-existence of the soul in the seed of the organism, of its immortality, and that idioplasm and genes are the carriers of heredity. This theory denied the influence of the external environment on the organism; it declared this influence powerless and impotent before the immutable and omnipotent laws of heredity. Radishchev ridiculed the theory of preformation, calling it 'seminal philosophizing.'

In connection with his critique of 'seminal philosophizing,' Radishchev noted the capacity of a living organism for 'irritability,' that is, for reactions to the influence of the external environment—climate, nutrition, etc. While recognizing the great significance of the forces of nature and hereditary traits, Radishchev at the same time emphasized the immense role of upbringing: '...Upon man will depend,' wrote Radishchev, 'learning the use of them, which will always be assisted in varying degrees by circumstances and everything surrounding us.' Man must, Radishchev believed, turn to his advantage what occurs in the phenomena of nature. 'Let us take the example of animals,' Radishchev pointed out, 'which we wish to settle in another climate. The relocated one will scarcely grow accustomed to it, yet that born from it will be more in harmony with it, and the third in descent may be considered a true native of that country where its grandfather was regarded as a wanderer.'

This remarkable scientific conclusion of Radishchev led to the development of that trend in progressive biological science which, grounded in materialist dialectics, much later triumphed in the teaching of Michurin. Practice confirmed Michurin's conclusions. Evidence of this is provided if only by the facts of advancing southern crops into the far north and numerous successes in the development of Soviet Michurinist biology.

Radishchev was a convinced opponent of agnosticism. He resolutely rejected all attempts to limit or belittle human cognitive capacities and insisted that there are no limits to humanity's cognition of the external material world. Human reason is so omnipotent, Radishchev affirmed, that despite all obstacles, difficulties, and temporary delusions in the process of attaining truth, man can and must comprehend all the secrets of nature and cognize the essence of things and phenomena. Radishchev considered the striving for perfection to be the goal of human cognition: to this perfection there is no limit, he said. Filled with faith in the might of human cognition, Radishchev exclaimed: 'And how can man not take pride in his mortality, subordinating to his power sound, light, thunder, lightning, and sunbeams, moving immeasurable weights, reaching the farthest bounds of the universe, and comprehending and foreknowing the future.'

Compared with his predecessors, Radishchev took a step forward by imparting a more active character to materialism and linking it with progressive social ideas directed against tsarism and serfdom. Radishchev also had the opportunity to study the progressive philosophy of the French materialist-encyclopedists and, critically assimilating it, to utilize the best of what was contained therein. Radishchev's philosophical views represented a valuable acquisition in the history of Russian materialist thought by their depth and meaningfulness, and by the progressive character of the ideas embedded in them.

* * *

Radishchev's principal merit in the history of Russian social thought lies in the fact that he initiated the development of revolutionary, anti-serfdom ideology in progressive circles of Russian society under conditions of the incipient disintegration of the feudal-serf mode of production.

Radishchev's courageous struggle against autocracy and serf oppression exerted a strong, beneficial influence on the subsequent development of revolutionary-liberation ideas. Radishchev's anti-serfdom ideas found reflection in Russian belles-lettres. They were taken up by the Decembrist poets, especially Ryleyev, and then by Krylov, Griboyedov, Lermontov, and Pushkin. The creative work of the great Russian poet Pushkin developed under Radishchev's direct ideological influence and was inspired by his freedom-loving ideas. Pushkin knew and highly valued Radishchev's literary heritage. Until his very death, he saw in Radishchev his predecessor, the one who first prophesied liberty—a fearless, courageous fighter for freedom. In 1836, in the first version of his famous poem 'I Have Erected a Monument to Myself Not Made by Hands,' Pushkin, as if summing up his highly ideological literary work, recalled his succession from Radishchev's work:

> "And long shall I be dear to the people for this,
> That I awakened noble feelings with my lyre,
> That following Radishchev I glorified freedom..."

Herzen was completely right when, on the eve of the peasant reform, he wrote about the author of 'A Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow': '...his ideals... are our dreams, the dreams of the Decembrists... in every word of his we find, together with hatred of violence, a loud protest against the serf condition... And whatever he wrote, one hears the familiar chord that we are accustomed to hearing both in Pushkin's first poems, and in Ryleyev's "Meditations," and in our own heart.' In 'our heart'—this means in the hearts of all the great Russian revolutionary democrats and their followers who continued Radishchev's cause: Belinsky, Ogaryov, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, Pisarev, Antonovich, Serno-Solovyevich, Shelgunov, and others.

With full right Radishchev said of himself: '...My heart is not empty, and I live not a single life; I live in the soul of my friends, I live a hundredfold.'
Soviet people, building a communist society, are the lawful heirs of all achievements of world culture. With love and gratitude they recall the name of A. N. Radishchev, the great patriot and revolutionary who gave his life for the freedom and happiness of his native people.

A 05837. Publ. No. 752. Order No. 2310. Print run: 600,000 copies.

EDITORIAL BOARD:
S. M. Abalin (Editor-in-Chief),
L. F. Ilyichov, P. N. Pospelov, V. S. Kruzhkov,
V. G. Grigoryan, A. S. Myasnikov, M. D. Kammari,
F. D. Khrustov.
Signed for press September 15, 1952. Paper format 70×108 1/16. 2.5 paper sheets — 6.85 printer's sheets.
Stalin 'Pravda' Newspaper Printing House. Moscow, 24 Pravda Street.