

VOL. 7
NO. 1
1976

SOCIAL SCIENCES

World Socialist System

**Security and Cooperation
in Europe**

**Socio-Economic Problems
of Developed Socialism**

**The 1905 Revolution
in Russia**

Vietnam: Road to Victory

**Systems Analysis
in Literature**

Soviet Ethnography

Ethology and Ethics

**Science and Technology
in the Third World**

1

1976

USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

A quarterly of the Section
of the Social Sciences,
USSR Academy of Sciences.
Founded in 1970.
Published in Moscow in English,
and also in French, Sciences Sociales;
in German, Gesellschaftswissenschaften;
and in Spanish, Ciencias Sociales

The journal is published by agreement:

in Bengali,
Samaj Bijan (Bingsha Shatabdi Publishers,
Calcutta, India);
in Japanese,
Shakai Kagaku (Nara-Eiwa Shoji Co., Ltd., Nara,
Japan);
in Greek,
Kinonikes epistemes (Planet Publishers, Athens,
Greece);
in Arabic,
Al Ulum al-Ijtima'iyah (Dar al-Farabi Publishers,
Beirut, Lebanon)
and reprinted in Argentina by Anteo Publishers,
Buenos Aires

For subscriptions apply to national distributors
dealing with V/O Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga
listed at the end of this issue.

© *Social Sciences*, 1976.

Reprints authorised with written permission from the Editorial Board.

"*Social Sciences*" Editorial Office, 33/12 Arbat, Moscow 121002, USSR

USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Vol. VII, No. 1, 1976

Philosophy
History
Economy
Politics
Sociology
Law
Philology
Psychology
Ethnography
Archaeology

CONTENTS

	<i>To the Reader</i>	5
K. Katushev	The Victory over Fascism and the Develop- ment of the World Socialist System	8
L. Tolkunov	Détente Enters New Phase	26
	Socio-Economic Problems of De- veloped Socialism	
M. Volkov	Scientific and Technological Revolution and the Creation of the Material and Technical Basis of Communism	36
P. Fedoseyev	Economic Science and Social Develop- ment of Society	49
R. Belousov	Planned Use of Economic Laws	69
N. Fedorenko	The Integrated Approach to Improving Economic Planning and Management	79
E. Kapustin	The Socialist Way of Life as a Socio- Economic Category	93
	* * *	
	Vanguard of Struggle for Peace, for the Social and National Liberation of Peoples	104
S. Titarenko	The Revolution of 1905-1907 in Russia	118
A. Uralsky	Vietnam: Road to Victory	137
M. Khrapchenko	Systems Analysis in Literature	151

Y. Bromley	Soviet Ethnography Today	165
A. Shishkin	Ethology and Ethics	177
	Developing Countries: New Researches	
G. Skorov	Scientific and Technological Progress and Social Orientation	191

CRITICAL STUDIES AND COMMENT

I. Antonovich	Bourgeois Sociology and the Problem of a Social Ideal	205
----------------------	---	-----

VIEWS AND OPINIONS

V. Sukhomlinsky	Overwhelming Joy of Knowledge	217
------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----

SCIENTIFIC LIFE

M. Gapochka	Institute of Scientific Information for the Social Sciences	222
L. Voronkov	Soviet-US Cooperation in the Social Sciences	226
G. Kotovsky	Indo-Soviet Commission	228
A. Manfred	<i>French Yearbook</i>	229
V. Tishkov	<i>Annual Studies of America</i>	232
	Congresses • Conferences • Symposiums	
	Sholokhov Jubilee	235
Y. Chelyshev, I. Serebryakov	International Meeting of Indologists in Berlin	236
N. Narochnikskaya	Colloquium of Soviet and West German Historians	238
O. Malyarov	Soviet-Indian Symposium on Industrialisation	241
	Chronicle	244

BOOK REVIEWS

V. Drobizhev	Leichuk V. S., <i>Socialist Industrialisation in the USSR and its Analysis in Soviet Historiography</i>	248
A. Silenko	Kumanev V. A., <i>The Revolution and the Education of the Masses</i>	249

I. Olegina	Igritsky Y. I., <i>The Myths of Bourgeois Historiography and the Reality of History. Modern American and English Historiography of the Great October Socialist Revolution</i>	250
M. Karamanov	Pletnev E. P., <i>The Cosmopolitanism of Capital and the Internationalism of the Proletariat</i>	252
L. Antayferova	Luriya A. R., <i>The Historical Development of Mental Processes</i>	254
A. Pozner	Ilyenkov E. V., <i>Dialectical Logic. Essays on History and Theory</i>	257
O. Darusenkov	Grinevich E. A., <i>Cuba: Road to the Victory of the Revolution</i>	260
I. Rybakina	Lavretsky I., <i>Salvador Allende</i>	261
A. Okladnikov, A. Samsonov	<i>A History of Hungary in 3 vols</i>	268
V. Malkov	Fursenko A. A., <i>A Critical Decade in America (the 1960s)</i>	274
S. Tulpanov	<i>Developing Countries: Regularities, Tendencies, Prospects</i>	275
A. Karelsky	Berkovsky N. Y., <i>Romanticism in Germany</i>	279
L. Litvinova	Sarukhanyan A. P., <i>Modern Irish Literature</i>	282

BIBLIOGRAPHY

New Books by Soviet Authors on the Second World War	285
Reviews of Foreign Books in Soviet Scientific Journals	288
* * *	
List of Distributors	301

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

FEDOSEYEV P. N., Academician, Chairman
GRIGULEVICH I. R., D. Sc. (Hist.), Deputy Chairman
MASLOVA N. I., Executive Secretary

Members

ABOLTIN V. Y.,
D. Sc. (Econ.)

ARBATOV G. A.,
Academician

BOGOMOLOV O. T.,
Corresponding Member,
USSR Academy of Sciences

DUDINSKY I. V.,
D. Sc. (Econ.)

FROLOV I. T.,
D. Sc. (Philos.)

GAFUROV B. G.,
Academician

GAPOCHKA M. P.,
Cand. Sc. (Philos.)

GVISHIANI D. M.,
Corresponding Member,
USSR Academy of Sciences

INOZEMTSEV N. N.,
Academician

KAPUSTIN E. I.,
D. Sc. (Econ.)

KHACHATUROV T. S.,
Academician

KHRAPCHENKO M. B.,
Academician

KOMKOV G. D.,
D. Sc. (Hist.)

KOVALCHENKO I. D.,
Corresponding Member,
USSR Academy of Sciences

KUMANEV V. A.,
D. Sc. (Hist.)

KUZNETSOV D. V.,
Cand. Sc. (Hist.)

MCHEDLOV M. P.,
D. Sc. (Philos.)

MOMDJAN Kh. N.,
D. Sc. (Philos.)

NAROCHNITSKY A. L.,
Academician

OKLADNIKOV A. P.,
Academician

PIOTROVSKY B. B.,
Academician

SOBOLEV A. I.,
D. Sc. (Philos.)

SOLODOVNIKOV V. G.,
Corresponding Member,
USSR Academy of Sciences

TIKHVINSKY S. L.,
Corresponding Member,
USSR Academy of Sciences

TIMOFEYEV T. T.,
Corresponding Member,
USSR Academy of Sciences

TRUKHANOVSKY V. G.,
Corresponding Member,
USSR Academy of Sciences

VINOGRADOV V. A.,
Corresponding Member,
USSR Academy of Sciences

VOLSKY V. V.,
D. Sc. (Econ.)

ZHILIN P. A.,
Corresponding Member,
USSR Academy of Sciences

ZHUKOV E. M.,
Academician

To the Reader

Mankind has entered its fourth postwar decade in an atmosphere of beneficial changes throughout the planet. Social development has reached an unparalleled rate and international relations are being steadily restructured on principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-political systems.

One of the cardinal developments of the past 30 years has been socialism's conversion into a world system, and the formation and consolidation of the socialist community, which has become the key factor ensuring world peace. In the article opening this issue Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee **K. Katushev** traces the formation, basic achievements and international influence of the socialist world system. **L. Tolkunov** analyses the results of the historic Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Socio-Economic Problems of Developed Socialism

Under the Ninth Five-Year Plan (1971-1975) a huge and far-reaching programme has been carried out in the USSR with the aim of raising the people's standard of living. During these years the accent was placed on intensive methods of economic management and on the qualitative factors of growth. This is to remain the guideline under the Tenth Five-Year Plan (1976-1980), whose master assignments are to be approved by the 25th Congress of the CPSU. This will unquestionably be another major step in the building of a communist society in the Soviet Union.

In this issue Academicians **P. Fedoseyev** and **N. Fedorenko**, and Doctors of Economic Sciences **E. Kapustin**, **M. Volkov** and **R. Belousov** consider pressing problems linked with the further build-up of communism's material and technical basis, with the role played by economic science and the ways and means of making more effective use of objective economic laws, with the improvement of planning and managing the economy in order to achieve more rapid social progress and create the best possible conditions for the individual's free and harmonious development.

Modern and Contemporary History

A comprehensive review of the proceedings of a scientific conference in Moscow on the theme "The Communist Movement in the Vanguard of the Struggle for Peace and Social and National Liberation" (in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the Seventh Comintern Congress) gives a summary of the speeches by M. Suslov, Member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, B. Ponomarev, Alternate Member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other participants in the conference.

In an article devoted to the 70th anniversary of the revolution of 1905-1907 in Russia S. Titarenko analyses the causes, motive forces and main events of that first people's revolution of the epoch of imperialism.

A. Uralsky sketches the history of the first socialist state in Southeast Asia—the Democratic Republic of Vietnam—against the background of the general struggle for freedom and independence waged by the peoples of Indochina.

Ethnography

Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Y. Bromley acquaints readers with a wide range of studies by Soviet ethnographers aimed at resolving significant theoretical and practical problems.

Philosophy

In analysis of the works of K. Lorentz and other ethologists A. Shishkin proves the untenability of a purely biological approach to ethics, of the attempts to apply the conclusions of science on animal behaviour to morals and social phenomena.

Sociology

Reviewing the "ideal" models of man and society constructed by some bourgeois sociologists, I. Antonovich criticises futurological prognostications, in which social reality is replaced with abstract, moral-ethical imperatives.

The Economy of the Developing States

G. Skorov analyses the trend towards and possibilities for using the latest achievements of science and technology to speed up the economic development of the Third World countries. He underscores the importance here of the national, scientific and technical potential and the decisive role played by social conditions in furthering the productive forces.

Literary Criticism

Academician M. Khrapchenko shows the possibility of applying the systems analysis in literary criticism and, in particular, examines systems links as a component of the overall characteristic of the genesis and development of literature and art.

Pedagogics

This work from the archive of V. Sukhomlinsky gives an ideal of the theoretical views of that eminent Soviet pedagogue, who sought to turn the process of education into a laboratory of creative thinking with the child himself as the main creator.

* * *

The approaching 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, whose decisions will determine the prospects and the concrete ways and means for the Soviet Union's further advance towards communism, undoubtedly attracts the close attention of peaceloving people of the world. The continuation of the CPSU's Leninist foreign policy of peace at the new phase of international development will, without question, contribute to the further consolidation of peace and world security.

In charting its internal and external policies and in its concrete steps in implementing these policies the CPSU constantly relies on the researches of Soviet social scientists, on their analyses of the world situation and the key trends of present-day economic, political and social development. As the Editors see it, their prime duty is to acquaint readers with the latest achievements of the Soviet social sciences in these areas.

The Editors

The Victory over Fascism and the Development of the World Socialist System

KONSTANTIN KATUSHEV

This article was published in *KOMMUNIST* (No. 8, 1975), theoretical and political journal of the CPSU Central Committee.

The victory over fascism had an unprecedented impact on the course of world history. Today, thirty years later, the epochal significance of that victory is seen not only in the fact that it delivered modern civilisation from a terrible menace, not only in its huge contribution to the cause of peace and freedom of nations, but also in the revolutionary changes that have taken place in the social structure of many countries, in the fundamentally new balance of forces on the world scene as a result of the Second World War and postwar development, in the steady growth of the prestige of the world socialist system, and in many other positive changes.

The Second World War, unleashed by the most reactionary and aggressive segment of world capitalism—the fascist and militarist states of Europe and Asia—evolved into the greatest and most desperate attempt to crush society's revolutionary forces and reverse the course of history. It was no accident, therefore, that the fascist war machine directed its main blow at the Soviet Union, the world's first state of workers and peasants and the bulwark of advanced mankind. Our epoch's principal contradiction was laid bare and mankind's destiny was decided in the gigantic battles that were fought during the Great Patriotic War.

K. Katushev, Secretary of the CC CPSU.

In the struggle against fascism the Soviet people performed an unparalleled feat. Victory was won at the cost of 20 million lives and an unexampled mobilisation of physical and spiritual strength. The Soviet people shouldered the main burden of the war. Inspired by the great ideas of Lenin and the just aims of the struggle and led by the Communist Party, they won complete victory in the Great Patriotic War. The Nazi tyranny collapsed in Europe and Japanese militarism was defeated in Asia. The victorious outcome of the Second World War showed the immense might of socialism and its ideas and the great viability of the socialist social system.

"In the course of the 20th century," CPSU General Secretary L. I. Brezhnev said in a speech commemorating the 30th anniversary of the victory, "our country twice stood at the source of major changes in the make-up of the world. That is what took place in 1917, when the victory of the October Revolution heralded mankind's entry into a new historical epoch. That is what happened in 1945, when the rout of fascism, in which the Soviet Union played the decisive role, generated a mighty tide of socio-political changes which rolled across the globe and led to the consolidation of the forces of peace all over the world."¹

* * *

The defeat of fascism affected the course of history so powerfully because the preceding development of the world revolutionary process was brought into focus and continued in that colossal battle of the world's first socialist country, the international working class, its communist parties and the peoples of many countries against the forces of sinister reaction.

"World history," Lenin wrote, "is leading unswervingly towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, but is doing so by paths that are anything but smooth, simple and straight."² The profound truth of this capacious proposition is being borne out by the course of history.

Although capitalism crushed the first wave of revolutions generated in Germany, Hungary and some other countries, by the direct impact of the Great October Revolution, the succeeding two decades witnessed unceasing class battles. Unparalleled tension was reached by the strike movement in Great Britain. Germany again approached a revolutionary situation. The ominous economic crisis of the early 1930s shook capitalist society at its very foundations. It was accompanied by a new mighty uprising of the working-class movement in many capitalist countries.

Everybody knows how acute and well-defined the class struggle was in Germany and Austria at the beginning of the 1930s. In France the mass movement spread with slogans calling for the unity of all Left-wing forces and the creation of a Popular Front with the purpose of closing the road to fascism and reaction. A fierce battle against fascism unfolded in Spain and its outcome was a serious lesson and gave fresh impetus to the unity of the anti-fascist forces.

In the period between the two world wars Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia saw major action by the working people time and again. The strikes of the miners of Ostrawa and of the metalworkers of Kladno in Czechoslovakia; of the railwaymen of Bucharest and the oilmen of Ploesti in Rumania; the huge demonstration of workers in Budapest in 1930 and the strikes in Hungary; the actions of the Polish workers, who seized temporary control of factories; the massive demonstrations and strikes of the working people in Sofia, Plovdiv and other cities; and the general strikes staged by miners and construction workers in Yugoslavia are now part of the history of the international working-class movement. The peasant movement backed by the working class mounted sharply in almost all the countries of Eastern Europe. The class battles there were fought under not only economic but also political slogans demanding democracy and national independence. This was extremely significant in face of the growing threat of fascism and the increasing dependence of the governments of a number of those countries on Hitler Germany.

The colonial empires were still in existence during the prewar period. But already then, under the direct impact of the October Revolution, the tremors were becoming more and more violent, indicating that the national liberation movement was gathering strength. The Chinese revolution, which had the material and political support of the Soviet people, was gaining ground despite the innumerable barriers and contradictions. In Indochina and Korea the struggle of the people was gaining momentum. In Cuba a democratic revolution was unfolding against US imperialist domination and latifundism, and it brought about the downfall of the pro-imperialist Machado regime. An anti-colonial struggle was commencing in India and other Eastern countries. Imperialism's colonial rear was no longer as reliable as it had been prior to the First World War.

In those years manifold work was conducted on an immense scale by the Comintern, the militant organisation of the Marxist-Leninist communist parties. While making every effort to unite the workers of all countries against world capitalism, expand cooperation between the working-class and peasant movement and support the struggle of the colonial peoples, the Comintern was a staunch and consistent fighter against fascism and war. It indicated that fascism was the principal danger threatening not only socialism but also bourgeois democracy itself, drew up a programme of struggle based on the formation of popular fronts and initiated anti-fascist unity of action with the Social-Democratic parties.

The most noteworthy feature of the prewar years was the powerful growth of the Soviet Union's economic might and international prestige. The peoples saw in the Soviet Union the banner of their struggle and an unswerving champion of peace and progress. The USSR urged collective security in Europe and put forward a consistent programme for bridling fascist aggression.

However, class hatred of the USSR blinded many bourgeois leaders: hoping to encourage a "crusade" by Hitlerism against the

USSR, they pursued a policy of conniving at aggression. The Munich policy of appeasing the aggressors boomeranged against the Western bourgeois-democratic states. They were themselves attacked by Hitler Germany and then by militarist Japan.

Developments led to the formation of an anti-fascist coalition consisting of the Soviet Union, the USA, Great Britain and many other countries. The ruling circles of the capitalist states agreed to the formation of that coalition under pressure from their people and acute military necessity. Nonetheless this cooperation was of immense progressive significance. "The experience of the war period," L. I. Brezhnev said, "showed that different social systems are no bar to the pooling of efforts in fighting aggression and working for peace and international security."³

The vanguard role in uniting the anti-fascist forces was played by the communist parties, which earned the esteem of the masses by their courage, dedication, patriotism and awareness of their internationalist duty. The Communists headed the people's struggle in Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Albania, and the Resistance in France, Italy, Greece and other countries, and conducted the underground anti-fascist struggle in Rumania, Hungary and Germany itself, eloquently demonstrating that the communist parties are the most consistent champions of national interests, democratic freedoms and social progress.

Fascism is profoundly hostile to the vital interests and aspirations of the working people. Soviet people have never identified the people of the countries in the Hitlerite coalition with the fascist and pro-fascist ruling circles, which bear the entire responsibility for the death of over 50 million people during the Second World War.

By the very logic of developments, the struggle of the East-European peoples against Hitlerism turned against the local fascist myrmidons, against their mainstay in their countries—the big bourgeoisie and the landowners. The reactionary rulers, representing the exploiting classes in the East-European countries, completely discredited themselves, showing themselves as betrayers of their own peoples. Inspired by the Soviet victories in the war, the working masses became increasingly conscious that there should be no return to the former order and united in broad popular fronts, whose aim was to achieve not only national but also social emancipation and contained elements of a new social organisation.

The fact that the communist parties consisting of the finest representatives of the working class, the working peasants and the progressive intelligentsia became the leading core of these democratic associations was a natural, historically conditioned development. This was a genuinely mass movement, which saw not only the light of national liberation but also the realistic prospects for a better life. In some countries the conditions took shape for deepening the socio-political content of the anti-fascist and liberation struggle of the proletariat and all other working people, for a transition to the implementation of the tasks of the people's democratic and then the socialist revolution.

This further expansion of socialism's sphere was the natural continuation of the worldwide revolutionary process started by the Great October Revolution. The forces of world socialism — the Soviet Union, the new People's Democracies of Europe and Asia, the international working-class and the communist parties — emerged from the war stronger and more steeled and tempered than ever before.

* * *

With the formation of the People's Democracies the epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism, opened by the October Revolution and the building of socialism in the USSR, entered a new phase, the phase of the rise of the world socialist system. The existence of the powerful USSR unquestionably gave this new phase a specific of its own, because the working people of the countries that shook off capitalist oppression could count on the internationalist assistance and support of the Soviet people. This factor enormously facilitated revolutionary development in the People's Democracies, the class struggle of the peoples of these countries headed by the Communists against international and internal reaction, although, needless to say, it did not remove the entire complexity of these processes.

In the countries where they came to power the people encountered many extremely difficult problems. The communist and workers' parties adopted programmes envisaging revolutionary democratic reforms, the utmost promotion of the labour and political activity of the people, and the unity of all the patriotic forces around the working class. The confiscation of the property stolen by the fascist criminals and their accomplices, the nationalisation of big capital, the agrarian reform with the transfer of land to those who tilled it, and other measures were appreciated by the people and conformed to the interests of the workers and peasants.

The development of the People's Democratic power as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat was savagely resisted by the remnants of the former ruling classes and their political parties. The reactionaries hatched conspiracies and, with the direct assistance of the imperialist forces and the counter-revolutionary émigrés, attempted to dislodge the people's power from the positions it had won. Such attempts were made in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and other countries. A political struggle unfolded in the parliaments, in the popular fronts, in public organisations and at factories; the working class held powerful demonstrations in defence of the new system.

This struggle fostered the growth and maturity of the communist parties and enhanced the prestige of the Communists as dependable champions of the people's interests, of democracy and progress. The closing of the long-standing split in the working-class movement and the unification of the communist and Social Democratic parties on the basis of Marxism-Leninism was a historic event in many countries.

Millions of working people, who were becoming makers of their own history, rallied to the communist and workers' parties.

At the close of the 1940s, after they had upheld and expanded their democratic gains, the proletariat and other working people of a number of European and Asian countries completed the popular democratic revolutions, consolidated the power of the workers and peasants and created the conditions for society's further socialist reorganisation. This marked a major political victory on the internal front.

But in this struggle there was also an external front. Imperialism was seeking by all available means to influence the European and Asian countries that had taken the road of socialism. To this end it had recourse to political and economic blockades and, where possible, to military intervention. In the complex international situation of those years the young workers' and peasants' states, assisted by the USSR, repulsed the attempts to restore capitalist practices in the East European countries, reinstall reactionary, pro-imperialist regimes in Korea and Vietnam and hinder the triumph of the people's revolution in China.

During the very first years after the war the communist parties and governments of the fraternal countries set up a system of bilateral relations founded on treaties of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance. A major step was the formation in 1949 of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, which became the first organisation in history to implement in practice the socialist principles of the international division of labour. The signing of the Warsaw Treaty in 1955, when the imperialist, aggressive NATO bloc sharply intensified war preparations strengthened the defence capability of the European socialist countries and gave organisational form to the vigorous, many-sided political cooperation among them.

As the people's governments achieved their aims in internal and foreign policy, the entire system in the new workers' and peasants' states underwent far-reaching revolutionary changes, for these aims required socio-economic reforms and the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. A decisive step on this road was the abolition of capitalist and the establishment of socialist ownership of the basic means of production, and the build-up of a socialist system of economic management based on the conscious application of the new society's economic laws. As early as the beginning of the 1950s the fraternal countries had begun to plan the development of their socialist economies. This enabled them to speed up the building of a material and technical basis consistent with socialism and to subordinate the entire development of production to the interests of the working people.

Using the experience of the Soviet Union and relying on its internationalist assistance, most of the People's Democracies had completed the revolutionary reorganisation of their economies by the close of the 1950s. This process mirrored the objective laws of the transition from capitalism to socialism, the overall guideline of building the economic foundations of socialism and the promotion of

socialist industrialisation and cooperation in agriculture. However, compared with similar processes in the Soviet Union, this process in each fraternal country had specifics springing from the features of that country's historical development.

Persevering effort and considerable organisational work were required of the working class and the communist parties to resolve the most complex and difficult problem following the conquest of power by the proletariat, namely, the socialist reorganisation of agriculture. This problem was resolved by setting up large state farms as the foreposts of socialism in the countryside and as the model of the new, socialist economic management, and by the gradual, voluntary transition of the peasants to socialist organisation through a number of intermediate forms of cooperatives in keeping with the actual conditions obtaining in each country. Thanks to the fulfilment of the Leninist cooperative plan, the peasant masses were drawn into the general process of socialist construction.

In the 1960s already the socialist system became predominant in the economy. The promotion of large-scale industry ensured high rates of industrialisation, the creation of many modern branches and industry's re-equipment on the basis of up-to-date technology. Within a historically short span of time the former agrarian countries became industrial-agrarian states. In Bulgaria, for instance, gross industrial output increased 50-fold compared with the prewar level and in 1973 accounted for over 51 per cent of the total national income.

Bourgeois ideologists are trying to prove that socialism can ensure marked progress only in backward countries. The substantial growth of the production assets and overall industrial potential of countries such as Czechoslovakia and the GDR, which had the hallmarks of industrialised states when they embarked upon socialist construction, convincingly refutes their fabrications. In Czechoslovakia industrial output has increased 9.3-fold over 1937. Czechoslovakia, which has only 0.4 per cent of the world's population, produces more than 1.5 per cent of the world's industrial output. In the GDR the national income increased 6-fold between 1949 and 1974.

In the socialist countries the social structure has undergone radical changes. With the abolition of capitalist property in the means of production an end was put to the exploiting classes and, with them, to exploitation of man by man.

In the building of the new system the decisive contribution was made by the working class, which had itself improved in the course of the revolution and the building of socialism. As a result of the swift rates of industrial development it became society's numerically largest class. Its skills, general culture and educational level have grown and it has grown more active in social life; awareness of one's responsibility for the destiny of one's people and the sense of being the master of the country have given rise to a new, socialist attitude to labour, new morals and conscious discipline, and a mass socialist emulation movement as a manifestation of the people's creative initiative. The role of the working class as the leading force of social development, a role springing objectively from its place in the system

of material production, has been enhanced in the course of socialist construction.

A class of peasants, who had broken with private ownership and gone over to collective farming, came into being in most of the socialist countries with the establishment of socialist relations of production in the countryside. This was a major revolutionary achievement, which brought industry and agriculture, founded on socialist forms of ownership, into an integral planned economic system. As a result, the political alliance between the working class and the peasantry has been still further strengthened.

Since the establishment of rule by the people hundreds of thousands of workers and peasants have received a higher education and joined the ranks of the intelligentsia, which serves the working people consciously and actively.

Victorious socialism has created a social structure characterised by comradely cooperation among the labouring classes, social strata and groups. A salient feature of this cooperation is society's growing social, ideological and political unity, its cohesion around the Marxist-Leninist vanguard and the working class.

Socialism has given shape to a genuinely people's state, the new, socialist democracy, and a new way of life. It has ensured the triumph of the revolutionary, scientific Marxist-Leninist ideology. Within only a few decades socialism has resolved age-old problems that capitalism had been unable to cope with throughout the years of its existence. Socialism has abolished exploitation and unemployment, given each person the right to work and security, and ensured the social and political equality of the working people, granting women actual equality with men and making them full members of society; it has opened up a bright future for young people, and created a developed network of education and health services. Strife between nations has given way to relations of comradeship and friendship. History knows of no other social system whose main purpose is to promote the well-being of the working people, to further the harmonious physical and cultural development of man, as is being done by socialism. The past 30 years have convincingly demonstrated the huge potentialities of socialism, which is a strong, dynamic and confidently developing socio-economic organism.

The life of millions of people could not, needless to say, be reorganised on the qualitatively new, socialist foundation smoothly, without difficulties, without miscalculations and growth pains. However, thanks to the correct policies pursued by the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties, to their ability to assess their own steps critically and to the possibility of relying on international solidarity, the socialist countries successfully resolved the most difficult problems.

A major result of the development of the European socialist countries is that at the close of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s most of them went over to the building of a mature socialist society, the attainment of which, as the experience of the Soviet Union shows, requires the solution of important socio-economic,

ideological and political problems, considerable **organisational work** by the Party and purposeful efforts by the entire nation.

The building of developed socialism means the further **improvement** of social relations and socialist democracy and **gives ever** growing possibilities for attaining socialism's main goal, namely, the ever fuller satisfaction of the people's material and cultural requirements and man's harmonious development.

The ruling communist and workers' parties are the soul, organiser and leader of socialist construction. The course of each socialist country's development demonstrates that the solution of economic, socio-political and cultural problems depends to a large extent on the work of the communist party, and that the importance of the guiding functions of the working class' Marxist-Leninist vanguard grows in proportion to the growth of the volume and complexity of the creative tasks involved in socialist and communist construction. The growth of the communist party's leading role and its unbreakable link with the people are the prime conditions for the building of the new society and a law of that society. The unity of the fraternal parties on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism provides the solid foundation for cooperation between the socialist countries and for drawing them closer together.

The successes of socialist construction in each fraternal country are inseparable from the deepening of cooperation between them, from the development of the entire world socialist system. The socialist states are united by a common social and state system, and by the unity of the basic interests and aims of their peoples. An objective law of world socialism — growth of the unity and solidarity of the fraternal peoples and their drawing closer together in all spheres of political, economic and cultural life — is embodied in internationalist cooperation among the socialist countries.

The consolidation of the world socialist system is the fruit of the considered and purposeful policy of the ruling communist parties. A key factor in strengthening and promoting that system is the coordinated actions of the communist parties, the constant exchange of know-how in socialist and communist construction and the internationalist education of the people. The strengthening of the friendship and unity of the socialist countries, it was stated in the Report of the Central Committee to the 24th Congress of the CPSU, is the prevailing trend in the development of the socialist world.

The world socialist system develops in struggle against the forces of imperialism. Lately this struggle has been complicated by the anti-socialist activities of China's leaders. The Maoist leaders propound the "theory" that the socialist system is non-existent and in practice they are going to all lengths to disunite the socialist countries. This subversive activity is harmful because it clashes with the fundamental objective regularities and requirements of socialism, with the vital interests of all the socialist countries, including the Chinese people. But the principal trend of the development of the world socialist system is determined not by this activity but by the

growth of that system's cohesion on the principles of internationalism.

The norms of proletarian, socialist internationalism, by which the ruling Marxist-Leninist parties are guided, have played an outstanding role in the development of the fraternal states and of the socialist community as a whole. Thanks to their internationalist relations the socialist countries have been able to achieve major political aims. Thanks to internationalism they are reaching new summits in economic development. Internationalism is an effective instrument in the solution of the national question in asserting the Marxist-Leninist world outlook and in the communist education of the people.

Consistent implementation of the principles of socialist internationalism has made it possible to arrive at a most comprehensive and competent solution of many urgent problems related to the national and international interests of the socialist states and to the harmonious combination of these interests. This was the basis for the formation of the new, socialist international relations, which objectively express socialism's international character and its socio-political foundations.

The socialist world lives and develops under the banner of internationalism. The very emergence of the socialist states is indivisibly linked with the international feat of the Soviet people, namely, their great victory over the forces of fascism. By translating the ideas of internationalism into life, socialism gives a new and richer content to such general democratic principles as independence, sovereignty and equality of all countries and injects an entirely new content — fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance, comprehensive rapprochement and the consolidation of friendship — into the relations between nations.

* * *

One of the cardinal achievements of the world socialist system over the past 30 years is the institution of socialist production on an international scale. A successfully developing system of cooperation between the swiftly growing national economic complexes of sovereign socialist states has been shaped on the basis of the new relations of production.

The swift and complete restoration and modernisation of the war-ravaged economies of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies are in themselves eloquent evidence of the huge potentialities of socialist production. But the economy of socialism demonstrated its basic advantages in subsequent years, during the fulfilment of ever more grandiose economic development plans.

In 1974 the volume of industrial output in the socialist countries exceeded the 1950 level approximately 10-fold, while in the industrialised capitalist states it increased only 3.4-fold during the same period. The socialist countries' share of the world's output has grown correspondingly. Thirty years ago the USSR and the People's Democracies accounted for roughly 14 per cent of the world's industrial output, in 1950 their contribution rose to about 20 per cent,

and today the world socialist system has approximately two-fifths of the world's industrial potential.

Moreover, the advantages of the planned economy are seen in bold relief when we compare the economic development rates of the socialist and capitalist countries of Europe, especially if we take into account the fact that the postwar Western Europe's economic development is characterised by bourgeois propaganda as an "economic miracle" that is in many ways linked with intensified state-monopoly regulation and the formation of the Common Market. A comparison of the economic development of the EEC Nine and of the CMEA European member states gives the following picture.

Compared with 1949 the national income has grown by nearly 640 per cent in the CMEA countries and by 200 per cent in the Common Market countries. Between 1950 and 1974 industrial output increased 11-fold in the CMEA countries and 3.7-fold in the EEC states. Within the same period agricultural output increased 2.3-fold and 1.9-fold respectively. In 1960 the CMEA European countries were still behind the EEC states in the output of electric power, steel, cement and mineral fertilisers, but today they have moved far ahead of them in the production of these major commodities.

Thanks to socialist ownership of the means of production and the leadership of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard, it has been possible to mobilise inner resources quickly and in a balanced manner and organise exchanges of know-how, cooperation and mutual assistance. Today most of the socialist states are industrially developed. Industrialisation is proceeding successfully in Mongolia and Cuba. Heroic Vietnam, too, is embarking on industrialisation as it restores its national economy. Within the lifetime of a single generation most of the socialist countries have made considerable headway in surmounting the economic inequality inherited from the exploiting epoch. This is one of the socialist world's greatest socio-economic and political achievements since the war.

Tangible advances in industrial development were also made in Albania and China, and there is no doubt that this process would have continued successfully had their development proceeded on a healthy foundation, in accordance with the general laws governing the building of the new society.

The communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries have amassed vast experience in implementing the Marxist-Leninist economic policy. Today most of these countries have begun building the material and technical basis of a developed socialist society. A specific of this process is that it is impelled mainly not by extensive but by intensive factors of economic growth. Whereas during the initial postwar period only 50-60 per cent of the increment in industrial output in most of the socialist states was contributed by the growth of labour productivity, today this factor ensures 85 per cent of that increment in the CMEA countries.

It is therefore quite natural that the communist and workers' parties are paying more attention to the qualitative aspect of the development of socialism's material and technical basis, to promoting

the efficiency of all branches of the national economy through the utilisation of the latest scientific and technical achievements, to combining these achievements organically with the advantages of the socialist economic system and to improving the organisation and management of production. This is essentially an international task and it is carried out by most of the socialist countries by promoting closer economic, scientific and technological cooperation and by deepening the objective process of internationalising production.

It will be recalled that the internationalisation of the economy was started and attained a high level of development under capitalism. It will also be recalled that Lenin had noted that this trend could be further promoted and consummated only under socialism. In carrying out this task the world socialist system encountered a number of objective difficulties. First, the degree of development of economic ties between the present socialist countries was extremely low and the division of labour between them had to be organised practically from zero. Second, the socialist world could not utilise the established capitalist mechanism geared for the international socialisation of production based on competition, the export of capital and the exploitation of some countries by others; from the very beginning it had to evolve its own forms and methods for the internationalisation of production in keeping with socialist relations of production.

A historic service rendered by the world socialist system is that it carried out this task. The fraternal parties initiated and organised a qualitatively new type of international division of labour. They have created an intrinsically socialist system under which the internationalisation of production is consciously directed and planned and are now promoting the highest form of such internationalisation, namely, socialist economic integration. Considering the coordination of economic development plans as the principal method of promoting the international socialist division of labour, the fraternal CMEA countries continue to improve the collective management of the integration process and deepen the production, scientific and technological cooperation on the basis of the Comprehensive Programme for socialist economic integration that was jointly drawn up for a 15-20 year period to come and unanimously approved in 1971. They are thereby laying a firm foundation for each fraternal country's further progress and for strengthening the unity and cohesion of the world socialist system.

In the present international situation, when the capitalist system has been hit by a severe production, energy, finance and currency crisis, when that system's economic and political contradictions have again been aggravated, the world socialist system is demonstrating its decisive advantages more clearly and more convincingly than ever before. The economies of the socialist countries continue to develop by plan, rhythmically, at notably high rates, ensuring the attainment of socialism's main aim — the steady rise of the people's standard of living and cultural level. Against the background of capitalism's irreconcilable class antagonisms, against the background of deep-rooted social injustice, the racial and national conflicts, the decline of

morals, the destruction of the ethical norms of human life and the many other social calamities and upheavals generated by the exploiting system, socialist society is seen in glaring contrast as a healthy, dynamically growing system creating favourable conditions for the comprehensive, harmonious development of society as a whole and of each of its members, as a social system to which the future of mankind belongs.

* * *

The victory over fascism and militarism in the Second World War ushered in a new phase of socialism's foreign policy, whose distinctive feature is that the new social system has much greater possibilities of countering imperialist aggression, curbing the imperialist policy of violence and exercising a beneficial influence on the international situation, on the forms of relations between states.

The communist and workers' parties have always been consistently opposed to war, to militarisation and the arms race. They have always regarded this opposition not only as a humane but also a revolutionary task. It was not accidental that Lenin underscored that the International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart had been correct when in its resolution it noted: "The working class, which is the principal supplier of soldiers, and which bears the brunt of the material sacrifices, is in particular the natural enemy of wars, because wars contradict the aim it pursues, namely, the creation of an economic system founded on socialist principles, which in practice will give effect to the solidarity of peoples."⁴

This has to be recalled because the obvious link between the victory over fascism and the new upswing of the forces of world socialism has given rise to simplified, superficial notions about the allegedly decisive role of wars in the world's advance towards socialism. In its most primitive form this notion was stated in the theory, repeated time and again by Mao Tse-tung, that to enable socialism to score new triumphs mankind must pass through new wars, through the sacrifice of hundreds of millions of lives. This monstrous theory, needless to say, has nothing in common with scientific socialism.

A mainspring of Soviet policy has always been that postwar settlement must be founded on lasting peace. In the decisions of the Potsdam Conference, the heads of state of the anti-Hitlerite coalition acknowledged that the victory over fascism had given mankind its greatest possibility of creating the key conditions for a just, stable and lasting peace, for cooperation and mutual understanding.

The Soviet Union and the People's Democracies firmly steered a course towards translating this possibility into reality. However, the reactionary ruling circles of the imperialist powers, who once more overrated their strength, soon closed their eyes to the lessons of the Second World War, renounced the Potsdam decisions, began an arms race and went over to attempts to "roll back" socialism by undisguised

nuclear blackmail, threats to unleash another world war, political and economic blockades and even direct military intervention. In the difficult situation of those years the young socialist community consistently upheld peace and fought the threat of war.

One of the key orientations of the socialist policy of peace was the struggle to limit the material preparations for war. As early as 1946 the Soviet Union proposed the imposition of a ban on the military use of nuclear weapons and other means of mass annihilation, the conclusion of an international convention prohibiting the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons, and the recognition that there had to be a general reduction of armaments. In the following year the United Nations passed a resolution, moved by the USSR, condemning war propaganda. A year later the Soviet Union proposed that all the permanent members of the UN Security Council should reduce their land, naval and air forces by one-third and take practical steps to ban nuclear weapons and achieve a general reduction of armaments. In 1949, at a conference in Hungary, the communist and workers' parties of Europe proclaimed the struggle for peace as their central aim, and the Soviet Union proposed a Peace Pact to the Great Powers. The efforts of the socialist countries received massive support from world opinion. The peace movement assumed worldwide proportions and hundreds of millions of people of good will in all countries signed the appeal for a nuclear arms ban.

Rejecting the constructive initiatives of the socialist countries, the imperialist powers formed aggressive military blocs, pursued a policy of splitting the countries that had been divided as a result of the Second World War, provoked crises and organised military adventures. The cold war seriously aggravated the situation in Europe.

Consistently abiding by the historic decisions of the Potsdam Conference, the socialist countries pursued the objective of achieving lasting peace and security in Europe. The first joint action of the European socialist countries was the Foreign Ministers' Conference in Warsaw in 1948. That conference proposed a programme for settling the German question and ensuring peace and security in Europe. In 1954, expressing the common will of the fraternal European socialist states, the USSR proposed a Treaty on Collective Security in Europe and the holding of a conference of all European states on setting up a system of collective security in Europe. A detailed programme for ensuring European Security was proposed by the Soviet Union in 1955 at the Conference of Heads of State in Geneva.

A major contribution to a constructive peace policy was made by the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance, which erected an insuperable barrier to imperialism's anti-socialist, aggressive plans. For the past 20 years the Warsaw Treaty Organisation has been an effective instrument of political cooperation and the working out and implementation of a coordinated foreign policy by the fraternal countries. The Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation initiated a number of moves of all-European significance. In 1958 a draft of a non-aggression pact

between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO was proposed to the European states. In 1966 the Political Consultative Committee adopted the Bucharest Declaration on strengthening peace and security in Europe, and in 1969 it proposed that all the European states should join in the practical preparations for a European conference.

The Communists were invariably in the front ranks of the proponents of détente — this is eloquently shown by the documents of the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties at Karlovy Vary and by the decisions adopted by international communist meetings.

In face of the further strengthening of socialist society's moral and political unity, the growth of the economic potential of the socialist countries, the enhancement of their political prestige in the world, the increased unity of the socialist community and the coordination of the foreign policies of its member states, imperialist reaction failed to achieve its class aims by means of the cold war. The dwindling of the possibilities open to imperialist policy of strength was also seen in the fact that in one way or another more and more countries shook off its influence. The decolonisation and liberation of the oppressed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America proceeded apace. The socialist revolution in Cuba advanced successfully. In their struggle against neocolonialism a growing number of developing countries adopted a socialist orientation, their own experience showing them that the utilisation of capitalist methods of development did not resolve the acute problems inherited from the colonial past, and they entered the international scene as allies of the socialist states. The policy of non-alignment pursued by a large group of states acquired an increasingly pronounced anti-imperialist orientation. The historic example of establishing and promoting relations of the new, socialist type between countries of the socialist community has profoundly influenced international life as a whole. The balance of strength on the international scene has changed in favour of socialism, peace and progress.

Modifications in favour of a more realistic line began to take place in the policies of a number of leading imperialist powers as a result of these processes. An indication of this reconsideration of the imperialist system's foreign policy guidelines was the acceptance of the Soviet initiative on banning nuclear tests. In 1968 the tireless efforts of the socialist countries to limit the arms race led to the signing of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, a treaty for which the Soviet Union had been pressing since 1964. Over 100 countries signed that important document.

Since the war the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries have been perseveringly working to firmly establish the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems in international relations. However, for a long time it was possible to give effect only to some aspects of these principles because until the close of the 1960s the imperialists were still trying to attack individual elements of the socialist system from positions of strength, testing

their durability and their determination to give a rebuff to direct acts of aggression, to subversive activity of all kinds.

The consistent foreign policy of the CPSU, of its Central Committee headed by L. I. Brezhnev, a policy agreed and coordinated with the other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties, the courage and determination displayed in repulsing any attempt of the class enemy to injure the positions and interests of socialism, the unflagging comradely concern for promoting and deepening allround political and economic relations between the fraternal socialist countries on the basis of equality and sovereignty, and the careful attention given to the views of each fraternal party made it possible to turn the socialist community into an unassailable bastion of peace and socialism, of the freedom, independence and social progress of all the peoples of our planet.

At the turn of 1970s, after thoroughly analysing the balance of world forces, the CPSU Central Committee drew the conclusion that it was possible to launch an overall peace offensive with the aim of achieving a relaxation of world tension and normalising and further promoting relations with the capitalist countries on the basis of the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence in order to ensure genuinely durable world peace and security. In the Report of the Central Committee to the 24th Congress of the CPSU, General Secretary L. I. Brezhnev formulated a Peace Programme — a key component of the CPSU's foreign policy.

The charting of the Peace Programme was one of the most important steps on the road of radical changes in international life, because it mirrors the vital interests of the socialist countries, the common aims of the world socialist system in foreign policy and the aspiration of all nations for peace, because the objectives and the means of achieving these objectives mapped out in it are highly realistic. The Peace Programme received broad international recognition and the wholehearted approval of the fraternal parties.

By consistently and persistently implementing the Peace Programme the community of socialist states has in recent years achieved an essential change in the international situation, a turn from the cold war and confrontation to détente, to the strengthening of security, to peaceful cooperation between countries with different social systems.

The principles underlying the new relations between countries are embodied in many international documents signed in recent years, including agreements, which, in keeping with international law, formalised the frontiers that took shape in Europe as a result of fascism's defeat. This has resulted in broad international recognition of the German Democratic Republic, the legal formalisation of Poland's western frontiers and the final annulment of the disgraceful Munich Diktat. An important step was thus taken towards peace, security and mutually beneficial cooperation in Europe.

In this situation of détente and relying on the support and solidarity of the fraternal countries, the Republic of Cuba has scored a major victory: it broke the economic blockade and strengthened its socialist social system. The long heroic struggle of the Vietnamese

people against the foreign interventionists and their satellites ended in a historic victory. These notable successes are evidence of the invincibility of nations that have taken the road of socialist construction and fight for their freedom and independence, and of the working people's unconquerable spirit of militant internationalist solidarity. These successes give the peoples of Latin America, Asia and Africa the confidence that today all attempts to crush the liberation movement are doomed to failure. The quenching of the flashpoint in Indochina is helping to further the improvement of the international atmosphere and promote détente, and is a tangible contribution to the general struggle of the peoples for peace and security.

Considerable changes have taken place in the relations of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries with capitalist powers, such as the USA, France, the FRG and Britain. Special significance attaches to the Soviet-US agreement to limit strategic arms and avert a nuclear war. The consistent implementation of the Peace Programme has changed the overall picture of the world and created favourable conditions for making détente irreversible. The immense international success of this foreign-policy programme ushered in, essentially speaking, a new phase in international life and a substantial expansion of the operation of democratic norms on the international scene. It is particularly important that the realisation of the Peace Programme has moved back the threat of another world war and created the conditions for the ultimate total elimination of that threat.

The cardinal aim of the socialist policy of peace during the past three decades has been to ensure durable peaceful conditions for the building of the new society. Thanks to the unflagging efforts of world socialism, which acts in alliance with all anti-imperialist forces, mankind has for three decades been safeguarded against global armed conflicts, against a nuclear war. The postwar development has firmly established socialism as the principal factor of present-day international reality.

More than a hundred years ago Karl Marx wrote in a message to communist workers: "... On you, then, depends the glorious task to prove to the world that now at last the working classes are bestriding the scene of history no longer as servile retainers, but as independent actors, conscious of their own responsibility, and able to command peace where their would-be masters shout war."⁵ Marx's prevision about the ability of the working masses honourably to discharge their responsibility for the destiny of peace has come true.

The Address of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Soviet Government "To the Peoples, Parliaments and Governments" is permeated with a sense of this responsibility. "The Soviet people, the Soviet state on whom the main burden of the fight against fascism fell," the Address states, "again declare their firm intention to do everything possible in order jointly with other peoples and states to exclude war from the life of mankind.... Lasting peace, freedom of the peoples are the undying ideal which inspired the heroes in the struggle against fascism and

which inspires us. Let us do everything so that this ideal should become an absolute law in mankind's life."⁶ Awareness of this responsibility inspired the address of the parliamentarians of the Warsaw Treaty states, in which they called upon the parliamentarians of the European countries to strengthen peace in Europe.

Proletarian solidarity unites the working people of the socialist countries with their class brothers, with the freedom-loving peoples and progressive forces of the world fighting for peace, democracy and social justice. "Socialist internationalism," L. I. Brezhnev noted, "spells out lofty responsibility for the destiny of socialism not only in one's own country but also throughout the world. It spells out the highest respect for the national and historical specifics of the development of each country and the determination to render each other the broadest possible support. It spells out profound understanding of the historic role played by the socialist countries in the revolutionary process, in rendering support to the liberative, anti-imperialist struggle of nations."⁷

Internationalism, proletarian solidarity and the struggle for peace and the happiness of nations were the banner of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Under that banner the Soviet people built the world's first state of workers and peasants. The ideas of internationalism, proletarian solidarity, peace and social progress inspired the fighters against fascism during the Second World War. A profound sense of international solidarity united the peoples of the socialist countries into a powerful socialist community and ensured the socialist states' continued assistance to the national liberation movement. To this day the socialist policy of peace and social progress rests on the great principles of proletarian internationalism. Herein lies one of the mighty sources of socialism's viability, of the growth of its prestige in the world as a social system to which the future belongs.

NOTES

¹ *Moscow News*, May 17, 1975.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 29, p. 309.

³ *Moscow News*, May 17, 1975.

⁴ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 193.

⁵ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1969, Vol. II, p. 157.

⁶ *New Times*, No. 20, 1975, p. 5.

⁷ L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1970, Vol. 2, pp. 423-424 (in Russian).

Détente Enters New Phase

LEV TOLKUNOV

(Published in Russian in the journal
KOMMUNIST, No. 13, 1975)

The consistent implementation of the Peace Programme, adopted by the 24th Congress of the CPSU, was marked in 1975 by an event of tremendous international importance — the successful conclusion at the summit of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which was called on the initiative of the countries of the socialist community supported by other European countries and also the USA and Canada.

The Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers met to consider the results of this unprecedented meeting of the leaders of 33 European states, the USA and Canada, said that it inaugurated a new phase in the détente and was an important step in establishing the principles of peaceful coexistence and arranging relations of equal cooperation between states with different social systems. The Conference in Helsinki was a necessary collective summing-up of the political results of the Second World War, a confirmation of the futility and harm of the "strength" and "cold war" policy, paving the way for fresh opportunities in tackling the central task of our day, that of consolidating peace and the security of nations.

The Soviet people, like the rest of progressive mankind, have expressed profound satisfaction over the fruitful results of the historic forum, and share the high appreciation of the outstanding contribution made by L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the implementation of the Leninist foreign-

L. Tolkunov, Editor-in-Chief of Izvestia, organ of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

policy line of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, the formulation and realisation of the Peace Programme. The document adopted by the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers, said, in part: "His purposeful activity which is motivated by a tireless concern for world peace, was highly important in convening the European Conference and making it a success."

The difficult way from the suggestion of the idea of the Conference to its successful conclusion is now behind us. In his speech in Helsinki, L. I. Brezhnev expressed the Soviet Union's firm conviction that the mighty streams of détente and equal cooperation, which over the past few years have increasingly determined the course of European and world politics, will now acquire fresh strength and still greater scope. He put forward a concrete and realistic programme for further materialising international détente. Materialisation is the substance of everything that should make peace in Europe truly sound and lasting. It is very important to proclaim, as the countries participating in the Conference have done, correct and just principles of relations between states, but it is equally important to establish them, to introduce them into practice, to make them a law of international life, which no one will transgress. There is need to make a maximum effort to back up the political détente with a military one, making use of all the premises for expanding mutually advantageous trade without any discrimination, and for more active and diverse cooperation.

A solid basis for this is provided by the Final Act, a broad but clear-cut platform of action drawn up with consideration of the views and interests of all the participants in the Conference, and based on mutually acceptable propositions which go to benefit peace, without, of course, obliterating the distinctions in ideology or social systems. This platform should help further to improve international relations, strengthen confidence among the states, and dynamically advance détente not only on the continent of Europe but all over the world.

* * *

The Soviet Union regards the results of the Conference not just as a necessary summing-up of the results of the Second World War, but also as a comprehension of the future in the context of the realities of our day and the long centuries of experience of the European nations. Never before has Europe been so close to a solution of its outstanding problems. The need to turn the page in its history in order to ensure peaceful coexistence between the European nations, as Lenin put it, is dictated by the sum-total of objective factors, and above all the nations' whole-hearted yearning for peace.

The European continent is relatively small. From the Urals Range to the Atlantic it has a territory of just over 10 million sq. km., but its

geographical, ethnic and political map is highly colourful and diverse. Europe has one-half of the globe's industrial, scientific and technical potential and holds within itself immense values of civilisation. It is here, in Europe, that the socio-political doctrine, which not only explains but also changes the world, originated. The insistent demand of the times is to preserve and multiply all the material and spiritual treasures for the benefit of all nations, to turn Europe into a continent of reliable security and good-neighbour cooperation, thereby making a most resolute contribution to world peace.

Historians have estimated that 17th-century wars in Europe took 3 million lives, 18th-century wars—5 million, and 19th-century wars—6 million. In the 20th century, the First World War took 9 million lives, and the Second—over 50 million. The armed conflicts of this century have left an indelible impression on the minds of the nations. They do not want a repetition of past tragedies. Only militaristic and revanchist maniacs can now contemplate about returning to the times of bloodshed, air raid alarms, charred ruins and tears, about depriving Europe of peace under which it has now entered its fourth decade.

The first two postwar decades were marred by the cold war and by the wild attempts on the part of imperialism to "roll back" socialism. That policy was a fiasco. Western politicians who gave thought to the future and who truly cherished their nations' interests had to take a realistic view of the new situation and opt for peaceful coexistence. It is life itself that gave rise to the idea of joint efforts by European nations for peace and cooperation. Under the impact of new trends, Europe was discarding the impediments of the cold war. In 1966, the socialist countries, confident that reason and common sense would ultimately win the day, put forward the idea of a European conference. It is true that in that period the idea did not meet with broad support in the West, but time was on its side.

Subsequently, the Soviet Union, together with the fraternal socialist countries, came forward with a number of major initiatives which step by step paved the way for an improvement of the political climate in Europe. Other states also contributed to the relaxation of tensions. The policy of France in favour of European cooperation, the FRG's desire to normalise relations with the socialist countries, Finland's constructive foreign-policy activity, and the concern displayed by Austria, Italy, Sweden, Denmark and other countries for a relaxation of tensions did much to bring about the positive changes in Europe. Later, Britain also joined in these efforts. The USA and Canada, the overseas participants in the European Conference, made their contribution to the common effort.

Soviet-French cooperation became a key factor of international life. The meetings and conversations between the leaders of the two countries helped to raise their cooperation to a new and higher level. They helped to introduce into the practice of international relations the principles of peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous partnership among states with different social systems.

The improvement of relations between the USSR and the FRG also had a big role to play. On the shaping of relations between these two major states of the continent largely depended its political climate and the possibilities for tackling the cardinal problems of peace and security. We must put this bluntly: it has been no easy thing for the Soviet people to normalise relations with the FRG. They have not yet forgotten the horrors of Hitler's aggression. Besides, the policy pursued by the FRG's ruling circles in the postwar period was not aimed at bridging the gulf which had appeared between the two countries during the piratical nazi invasion, but to deepen that gulf. The Bonn governments of that period refused to learn the lessons of history and for years pursued a policy of revenge and hostility towards the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in Europe. This line, designed to restore the German Reich within its 1937 borders caused resolute rebuffs and generated legitimate mistrust of the FRG both in the East and in the West.

This went on until an SDP/FDP government took over from the CDU/CSU coalition. The Treaty between the USSR and the FRG signed in August 1970 created the necessary political basis for a radical change in Soviet-West German relations and their allround development. The Treaty is mutually advantageous for both states. Those who cast doubt on it, as some people on the banks of the Rhine do (indeed, men like Strauss opposed the convocation of a European conference and are now attacking the agreement reached at it), simply engage in dangerous demagogy. The Treaty has given a clear-cut and unequivocal answer to the key problems in ensuring peace and security. It fixed the existing European realities, the inviolability of frontiers on the continent, and established the principle of refraining from the threat or use of force.

Soon, relations were normalised between the FRG and a number of socialist countries: GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria. The general tendency towards mutual understanding in Europe became stronger. A vivid illustration of this was the four-power agreement on West Berlin, which helped to untie a most intricate knot of problems in the heart of Europe and to involve West Berlin in the process of détente.

The improvement of Soviet-American relations has had an exceptionally positive influence on the development of the situation in Europe. The conclusion by the USSR and the USA in 1972 and 1973 of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Defence Systems, the Interim Agreement on some measures in limiting strategic offensive weapons and especially the Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War were the first concrete steps along the way of containing the arms race and reducing the danger of a world conflict.

The provisions of the bilateral interstate treaties and documents signed by the Soviet Union with France, the FRG, and the USA, among others, were confirmed in the principles of relations between states proclaimed by the European Conference.

The preparation of the third and final phase of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe took over two years, including the initial consultations in Helsinki. Those were years of intense effort by diplomats of the European states and also of the USA and Canada, and a search for reasonable compromise. Decisions were taken only if there was a consensus of all the 35 countries. This was very hard to do because of the socio-political distinctions and the resulting interests of states belonging to the two opposite social systems. The understanding reached on that basis at the second, Geneva, phase of the Conference created a truly sound foundation for framing the Final Act and all its articles and paragraphs.

In Geneva, attempts were made to impose on the socialist countries unacceptable demands which, in effect, verged on interference in their domestic affairs and had nothing in common with the principles of peaceful coexistence. Such attempts were naturally rejected, and everyone had to get down to a search for a common denominator which lies in the practical application of the principles of peaceful coexistence in European conditions. The West German *Süddeutsche Zeitung* characterised the atmosphere at the Conference and said that there could be no doubt about the Soviet Union's concern for détente, that because of the firmness it had displayed, domestic issues like emigration would no longer be among the problems being discussed, and that the principles of equality, reciprocity and non-intervention would prevail. In other words, the paper said, the Soviet leaders had cleared the détente of emotional trivialities and put the policy on a strictly business-like basis.

Just before the final phase the opponents of détente became especially active, seeking in every way to prove that the détente went to benefit only the Soviet Union and that the Western countries would allegedly not benefit from it in any way. It is, indeed, a surprising line of reasoning to talk about who stands to gain and who to lose from the détente, that is, who stands to benefit and who stands to lose from living in conditions of ever stronger peace and a receding danger of war. After all, all nations equally need peace. All states are concerned to eliminate the danger of war. That is the main basis for the joint efforts to strengthen peace and security. There can hardly be any doubt that from the standpoint of long-term interests and the very destiny of the peoples of Europe, as of mankind as a whole, the measures which are designed to eliminate the danger of nuclear war are of primary and, one could say, even of paramount importance in the practical plane. But the fact is that even today, after the Conference, some political leaders, in a kind of relapse into the cold war period, keep saying that the détente goes to benefit only the Soviet Union which is why there is need to step up the arms race and to get the Soviet Union to make various concessions.

However, the intrigues by the enemies of peace did not prevent the participants in the Conference from undertaking far-reaching commitments, which the Final Act put on record. What are the basic

provisions of this document? First of all, there are the principles of relations between states of which there are ten. In a nutshell they are the following:

Sovereign equality, respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty. These rules include the right of every state to juridical equality, to territorial integrity and to freedom and political independence. The participating states undertook to respect each other's right freely to choose and develop its political, social, economic and cultural systems, as well as its right to determine its laws and regulations.

Refraining from the threat or use of force. In accordance with this principle, force will not be employed as a means of settling disputes or questions likely to give rise to disputes, between them.

Inviolability of frontiers. The participating states regard as inviolable all one another's frontiers as well as the frontiers of all the states in Europe and therefore they will refrain now and in the future from assaulting these frontiers.

Territorial integrity of states. This means that the participating states will refrain from any action inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the UN Charter against the territorial integrity, political independence or the unity of any participating state.

Peaceful settlement of disputes. This implies the settlement of disputes using such means as negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement or any other peaceful means chosen by the parties. The settlement of outstanding issues should not jeopardise international peace, security and justice.

Non-intervention in internal affairs. The prohibition applies to any form of intervention. Accordingly, the states must refrain from rendering direct or indirect assistance to terrorist, subversive or other activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the regime of another participating state.

Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief. Respect for these rights and freedoms is recognised as an essential factor for the peace, justice and well-being necessary to ensure the development of friendly relations and cooperation among all states.

Equal rights and self-determination of peoples. By virtue of this principle, all peoples always have the right, in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their status without external interference and to pursue as they wish their political, economic, social and cultural development.

Cooperation among states. This should develop on the basis of complete equality and should promote mutual understanding and confidence among nations, and the strengthening of peace and security. Cooperation is called upon to promote the raising of the nations' well-being and a reduction of the differences in levels of economic development.

Fulfilment in good faith of obligations under international law. This means commitments which stem from the generally recognised principles and rules of international law and treaties and agreements in conformity with that law. The states will, in addition, abide by the

provisions of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Each of these principles is an integral part of the political pivot which is to direct the multifaceted cooperation of the European countries along the right channel. The principle of the inviolability of frontiers shows just how important all of these principles are. Wars were begun by one state making territorial claims on another. Territorial integrity is the prerogative of every state. Only unconditional recognition of the principle of the inviolability of frontiers can make for the strengthening of peace. All the European countries are interested in this — the socialist as well as the capitalist, the big as well as the small states.

* * *

One of the largest sections of the Final Act deals with economic, scientific, technical and environmental cooperation. The improvement of the political climate helped markedly to invigorate economic ties between the socialist and the capitalist countries. These ties, of which complete equality and mutual advantage are an integral feature, bear not only on trade but also other fields of economic, scientific and technical cooperation. The Soviet Union has advocated further extension and deepening of such cooperation because the present level of development of the world's productive forces and the international division of labour requires that the exchanges of material values, technical experience and knowledge should be based on large-scale and long-term agreements. Such agreements are also of great political importance, for they help to entrench the positive changes in the world and provide a starting point for fresh efforts in consolidating peace and the security of nations. The participants in the Conference undertook to promote the expansion of mutual trade and exchange of services. They recognised the beneficial effect of the most-favoured-nation treatment on the development of trade. They declared that they would encourage the expansion of multilateral trade, seeking to make use of various commercial and economic opportunities. They recognised the importance of bilateral and multilateral intergovernmental and other agreements for the development of trade on a long-term basis.

In the course of its Ninth Five-Year Plan period (1971-1975), the Soviet Union actively developed new and higher forms of economic cooperation with other countries which are in line with the modern level of the development of the productive forces and meet the requirements of the scientific and technological revolution. The USSR's participation in the international division of labour is becoming ever deeper, more stable and efficient. Long-term, usually 10-year intergovernmental agreements on economic, scientific, technical and industrial cooperation are being concluded.

Such agreements have been concluded with a number of European countries, including Finland, France, Austria, the FRG, Italy, Britain

and Sweden. The countries of Western Europe account for three-quarters of the USSR's trade with the industrialised capitalist countries. The USSR's trade with the capitalist countries, mainly with the West European countries, has grown markedly over the past few years.

The Conference recommended that organisations, enterprises and firms studying the opportunities for their participation in projects of common interest should exchange the necessary economic, legal, financial and technical information with their potential partners.

In the West there is a rapid growth of energy requirements. That is why the import of Soviet gas and electric power could be of great importance for the economy of some European countries. But their delivery could be substantially increased only if the countries concerned take part in the necessary investments. Cooperation in the search for fresh sources of energy, development of the means of communication, and improvement of equipment for transport is to be extended.

The growing specialisation not only in production but also in research requires intensification of international scientific and technical ties as well. These are also defined in the Final Act, which sets out a number of complex problems which are global and which bear on the interests of all nations. Large-scale research into these problems is beyond the means of individual countries, however developed in economic, scientific and technical terms. In such cases, international scientific and technical cooperation turns out to be not only an advisable but frequently the only possible form of research. All of this is especially true of Europe, which has been a traditional centre of the international division of labour. On the whole, scientific and technical cooperation between the East and the West of Europe has yet to be duly developed, and this offers an extensive field for activity in the future.

The decisions of the Conference can provide a good reference point for exchanges in the humanitarian sphere. The Soviet Union has always stood for an extension of such exchanges, but it has always held that they should be carried on with an eye to Soviet laws and customs, must serve the interests of peace, mutual understanding and cooperation and promote closer ties and accord among nations.

In short, the continent now has all the conditions for the most extensive political, economic and cultural cooperation among countries with different social systems. The principles of peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous cooperation are being increasingly filled with concrete content and this should doom to failure any attempts to return mankind to the cold war.

* * *

All the nations, and the cause of world peace, have benefited from the Helsinki meeting. Optimism and the confidence that the most complicated problems can be solved by peaceful means, have grown.

Only some seven or eight years ago very few people could expect events in Europe to take such a turn. This shows the potentialities latent in the very method of the peaceful settlement of relations by means of negotiation. This also indicated that it is possible gradually to secure the solution of the problems of disarmament, and to switch vast potentials—material, scientific and technological—to the development of non-military branches of production.

Confidence in the peaceful prospects of international development also tends to grow because masses of people and public figures have been taking an ever more active part in foreign-policy affairs. They can no longer remain mere observers of the on-going processes; they exert an active influence on them, being fully aware that a passive attitude would merely benefit the enemies of peace.

Of considerable importance for the practical implementation of the agreements reached at Helsinki is the great experience gained by the leaders of the socialist and the capitalist states through their summit contacts over the past few years. Fresh advances towards stronger peace can be achieved at such meetings in the future as well.

The nature of international détente is such that it requires forward movement. Any marking of time will be intensively used by the adversaries of détente in order to torpedo it. These adversaries are many. It cannot be said that they are always guided by the same purposes and motives. In the broad plane, this is a motley coalition, which is frequently not formalised even within the boundaries of one country, but which does exist in real terms. Some of them frequently act out of domestic political considerations, seeking to overthrow the leaders who have more or less consistently pursued a policy of improving relations with the socialist countries. Others, closely allied with military-industrial complexes, want to see the arms race go on and international tensions stepped up. Still others seek to gear the policy of their countries to the interests of narrowly-based groups. Thus, in the USA everyone has seen the Zionist circles unfold their intense activity.

The opponents of détente want a build-up of armaments within the framework of the aggressive NATO bloc. But that is this drive that tends to increase the contradictions between the Western powers, and to deepen the crisis which still holds the capitalist world in its grip. No wonder many Western leaders admitted in their speeches at the Helsinki Conference that there was need to stop the arms race.

The Helsinki Conference created the conditions for Europe's further advance towards lasting peace and elimination of war from the life of nations. In this context there is need to note that on the whole the development of good-neighbour and equal cooperation in Europe is also having a growing influence on the USA. There are many reasons for this, but one of the main ones is that the USA must reckon with the opinion of its West European partners. There is also another aspect of the matter: the solution of key problems of Soviet-American relations like the limitation and then a possible reduction in strategic armaments will have a beneficial effect not only on Europe, but on other continents as well.

The reduction of the danger of a world thermonuclear war, on which the leaders of the USSR and the USA are now concentrating, is a global matter which concerns all mankind. That is why the artificial obstacles which some people would like to erect in the way should be seen as an urge to increase tension. Whatever their pretext, this question naturally arises: what is their scheme, what is their alternative to détente? Such an alternative can be nothing but another world war, this time a nuclear-missile war.

The Chinese leaders have joined the chorus of the most diehard forces of imperialism. Now, having failed, for all their efforts, to undermine the European Conference, they have been keeping curses on its results, trumpeting about the inevitability of world war and frankly advocating it.

The behaviour of the most rabid representatives of imperialism, as also Peking's policy, shows that it is necessary to assess the headway made in the struggle for détente soberly and not to underestimate the difficulties, that it is necessary to be ever vigilant and to wage a decisive and consistent struggle against all who would want to embroil mankind in a destructive war. It is also necessary to remember that realisation of the agreements reached in Helsinki will proceed in conditions of irreconcilable contradictions and differences in the ideologies and social systems of capitalism and socialism. The point is not to allow these contradictions to erupt into a dangerous military confrontation. The only alternative to a destructive war is the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, which principle was substantiated and confirmed at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The urge not only to prevent a world thermonuclear war, but also to rid mankind of the very threat of it constitutes the essence of the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state, a policy which has run consistently on class lines, and which has served the cause of peace, freedom and the security of all nations, the cause of their national independence and social progress. This truly humanistic policy, which meets the interests of the broadest masses of people all over the world, is based on the Communist Party's loyalty to this precept of Lenin's: "We promise the workers and peasants to do all we can for peace. This we shall do."¹ The foundation of this policy and an earnest of its continued success are the steadily growing might of the USSR and the Soviet people's creative labour effort.

Europe has now received long-term guidelines for peaceful development. Europe is capable of setting an example to other regions in structuring interstate relations on the basis of lasting peace.

NOTES

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 27, p. 379.

Socio-Economic Problems of Developed Socialism

Scientific and Technological Revolution and the Creation of the Material and Technical Basis of Communism

MIKHAIL VOLKOV

The economic policy of the Soviet state is sound because it combines organically the specific burning questions of economic construction with the general prospects of Soviet society's advance towards communism.

While devoting foremost attention to the solution of current problems the CPSU is at the same time taking practical measures for solving long-term socio-economic problems. In accordance with the directives of the Party, the Soviet planning bodies, in conjunction with research institutions, have carried out extensive work in elaborating a long-term plan for developing the national economy of the USSR. The elaboration of this plan is regarded as a task of utmost economic and political importance which can be successfully carried out only on the firm basis of Marxist-Leninist science and through its further creative development.

In this connection it is of particular importance to conduct an allround study of the economic problems of creating the material and technical basis of communism in the conditions of a developed socialist society and of the scientific and technological revolution which is developing on an unprecedented scale. The creative energy

M. Volkov, Professor. Engaged in research into problems related to the political economy of socialism and specifically to labour, scientific and technological progress and economic accounting. Co-author of textbooks on the political economy of socialism widely used in the USSR and in many other countries.

of the Soviet people is directed towards utilising the possibilities arising from these conditions in the interests of the consolidation of socialism and of building a communist society.

THE SOCIAL ASPECT OF THE MODERN SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION

In elaborating its economic policy the Communist Party takes into account the main features of each stage of the country's development. Socialism had triumphed in the USSR in the second half of the 1930s. The victory was the result of the consistent implementation of the Leninist policy of socialist industrialisation, agricultural collectivisation and of the cultural revolution. Now the Soviet Union has entered the stage of developed socialism.

The Soviet economy today is based on the same socialist production relations that were established in the 1930s. But these relations have matured and the productive forces have entered a qualitatively new stage. The leading sectors of the economy have been equipped with the latest technology. Large-scale machine production now embraces all sectors of the economy, including agriculture. The Soviet Union today is a great industrial power.

Having built a developed socialist society and created a great economic, scientific and technical potential, the Soviet people have started the construction of the material and technical basis of communism, which serves as a foundation for the communist transformation of social relations.

The USSR is tackling the important task of organically combining the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of the socialist economic system. Through the utilisation of scientific and technological achievements the material conditions for a further improvement of socialist social relations and their gradual transformation into communist relations are being created and all aspects of social life are advancing towards complete communism. That means that the scientific and technological revolution is unfolding for the benefit of the working people themselves, promoting their well-being, and in the interests of building a new society.

The Communist Party takes due account of the international situation, whose principal feature is the division of the world into two opposing social systems. The scientific and technological revolution is the main arena of economic competition between socialism and capitalism. At the same time it is an arena of sharp ideological struggle centring on the social aspect of the scientific and technological revolution.

Bourgeois scientists approach this question mainly from its scientific-technical side. In their attempts to defend capitalism they interpret the changes taking place in science and technology outside the context of social relations, in a "social vacuum"; they try to reduce everything to processes under way in the sphere of "pure"

science and technology and speak about a "cybernetical revolution" which is allegedly leading to a "transformation of capitalism", turning it into a society of "general welfare" free from antagonistic contradictions.

Technological progress, to be sure, leads to an enormous expansion of man's knowledge about nature, to broader connections between production and the process of cognition and the application of the laws of the natural sciences, to a greater and direct impact of science on production and the radical changes in the techniques and technology of production. However, knowledge of the laws of nature is not enough for explaining the level, the rates and the character of technological development. They do not and cannot give an answer to the question as to why in the capitalist countries modern technology brings in its wake growing unemployment, excessive intensification of labour, which is harmful to the health of workers, and concentration of wealth in the hands of financial magnates.

Marxism-Leninism examines scientific and technological progress in its organic relationship with social progress. Karl Marx, in his study of the technological changes of the late 18th and early 19th centuries, pointed out their dependence on the emerging and developing capitalist relations. He showed also that as a result of those changes the capitalist mode of production had been put on an adequate material basis — large-scale machine production, and stressed that the content of industrial revolution had not been exhausted by a revolution in technology but included a revolution in production relations, the victory of capitalism over feudalism. In his analysis of the new phenomena in the capitalist economy of the late 19th century, Lenin also linked technological progress with the production relations of bourgeois society, the emergence of monopolies and the turning of the capitalism of free competition into monopoly capitalism.

In our epoch the interaction between the development of science and technology is vividly manifested in the fundamentally different social consequences of scientific and technological revolution in the capitalist and socialist countries.

The vast possibilities for the rapid growth of production, created by the scientific and technological revolution, are in sharp contradiction with capitalist production relations which subordinate scientific and technological progress to a drive for monopoly profits and for strengthening the rule of the monopolies. Monopoly capitalism cannot advance social tasks corresponding to the level and character of scientific and technological development; it imparts to scientific and technological progress a one-sided, distorted character. It tries to adapt itself to the new conditions and utilise scientific and technological achievements for preserving its dominance. An aggravation of all the contradictions inherent in capitalism is one of the results of this policy.

Bourgeois scientists claim that the scientific and technological revolution, accompanied by an increase in the regulating role of the bourgeois state, has led to changes in the nature of capitalism. Life itself, however, has shown that such arguments are fully groundless.

The exploitative nature of capitalism does not change, while the problem of the social consequences of technological progress becomes ever more acute. And however vigorously bourgeois scientists praise the technical achievements of the developed capitalist states, the fact is that the economic gap between the exploiters and the masses is becoming wider, and these states are as far from "abundance for all" and "universal affluence" as they were before the onset of the scientific and technological revolution.

Socialism opens up broad vistas for the scientific and technological revolution in the working people's interests. Lenin said that "socialism alone will liberate science from its bourgeois fetters, from its enslavement to capital, from its slavery to the interests of dirty capitalist greed".¹ In our time this provision has been borne out.

The scientific and technological revolution in the USSR is the process of the construction of the material and technical basis of a communist society. This is a radical change in the productive forces which fosters the solution of the basic development problems of Soviet society. The main directions of the technological policy elaborated by Soviet state are based on a Marxist evaluation of the essence and role of the modern scientific and technological revolution. This revolution is the principal instrument for accomplishing the vital socio-economic tasks of developed socialist society. The CPSU holds that to solve the social problems connected with the development of mature socialism into communism it is necessary not only to replace old machines by new ones of a similar type and to use these machines and equipment on a large scale, but to introduce qualitative changes in this field and to go over to fundamentally new technology. Let us now turn to the intensive factors of expanding socialist production. At present, a major role is played here by the fuller use of the commissioned productive capacities, technical improvement of the existing apparatus of production, and partial and comprehensive mechanisation of labour that relieves an enormous number of auxiliary workers. At the same time technical re-equipment of production based on the automation of production processes acquires an ever greater significance in the intensification of production.

As is known, an enormous amount of work is being done in the Soviet Union to strengthen the material and technical basis of agriculture. The interests of agricultural production and the social tasks in the countryside have required an intensification of technical re-equipment of agriculture, its mechanisation and chemicalisation and large-scale land improvement work.

The tasks of training of a new type of workers, of eliminating unskilled and heavy manual labour and raising the workers' technical and cultural level are also connected with technological progress.

All this shows that within the framework of the developed socialist structure there emerged a need for radical, qualitative changes in the techniques of production. The potentialities, opened by the scientific and technological revolution, are being realised in the creation of the material and technical basis of communism, the attainment of the higher productivity of labour and its transformation, on the mass

scale, into a creative process. As soon as general prosperity is thus secured for all, the Soviet society will be able to overcome the still existing essential differences between town and country, between mental and manual labour and create the conditions for the allround physical and intellectual development of the individual. In solving its social problems on the basis of the development of the scientific and technological revolution, society will make a historic transition from socialism to communism. Thus, the historical and social significance of the present-day scientific and technological revolution as a powerful motive force of social progress lies in the fact that this revolution is necessary for the transition from developed socialism to complete communism.

MAIN DIRECTIONS IN THE CREATION OF THE MATERIAL AND TECHNICAL BASIS OF COMMUNISM

Marxism-Leninism has shown that the starting point for the creation of the material and technical basis of socialism is large-scale machine production. In our time there are tendencies towards the development of non-mechanical processing (methods of chemical transformation of matter, application of biological processes in production, creation of non-mechanical generators). Even now the development of implements of labour represents further progress of machine technique, while the creation of the material and technical basis of communism means the transition to a qualitatively new stage in large-scale machine production.

Machine production first appeared under capitalism. Socialism frees its development from the contradictions characteristic of capitalism, makes it serve the interests of the whole of society, systematically organises it and extends it to the entire national economy. The process of transition from developed socialism to complete communism brings about fundamental changes in the technical basis of machine production.

Modern scientific and technological trends show that the main direction of the development of the implements of labour lies in the gradual substitution of automatic machines for manually controlled machines. From this it follows that an adequate technical basis for communist large-scale machine production includes an automatic system of machines as its main link.

The technical development and improvement of socialist production is proceeding along the lines of completing the comprehensive mechanisation of production processes, the automation of these processes that are ready for automation technically and economically, the development of a system of automatic machines and the creation of the requisites for going over to comprehensive automation.

One of the major directions of Soviet technological policy consists in the creation and introduction of fundamentally new implements of labour. In view of the present trends of the scientific and technological revolution in this field the purpose is to make automatic

machines that are more efficient than the best models now existing and, in the more distant future, to create automatic coding systems.

At present there are automated power stations, oil refineries and chemical plants, and automated production lines, sections and shops in the manufacturing industries. The total number of automated production lines in the USSR's industry had increased from 6,500 in 1965 to 15,500 in 1974. In machine-tool manufacture new models of digital programme-controlled metal-cutting lathes and also metal-shaping machines have been developed, in instrument making—electronic digital computers on a uniform structural and microelectronic technological basis with compatible programming systems. In the textile industry spinning machines combining four technological operations are introduced. Serial production of shuttleless looms with an improved mechanism for changing colour has begun, which will make it possible to raise labour productivity by 2.5 to 3 times.

As a long-term prospect, there is to be mass production of systems of machines serving as the basis for comprehensive automation, i.e., the automation of an entire production cycle. In terms of mechanical engineering this means the automation of the machining of parts, transfer of materials and parts, assembly of articles and technical inspection, regulation of supplies of materials and their delivery to work-places, design operations and elaboration of technology, economic planning, statistical and other calculations. There will be automated systems for managing enterprises, combines, whole economic sectors and the entire national economy.

What is the relationship between the present state of automation of production and the trends of the scientific and technological revolution? If we take, for example, the stock of machine-tools in mechanical engineering, it makes it possible to automate such an element of the technological cycle as machining of parts. Other processes are not yet automated, or are automated to a slight extent.

Automatic lathes and automated production lines now in use increase the possibilities of mass flow-line production and considerably raise labour productivity. However, this technique has limited possibilities. The rigidity of the technological circuit typical of modern automated lines hampers a swift readjustment of production systems for turning out new types of goods. The readjustment of machines requires large additional expenditures and is often impossible. Apart from that, automatic transfer and fixing of parts cannot always be done properly, to say nothing of the adjustment of the operating conditions of machine tools depending on the changes caused by unaccounted-for interference, the wear of tools, hardness of metal, etc.

In future digital programme-controlled machine tools, which can be quickly readjusted for turning out new products thanks to perforation or magnetic recording of the programme, will be widely used. But the present models of such machine tools do not yet solve the problem of comprehensive automation. Experts believe that the solution lies in automatic coding systems which are a combination of a

system of digital programme-controlled machine tools and electronic computers. Such systems can serve technological processes in various intra-factory units, ensuring necessary flexibility and adaptability of production in a quick readjustment for turning out new types of goods; and they will be able themselves to work out optimum technological processes and rational operating conditions for the equipment, i.e., they will "self-adjust" on the basis of an analysis of accumulated experience.

The scientific and technological revolution engenders radical, qualitative changes in all the elements of the productive forces. Therefore, the study of the impact of scientific and technological progress on social life calls for an integrated approach to the analysis of qualitative changes in the productive forces, an approach in which the development of the implements of labour is examined in interconnection with the change in production technology and the use of new sources of energy and raw and other materials, with the rise in the educational and the technical and cultural level of the working people.

In the foreseeable future the energy basis of production will continue to be electricity. Therefore, the Leninist course being steered towards complete electrification of the country remains, as before, a major part of the CPSU's technological policy in the period of the construction of the material and technical basis of communism. Electric energy production in the next few years will be expanded through increasing the output of coal, oil and gas and the construction of hydroelectric power stations. While the thermal and hydroelectric powerplants will continue to play the leading role in electricity production, the capacities of atomic power stations will be increased at an ever greater rate. Already now the techno-economic indices of atomic power stations in regions far from the sources of cheap fuel are higher than those of thermal powerplants.

The production of electric energy in the USSR had grown from 507,000 million kwh in 1965 to 975,000 million kwh in 1974. With the expansion of allround mechanisation and automation of production the requirements in electric energy and electric power supply per worker will become greater still.

The going over to comprehensively mechanised and automated production, along with the improvement of the means of automation and expansion of electricity production, is connected with the creation of new technology. Allround automation leads to a revolution in production technology. The improvement, creation and introduction of new technological processes has become major trend in raising the technical level of production. New methods of shaping—electrophysical and electrochemical working of metals—are being used on an ever wide scale. At the same time mechanical working of metals is being ousted by stamping, rolling on, welding and other methods.

Introduction of new technology leads to qualitative changes in the objects of labour. Along with the fuller utilisation of the natural sources of raw and other materials, the production of new materials with preset properties, plastics and synthetic resins is rapidly

developing. These materials effectively replace and often surpass, as far as their chemical properties are concerned, traditional types of raw and other materials. The production of super-hard, heat-resistant, electric insulating, corrosion-proof and other new materials is being expanded.

Science exerts more and more a profound influence on the development of society's material and technical basis. The CPSU is taking all possible measures for swiftly increasing the country's scientific and economic potential. The number of scientific institutions in the USSR (including higher educational institutions) exceeds 5,000, and there are 1,160,000 researchers in the country. Every effort is made to develop and consolidate the material basis of scientific progress and large-scale basic and applied research programmes are being carried out. Scientists' efforts are concentrated on the most promising fields of scientific and technological progress. The scientific institutions are playing an increasing role in developing new machines and equipment and new production processes. State expenditure for the development of science and technology is growing at a faster rate than the national income.

The utilisation of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution in the process of constructing the material and technical basis of communism is the principal condition for solving the vital socio-economic problem of communist construction, namely, the attainment of the level of social labour productivity necessary for complete communism. Scientific and technical progress opens up new possibilities for using highly efficient production processes, giving production a broader mass character and raising the quality of goods.

The use of new materials and reduction of the cost of electric energy production, introduction of new technology and improvement of the structure and location of social production make for economy of labour. At the same time they help to improve working conditions and overcome the relatively narrow character of many specialities and the monotony of operations on production lines and conveyer belts.

In the level of labour productivity the Soviet Union still lags behind the United States. But it should be borne in mind that a simple comparison between the labour productivity levels of the USSR and the United States does not give a complete picture of their economic development. The heart of the matter lies in the fact that the indices compared are not the ones of labour productivity as such, but the output per worker, which also reflects the difference in labour intensity. As is known, in a number of US industries labour intensity is 1.5-2 times higher than in the USSR. Such an intensity is harmful to workers' health and causes premature ageing. The structural differences in production and consumption in the USSR and the USA also influence the relation of labour productivity indices.

The higher rates of growth of labour productivity in the Soviet Union testify to the advantages of the socialist economic system over the capitalist system. Between 1951 and 1973 the average annual rates of growth of labour productivity in Soviet industry were 1.8 times higher than in the United States and twice as high as in Britain.

There is no doubt that the high level of labour productivity attained in the USSR is a major condition for the creation of developed socialist society and provides a sound basis for the advancement to communism. The strength of socialism, which combines technological progress with the allround development of the working man or woman and concern for his or her health and well-being is manifested in the high and stable rates of growth of labour productivity. This is the basis for the comprehensive intensification of production processes and the improvement of efficiency of social production.

Owing to the comprehensive mechanisation and automation of production and the broad use of modern automatic machines, labour operations and industrial management are becoming ever more complex. Today, workers must be highly skilled and have a good knowledge of the scientific and technological foundations of production. This requirement arises under capitalism as well, but capitalist production relations are an insurmountable obstacle to the allround development of the working man or woman and to an improvement of his or her general educational level and skill.

The capitalist system dooms the working masses to unskilled labour and preserves the so-called partial worker. Socialist society, on the other hand, is faced with the task, as it was pointed out by Marx, to replace "the detail-worker", a person who performs a certain partial social function, with the "fully developed individual".² The occupational division of labour is brought here in line with the interests of the development of the individual. Socialist production based on modern technology presents rapidly growing demands not only with respect to machines but, above all, to workers themselves, who are the creators of these machines. In the USSR every effort is made to carry out the task of improving the conditions that would promote the allround development of the working people as the main productive force of society.

In recent years the network of general secondary schools, vocational schools and higher educational institutions has been extended; the professional qualification of teachers and the quality of instruction have been raised. The transition to universal 10-year education is being completed in the country. Great attention is devoted to the training of personnel possessing a good knowledge in individual fields and professional skill and capable of carrying on the scientific and technological revolution. There is an unprecedented increase in the number and percentage of workers with diverse skills and training in a specific technical field, of inventors, innovators and researchers, engineers and technicians. As the comprehensive mechanisation and automation of production is carried out, the creative character of labour will become more pronounced, and this will play an important role in the allround development of the individual.

The swift development of science and technology in the USSR is not only an essential condition for creating the material and technical basis of communism. The Soviet scientific and technical achieve-

ments exert a profound influence on the progressive development in the world; they strengthen the positions of the socialist community and open up fresh possibilities for increasing its economic and technical assistance to the developing countries. Scientific and technological progress in our time has become a major field of competition between the socialist and the capitalist economic systems.

UTILISATION OF THE ADVANTAGES OF SOCIALISM FOR PROMOTING SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS

The Soviet Union has long since done away with the economic and technical backwardness inherited from tsarist Russia and now holds leading positions in decisive fields of science and technology. Among them are space exploration, mathematics, application of nuclear energy, creation of quantum generators, and the use of oil and natural gas in the chemical industry, great progress in biology and other sciences. On the basis of its achievements in science and technology the USSR has set up its own atomic power industry, radio electronics and modern chemical production.

At present, the country has the scientific and industrial means to tackle the most complicated problems posed by the scientific and technological revolution. The industries that are directly connected with technological progress—the power industry, mechanical engineering and metallurgy, especially the manufacture of instruments and means of automation, the chemical and petrochemical industry, the production of plastics and synthetic resins—are developing especially rapidly. The technical re-equipment of the engineering industry is being carried out and more machines and equipment are supplied to the light industry and the food industry. Comprehensive mechanisation of the building industry and agriculture is under way.

New kinds of highly efficient machines, equipment and technological processes are being developed by Soviet scientists, design engineers and technologists. The country's economic development plans provide for the introduction of an ever greater number of new machines and equipment and of scientific achievements in the national economy.

Technical innovations applied in production are not an end in themselves but an important means of raising the efficiency of the national economy. In this connection, of special significance is the question of establishing the criterion of economic expedience and efficiency of new machines and equipment. Under capitalism, the use of machinery is determined solely by considerations of capitalist profit and, hence, the economy of paid labour only.

In socialist society, the economic expedience of the use of machines is determined by much wider considerations—their role in expanding the production of goods to satisfy the requirements of the whole of society, and, hence, the economy of social labour. Marx wrote: "The use of machinery for the exclusive purpose of cheapening the product is limited in the way that less labour must be

expended in producing the machinery than is displayed by the employment of that machinery."³

The approach to the use of machinery from the point of view of the economy of social labour opens up a real possibility for arriving at creating and choosing the most efficient solutions of technical problems. It makes it possible to start replacing manual labour by machines and obsolete machines by new ones. Economy of labour due to the use of new machines also accelerates technological progress by increasing the sources of means for conducting research and development and making wider use of new machinery.

The system of indices used in practice (particularly, lowering the expenditures of enterprises, increasing profits, labour productivity, the product-assets ratio, labour and material intensity, etc.) may give an idea of the economy of social labour. Account is also taken of the economic effect obtained in related branches and, in terms of the entire national economy, the growth of the national income.

Of course, it is in the interests of socialism to use the most efficient, up-to-date technology. To accelerate technological progress efficiency rates are being set which orient enterprises and branches of industry to creation and use of up-to-date machinery that surpasses the existing technical level and permits the greatest economy of social labour.

Perfection of methods of determining the socially needed expenditures of labour in making new machines and the mechanism of price formation based on these expenditures plays an important role in a system of measures designed to stimulate the use of highly efficient machinery. The setting of prices of machines with due account of the economic effect derived from their use makes it possible to relatively (and in some cases, absolutely) lower the price level as the efficiency of these machines rises. The average level of wholesale prices of goods produced by the engineering industries (according to the price-lists introduced in the USSR since January 1, 1973), when compared with the level of prices before that date, is 11.5 per cent lower; that of the means of computing technology, instruments, diamond-tipped tools, electrical apparatus and cables is 15 to 28 per cent lower.

The Soviet industry and the industry of other socialist countries have gained much experience in creating material incentives for the manufacture of new goods by setting the lower and upper price limits. The level of production costs reached in the second and third year of the serial production of goods is usually taken as the basis for setting the price. When forming material incentive funds at enterprises, account is taken of the growth of labour productivity and the percentage of new, top-quality goods put out by the enterprises.

A decisive advantage of socialism, from the point of view of technological progress, is its planned nature, which makes it possible to formulate and implement a single technological policy in terms of social production as a whole, to concentrate the material, financial and labour resources where they are most needed, and to choose the most efficient ways and means of achieving technological

progress on the basis of world experience. The chief sections and targets of five-year economic development plans are defined on the basis of a comprehensive programme of scientific and technological development. This has a positive impact on raising the scientific level of the planning activities of the state. The plans for attaining technical progress drawn up with due account for latest achievements of science and technology give the real foundation for the national economic development plans; the targets for the growth of labour productivity, the volume of production and the quality of the goods produced, rates of expenditure of live and embodied labour and financial indices are set in accordance with them.

State plans based on the latest scientific and technological achievements and embracing ministries and production associations, evaluations of the economic efficiency of new machinery and of incentives for their development and use, form a whole set of economic conditions for the best use of the stimuli of scientific and technological progress inherent in socialism.

The Soviet Government pays much attention to further raising the efficiency of science. The scientific and technological revolution calls for an improved system of state organisation of research, better management of scientific institutions and the coordination of their activities on the basis of a single state plan. The purpose is to eliminate a situation in which the same problems are studied at many research institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences, at higher educational institutions and at various governmental departments.

In socialist society, the possibility of state planning of scientific development has been confirmed by experience. Five-year plans define directions of fundamental research in conformity with the trends of world science and the requirements of the national economy. The results of this research work serve as an initial basis for the development of the applied sciences, and the achievements of these sciences are reflected in current research programmes. As research programmes draw nearer to the elaboration of concrete assignments, science becomes closer to production. Long-term plans are based on discoveries to be made in science and technology, while current plans outline the ways for employing the already made discoveries.

In the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution scientific forecasting is of special importance for the state management of science and technology. A correct evaluation of the general trends in world science, particularly in its principal fields, makes it possible to find an optimum correlation between the stages of scientific investigations, branches of natural science, technical science and economics, and increase the country's scientific potential where necessary. Scientific forecasting helps to elaborate a sound strategy for technological progress, and conceptions of the technological development of individual industries indispensable for the improvement of production, with due account of likely changes in technology within the next 10 to 15 years. Herein lies the key to designing machinery and enterprises of the future and turning to

comprehensive mechanised and automated production, often bypassing the stages of simple mechanisation.

The effectiveness of state plans for achieving scientific and technological progress largely depends on defining concretely the subjects of scientific research conducted by institutes and teams of scientists and on working out concrete plans for developing new machinery and equipment by enterprises. The concrete plans reflect the targets set by the state plan. Here the experience and specialisation of scientists should be combined with the tasks of promoting scientific advance set by the state. The use of elements of cost accounting in the formation of teams of scientists working on comprehensive problems of an applied nature is fully justified.

Efficient management of scientific research presupposes a well-organised system of scientific and technical information. This makes it possible to eliminate duplication and parallel efforts in scientific research. The network of research institutions is being improved. The advantages of socialism make it possible to establish the close connection between various links of the chain leading from basic research to the development and mastering of new machinery and equipment and to speed up the introduction of scientific achievements in industry.

A major condition for accelerating scientific and technological progress is the further expansion and consolidation of economic cooperation between the socialist countries. In accordance with the Comprehensive Programme of socialist economic integration of the CMEA member countries, mutual consultations are conducted between these countries on questions of scientific and technological policy; scientific and technical forecasts are being jointly elaborated; there is joint planning in solving individual problems; scientific and technological research is being coordinated; and there is regular exchange of scientific and technical achievements and technical information and cooperation in the training of scientific personnel. Such coordination of the scientific potentials of countries makes for their more efficient use.

The Soviet Union possesses everything necessary for the development of the scientific and technological revolution: a powerful material base, a system of developed socialist production relations, and highly skilled personnel. Of decisive importance for utilising the existing advantages is society's organisational activity. This is why the CPSU attaches great significance to the comprehensive programme of accelerating scientific and technological progress and to the development of all forms of combination of science and production that are inherent in socialism.

NOTES

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 27, p. 411.

² K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1970, p. 458.

³ K. Marx, *Op. cit.*, p. 370.

Socio-Economic Problems of Developed Socialism

Economic Science and Social Development of Society

PYOTR FEDOSEYEV

The development of economic science, as of all social sciences in the USSR, is going through a stage of noticeable upswing. This is in line with the growing importance of scientific theory for the practical mastery of the exceptionally complicated and contradictory processes of social development now going on against the background of, and in close connection with, the revolutionary changes in science and technology. It is safe to say that the governing of social phenomena and the processes in which new, communist forms of social life are created is successful precisely because it rests on profound theoretical interpretation of these processes.

I

As a result of the general progress in all social sciences in the USSR, the necessary basis has been created for further advances in the study of key problems of present-day social development and a better understanding of the specific features of social processes. Soviet scholars have concentrated on a complex elaboration of the

P. Fedoseyev, Academician, Vice-President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Chairman of the Social Sciences Section of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Author of many works on philosophy, sociology, historical materialism and scientific communism (dialectics of contemporary social development, interaction of the productive forces and production relations, the role of the masses and the individual in history, problems of humanism), including the monographs *Dialectics of the Present Epoch*, *Communism and Philosophy*, *Marxism in the 20th Century*. Marx, Engels, Lenin and the Present Epoch.

problems of developed socialist society, which bear on every aspect of social life: economy, social relations, ideology, education and way of life, and are being tackled jointly by scientists and scholars of different specialities, as the social and natural scientists continue to pool their efforts.

The most important and large-scale work here, carried out in the Soviet Union over the past few years, has been participation by specialists in the humanities, economists in the first place, in working out the Comprehensive Programme of scientific and technological progress and its social consequences until 1990, and also in elaborating these problems in application to the forthcoming Tenth Five-Year Plan period (1976-1980).

This work shows very well how natural, technical and social sciences cooperate. Working together, representatives of different sciences complemented each other in making a close study of the obtaining situation and long-term prospects in the development of science and technology, the economy, social relations, culture, education, training of personnel, etc., in all their complex interconnection and interdependence. The programme that has been elaborated is something of an outline of future long-term plans based on the use of the latest achievements in social and natural sciences. It has provided excellent schooling for all those who took part in this work.

Elaboration of the problems of developed socialism provided an opportunity to gain an in-depth understanding of the substance and characteristic features of socialism and to express in concrete terms the prospects for progress in socialist society, the stages of its development and ways of transition to communism. The solution of these problems is of substantial importance for practice, which is also helped by the laws of social development that have been revealed at the stage of the building and further improvement of mature socialism, the problem, solved in principle, concerning the characteristic features of developed socialism, which are universal, and also by the specific features of socialist construction in the individual countries of the socialist community determined by the concrete historical conditions of their national and state development.

Soviet scientists and scholars and their counterparts from the fraternal socialist countries subjected to well-grounded criticism various incorrect notions of socialism and communism, like the unscientific concept denying the historical inevitability of socialism as an independent phase of the communist structure, and including socialism in the transition period. On the other hand, no support was given to the view of socialism as an independent socio-economic structure.

Life has confirmed — and keeps confirming — the correctness of the classical theory of Marx, Engels and Lenin, according to which the emergence and development of the communist structure, once a socialist revolution has been carried out and the dictatorship of the proletariat established, passes through three qualitatively distinct historical phases of development: *the transition period, socialism, as*

the first phase of communism, and communism proper, the higher phase.

The period of transition from capitalism to socialism is an inevitable historical phase of development. It starts with the victory of a socialist revolution and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship, and ends with the entry into the socialist phase, which implies the elimination of private ownership of the means of production, exploitation of man by man, and the construction of socialist society, in the main.

The construction of socialism, in the main, being the chief result of the transition period, means the creation of all the necessary elements of socialism, and not only of its economic foundation. This is a process that cannot be reduced to the triumph of the socialist forms of property.

Soviet scientists regard socialism as a stable and qualitatively definite state of society which has its own nature. Socialism is not at all a temporary coexistence between immature communism and the "birthmarks of capitalism", but a social system characterised by socialist principles which are coherent in their social nature. Socialism, the first phase of the communist structure, has a number of common features with the higher phase of communism, because it is a society based on the principles of collectivism and on the common ownership of the means of production. But socialism also differs substantially from the higher phase of communism in its socio-economic structure and material and technical basis. Consequently, socialism is a definite stage of communism, but is not a short-lived stage. The duration of the socialist phase suggests the question of its stages. It is generally accepted in Soviet science that there are at least two stages within the framework of the socialist phase.

The first stage opens with the establishment of socialism in the main and ends with the construction of mature, developed socialist society. In the documents of the CPSU and other communist parties this stage is characterised as a stage of consolidation, development or completion of socialist construction. Most of the countries of the socialist community, where socialist production relations have won out, the transition period has been concluded, and socialist production based on the use of modern industrial techniques created, are at the stage of building developed socialism. With the final victory of socialism the state of the proletarian dictatorship develops into the state of the entire people.

The stage of developed socialist society covers the next stage of socialist development on the way to communism. At this stage, efforts are made to ensure the allround improvement of socialist society, the material and technical basis of communism is being built up, and communist social relations are being gradually formed.

Soviet scientists and scholars regard developed socialist society not as something intermediate between socialism and communism, combining the one and the other. It is a socialist society which has achieved a developed state. It is characterised by the allround unfolding of the advantages of socialism and the consistent conjunc-

tion of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the new social relations. The sphere of operation of the economic laws of socialism and potentialities for their implementation are extended. The social results of the use of these laws become much more fruitful. This helps to create favourable material and cultural requisites for the allround development of the individual.

Soviet science has concentrated on the problem of the *criteria of developed socialism*, and it is now possible to consider some of the methodological principles that have been formulated in this area.

First, in determining the criteria of the maturity of socialism it is not right to start only from its individual indices, like the productive forces, labour productivity, etc. There is need for a comprehensive approach, taking account of all the basic factors which, in their sum total, determine the degree of the maturity of socialism in this or that country.

Second, Soviet science has rejected the principle of deriving the criteria of the maturity of socialism on the strength of the indices achieved in the sphere of production in highly developed capitalist countries. The criteria of developed socialism are inherent in socialism and its socio-economic substance. That is why they are formulated on the basis of the nature of socialism. Higher labour productivity under socialism than under capitalism is an index of the competition between the two world systems and the condition for the final victory over capitalism.

Third, the achievement of the socio-political and ideological unity of society with the leading role of the working class, and the cohesion of the working people and all their organisations round a Marxist-Leninist party should be regarded as a key criterion of developed socialism.

A generalising criterion of developed socialism is the high degree of use in every sphere of social life of the objective laws and advantages which are inherent in socialism, and the attainment of its socio-economic goals.

II

Soviet scientists have studied developed socialism in its dynamics, with an eye to its historical prospects and, in this context, have devoted special attention to the ways of building up the material and technical basis of communism, advancement of the economy of mature socialist society and gradual development of production and all other social relations into communist relations.

Under developed socialism the *problem of the socio-economic efficiency* of social production comes to the fore both on the scale of individual socialist countries and of the socialist community as a whole. This is due to the fact that developed socialism implies a fundamental swing towards a fuller satisfaction of the people's social requirements and a rise in their material and cultural standards. For its part, a high level of satisfaction of these requirements calls for vast

new resources, which can be created only through a considerable intensification of the economy and greater efficiency of production. In these conditions, the growth of the working people's welfare and cultural standards becomes a key factor of progress in social production.

Consequently, the theory of socio-economic efficiency starts from two basic points: a) enhancement of the efficiency of production is seen as the basis and chief condition for tackling all the problems which arise under developed socialism; b) efficiency cannot be confined to a narrow economic framework, such as national-economic cost-cutting, to say nothing of economic accounting efficiency on the enterprise level, but must necessarily include various social elements. The combination of social and purely economic elements is a necessary condition for determining efficiency and its criteria under socialism. Social factors, like working conditions, the attractiveness of various jobs, and the improvement of the environment, in themselves operate as factors behind the growing productivity of labour.

The marked enhancement of the socio-economic efficiency of production is connected with the fulfilment of the historic tasks put forward by the 24th Congress of the CPSU, of organically combining the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of socialism at its mature stage. Soviet social scientists have been working on the problems arising in the balanced conjunction of scientific progress with the entire system of planning production and consumption at every level: on the scale of the national economy, the individual branches, associations and enterprises.

The problems of the socio-economic efficiency and the combination of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of socialism cannot be confined to the national framework of individual countries. By their very nature, these problems apply to the community of fraternal countries and success in their solution depends on the development of socialist economic integration. Working in close contact with scientists in other countries of the socialist community, Soviet scientists have made a definite contribution to elaborating the *theory of socialist economic integration*.

Soviet social scientists have carried out concrete analyses of the fundamental distinctions between socialist integration and capitalist integration.¹ The economic effects of capitalist integration have been assessed, above all, from the standpoint of creating more favourable conditions for the operations of the monopolies and boosting their profits, which, the facts show, lead to greater exploitation of the working people. Socialist economic integration is aimed to raise the working people's material and cultural standards, to even out the socialist countries' economic development levels, to bring their economies closer together and consolidate them politically.

Integration is a decisive factor which ensures realisation of the advantages of socialism as a world economic system. It rests on the

objective tendency of the internationalisation of economic and social life and is directed in a balanced manner by the communist parties and governments of the socialist countries — members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA). Integration processes in the world socialist economy (at the present stage, within the framework of the CMEA community) are centred on the planning of production and the use of achievements of the current scientific and technological revolution.

When the concept of socialist-type economic integration was being formulated, the "market" approach was rejected, for it entailed an uncritical borrowing of capitalist integration methods and their applying to the socialist economy. The world socialist system can develop successfully only if the methods adequate to socialism are used, and the chief of these are centralised state planning and the guiding role of the communist and workers' parties in managing the national economy and international economic cooperation.

Social scientists in the USSR and other fraternal socialist countries have formulated the fundamentals of the integration machinery which is an interconnected sum total of forms of planned management of interstate cooperation, commodity-money instruments, and an organisational and legal structure catering for the development of integration process and organic involvement in it of individual national economies. All this is of fundamental practical importance for such spheres of cooperation as international socialist specialisation and cooperation of production, scientific and technical research, efficient foreign trade, etc.

If the socio-economic efficiency of social production is to grow steadily there is constant need to improve the management of the functioning and development of socialist society. Special attention is being given to the problem of organising production, scientific-production and agrarian-industrial associations.

The construction of developed socialism has sharply increased the demands put to the *theory and practice of planning*, whose characteristic features today are comprehensive approach, elaboration of long-term prospects and emphasis on the social aspect of the plans. Socialist society is faced with the task of directing the processes of the scientific and technological revolution through a considerable extension of planning. This requires that fundamental and applied research, design and development, construction of new installations and training of personnel, organisation of mass production of goods and services and their supply to consumers should constitute a single cycle. Ever growing importance attaches to long-term social planning, with the improvement of every aspect of social being and consciousness taken as a cornerstone of planning and its objective basis.

Long-term planning has been assuming international forms in the CMEA countries' joint activity in this field, including the joint planning of a growing number of spheres of production.

At the present stage, special importance in the further development of society and successful planning attaches to the *Marxist-*

Leninist theory of reproduction, especially the problem of national-economic proportions and the relation between the two basic departments of production. The latest *Lenin Miscellany XXXVIII* contains unpublished writings by Lenin on these problems. There we find Lenin's schemes of reproduction and the relation between the two departments. Lenin drew up several variants of such schemes which develop Marx's scheme of reproduction for socialist society, with an eye to the changing relations of production and, consequently, a totally different type of distribution, notably, of the part of the value of the surplus product which under capitalism goes for parasitic consumption by the exploiters. Lenin's scheme also includes precapitalist structures. On the basis of a historical comparison, Lenin proved that the communist social structure is able to ensure higher rates of growth both in production and consumption.

Solution of the problems of the socio-economic efficiency of social production, management and planning is closely connected with the development of *economico-mathematical methods*. These methods have ceased to be a separate line in the social sciences and are becoming their organic element. Various macro-economic models, static and dynamic intersectoral balances, models of reproduction of fixed assets and labour resources, models of the dynamics and structure of the people's consumption, and models of external economic relations have already been worked out and are being extensively used. Advances have been made in optimising planning, especially on the sectoral, association and enterprise levels. A system of economico-mathematical prognostication models is being used in preparing scientific material for the five-year and long-term national economic development plans. But the most difficult part of the task of applying mathematical methods to planning has yet to be fulfilled; groups of Soviet scientists, together with planners, have been working to produce a single economico-mathematical system of accounting and planning, embracing all levels and elements of the national economy.

In the Soviet Union work is now going on to build up automated management systems for enterprises, associations, sectors and regions. Ultimately, a management, information and communications system is to be set up for the entire country on the basis of the latest achievements in many fields of the social, natural and technical sciences, thereby helping to realise the historic advantages of the ownership of the entire people in the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution.

Soviet social scientists oppose any underestimation of the importance of mathematical methods and modelling in analysing and generalising economic and social processes and implementing scientific solutions, because without consistent use of mathematical methods it is impossible to integrate the qualitative and quantitative aspects of research.

At the same time, we also oppose any attempt to turn these methods into absolutes or to enshrine them as fetishes, an approach which turns modelling into an end in itself. We oppose the

proliferation of models which have no value either for science or for practice, and which amount to "mathematical scholastics". There is good ground for our rejection of the technocratic belief in the possibility of automatically administering society by means of some universal system of machines. Just as there is no truth in the 17th-18th century idea that man is a machine, so there is no truth in the idea that society is a mechanism.

Long discussion and much research have helped to clarify the *place and role of commodity-money instruments* in the socialist economic system. Substantiated criticism was levelled at the revisionist theories of "market socialism", which tend to undermine the laws of the balanced development of the socialist economy. Ideas that commodity-money forms are incompatible with the nature of socialism, especially at the stage of developed socialist society, were also rejected.

Scientific studies have convincingly shown the fundamental, qualitative distinction between the substance and role of commodity-money categories under capitalism and under socialism. We proceed from the fundamental Marxist proposition that all economic categories — commodity, money, capital — are not things, but definite social relations. Under capitalism, these are not just economic phenomena but relations involving exploitation.

Under socialism, economic categories express fundamentally different social relations and have new functions to perform. Commodity is no longer a relation between private commodity owners, but a form and instrument of exchange of activity between those who work in collective production. Under socialism, labour power cannot be a commodity. State enterprises in industry, agriculture, transport and communications, like the land, which has been nationalised, cannot be bought or sold.

With the full triumph of socialism, money cannot be transformed into capital, even partially, whether it be industrial, financial or commercial capital; consequently, it cannot be an instrument of exploitation. Wherever money can be used, to whatever extent, to acquire the means of production as private property and to hire labour force for the purposes of producing surplus value or for commerce and profit-making, in short, wherever money can be used as capital in any part of the economy — production, the services or trade — there, of course, no developed, mature socialism has yet been established.

Consequently, with the transformation of social relations on socialist lines, the substance and role of commodity-money categories are modified, but they should not be regarded as forms which are extraneous or alien to socialism, but as important instruments for the functioning of the socialist mode of production, distribution and exchange of activity. It would be wrong, therefore, to underestimate commodity-money instruments and to regard them as some kind of relict or a form of accounting and nothing more. Under socialism, money is not just a symbol for settling accounts but an expression of economic relations, real labour inputs and a certificate for the acquisition of the corresponding quantities of the products of labour.

So long as the principle of distribution according to labour continues to operate together with the system of profit-and-loss economic relations, commodity-money instruments continue to be objectively necessary forms of socialist reproduction and exchange of the products of labour, designed both for personal and for production consumption. The law of value operates in new conditions; it is subordinate to the system of the economic laws of socialism and is used by society in a balanced manner.

Balanced, harmonious and proportional development is achieved, even in developed socialist society, by overcoming the irregularities and contradictions which either come down as a legacy of the past or arise anew. Nor does the problem boil down to the fact that in the vast and intricate business of planning and organising production there can be miscalculations in determining the necessary proportions. The objective process of economic development itself runs through dialectical contradictions, being a complex interaction of diverse elements of the productive forces and various aspects and elements of production relations.

Development engenders contradictions between objective and subjective factors, between desires and actual possibilities, between balanced development and spontaneous elements, between new and frequently unexpected and rapidly growing social and individual requirements and the efforts to meet them. Non-antagonistic contradictions like those between the necessary centralisation in the management of the national economy, on the one hand, and the growing role and independence of the various elements and branches of the economy and socio-political organisation, and regions of society, on the other, also have a definite role to play. Every new major stage in the development of socialist society produces something new in the relations between democracy and centralism and in the concrete expression of democratic centralism, the fundamental principle on which social processes are governed.

Contradictions have always been the motive force behind any advance, including social progress. Marxists have made a concrete in-depth study of the real contradictions around them, but they have resolutely opposed any invention of contradictions, which is essentially a petty-bourgeois approach. The petty bourgeois, Marx said, idealises contradictions because that is the fabric of which he himself is made. The task before Marxist-Leninists is to show up the real contradictions in life and to overcome them on the basis of the objective laws of development of socialism.

III

An important aspect of the studies of developed socialist society is analysis of the *changes in its social structure and elaboration of ways to improve it*. Studies are being made of the gradual bringing closer together and levelling out of the material standards and general living conditions of the various classes and sections of society, the rising cultural and educational level of Soviet people and the establishment

of a homogeneous social structure on that basis. The emphasis here is laid on the development of the Soviet working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the intelligentsia as mature socialism grows into the communist social system. These problems are being studied in the context of scientific and technological progress, and with an eye to the growing potentialities for overcoming the essential distinctions between town and country and between mental and physical labour. One of the main socio-economic tasks is to reduce and ultimately eliminate arduous manual and unskilled labour in every branch of the economy.

Various controversial questions arose in the elaboration of the various problems bearing on the class structure of socialist society. Some authors took a dogmatic view of Lenin's premise that socialism is a classless society and argued that there could be no question of developed socialist society so long as classes and class distinctions remained. Others, conversely, held that with the construction of developed socialist society classes tended to disappear, leaving behind them only occupational or socio-psychological distinctions between the intellectuals, workers and collective farmers. That is an example of an arbitrary and dogmatic interpretation of Lenin's ideas. Actually, Lenin made it quite clear that there were two stages in the creation of a classless society, for he spoke about the elimination of the exploiter classes and about the elimination of classes in general, linking up the latter with the elimination of the distinctions between town and country, and between mental and manual labour.

In determining the changes of the class structure in mature socialist society and the prospects of achieving social homogeneity, some authors are inclined to include a part of the intelligentsia or the whole of it in the working class. Others, conversely, believe that a part of the working class should be included in the intelligentsia, to say nothing of the fairly absurd attempts to include the whole of the working class in the intelligentsia, so establishing one class of intellectuals and thus, ostensibly, resolving the problem of eliminating class distinctions.

When considering this question, Marxists start from Lenin's concept of classes and class structure, which makes it clear that the working class is the chief leading force in socialist and communist construction. We cannot afford to lose sight of this cardinal criterion, especially in the present situation, when the ideological struggle is being fought mainly over these questions. The renegade Roger Garaudy, for instance, includes engineers and technicians in capitalist society in the working class, claiming that they are the most advanced section of that class, which in present-day conditions has the leading role to play.

Revisionists, like Ota Šik, contrast the intelligentsia and the working class, insisting that the intelligentsia must play the leading role under socialism. Thus, the leading role of the working class is denied, so automatically eliminating the question of the party as the vanguard of the working class and its growing role in communist construction.

However, actual changes in the class structure of socialist society do not at all occur through the inclusion of the intelligentsia, as a section, in the working class or of the working class in the intelligentsia.

In the course of socialist construction, two major tasks were resolved for a fundamental modification of the class structure: the elimination of the exploiter classes and the socialist transformation of petty-commodity production. Taken together, these major socio-political achievements led to a situation in the Soviet Union in which there are no classes or, in Lenin's words, social groups of men some of whom are able to appropriate the labour of others because of their different place in a definite structure of the social economy. This led to the elimination of the age-old antagonism between classes and class interests as the main basis for the class struggle. With the socialist reorganisation of petty production, the classes of workers and peasants no longer rely on different modes of production but on one and the same, socialist mode of production. Conventionally they have been called new classes. To be more precise, these are special — friendly — classes of working people which are not confronted with antagonistic classes of exploiters. Socialism does not create new classes, but fundamentally transforms the class structure of society.

However, under socialism class distinctions remain because they are determined by the existence of two different forms of social property, the division of labour into predominantly manual and predominantly mental labour, and also the distinctions between town and country. In this context, Lenin said that if classes were to be eliminated it was not enough to overthrow the landowners and capitalists, which was only one part of the task, and not the most difficult part at that. There is also need to eliminate the distinction between town and country and the distinction between mental and manual workers.² Lenin added that this eliminated one of the sources of social inequality, a source that could not at once be eliminated by the mere expropriation of capitalist property in the means of production and its conversion into social property.³ Elimination of this inequality, says Lenin, calls for "an enormous development of the productive forces...reaching the point of breaking away from the division of labour, of doing away with the antithesis between mental and manual labour, of transforming labour into 'life's prime want'."⁴

The development of society towards an ever greater social homogeneity runs through changes in the condition of the classes and social groups whose main content is an ever greater bringing closer together of the working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the intelligentsia. Their social positions, working conditions, nature of work, living standards, education, culture, and so on, become increasingly alike.

The development of the modern worker is a gradual process in which mental and manual labour are organically combined in his production activity. There is a growing number of highly skilled workers who are moving closer to the engineers and technicians in cultural and technical standards and functions in the process of

production. Today, millions of Soviet workers are inventors and innovators, thereby ceasing to be mere manual labourers or basic producers of material values (which, in effect, characterises the working class), but also creators of cultural values in the sphere of production (which is characteristic of engineers and technicians). Workers have a growing part to play in producing cultural values in general.

The system of public education helps to tackle the problem of combining mental and manual functions in the workers' activity. One of its elements is the establishment of vocational schools with secondary education standards which graduate more and more workers of the new generation. Together with the creation of material values these workers will quite obviously have ever greater opportunities to develop their intellectual activity.

Processes characterised by the ever greater drawing closer together of the peasantry, the working class and the intelligentsia are also in evidence in the transformation of the collective-farm peasantry and the nature of labour in agriculture. In this connection, vast importance attaches to the process in which agro-industrial complexes are being formed in the USSR. These not only help to raise the level of socialisation of collective-farm property, but also work a fundamental change in the nature of agricultural labour, making it akin to industrial labour which is increasingly saturated with science.

Thus, the Soviet working class and the collective-farm peasantry have changed a great deal. This means that the conditions for educating and upbringing children have also been changing, while the distinctions once arising from the different conditions and opportunities for education, cultural development, and so on, tend to disappear as well.

In socialist society, the intelligentsia is no longer an intermediate layer between classes, but a growing social stratum allied with the workers and peasants through common social, ideological and political attitudes. In the fraternal alliance of all the working people, the intelligentsia has a tremendous contribution to make to raise society's cultural and technical standards, thus helping to obliterate class distinctions.

Present-day sociological studies of the Soviet family have brought out processes which are important in making society's make-up ever more homogeneous. They show that there are many families, both in town and country, whose members come from different social sections, with the father a worker, the mother a collective-farm woman, the son an engineer, the daughter a teacher, etc. On the family level, there is an interweaving which characterises the obliteration of the old social facets and barriers.

Of course, the main thing is not to analyse individual cases or classify various citizens or families. Nor is it right to reduce the whole matter to a change in the social condition of individuals or individual occupational groups. The main question is the character of the changes in the structure of socialist society and the objective condition of the classes and social groups of which it consists.

Developed socialist society is distinguished by the *further democratisation of the state and social life*, which is one of the objective laws of this society. The expansion of democracy is considered in the Decisions of the 24th Congress of the CPSU and other documents of the Communist Party and the Soviet State as an objective process meeting the vital requirements of the economic, social and cultural development of Soviet society. The scientific and technological revolution and the growing scale of production and the complicated management processes it involves, pose new problems in understanding and developing democracy.

Lenin said that as society would advance towards communism administrative functions would become ever more simplified and would be carried out by an ever growing number of people. This prediction has come true, as far as political leadership is concerned.

Lenin however also perceived that the growth of industrial production, transportation and communication calls for the strictest order and discipline as well as centralised management. In conditions of the scientific and technological revolution the importance of this feature of society increases sharply. The use of the latest achievements of science and technology in management demands a high level of specialised training and, consequently, an ever higher level of professionalism. Under socialism the professionalism of executive administrative bodies is accompanied by a bigger role played by the representative bodies — the Soviets at all levels, and the mass public and political organisations, Party, trade-union, and youth organisations; production conferences, etc. Consistent realisation of the Leninist principle of democratic centralism is the best antipode to bureaucracy and formalism.

On the basis of the fundamental revolutionary changes in the material and cultural spheres of society in the USSR and other socialist countries, a fundamentally new, *socialist way of life* has taken shape and is developing. It has assimilated the best of everything that the working masses have produced over the long years of revolutionary struggle and socialist and communist construction.

In the past few years, the complex and multifaceted problem of the socialist way of life has become one of the key problems in research into mature socialism. Much has been done to study the problems of living standards, which are the key component of the socialist way of life. Much has also been done to solve the problem of distributive relations, incomes, consumption, differentiation of living standards and the important question of how the working people use their free and leisure time.

These studies have shown that the development of the socialist way of life at the stage of mature socialism is increasingly determined by the changes in labour caused by the scientific and technological revolution under socialism. While the problem of leisure is extremely important for man's allround development, the new man, the builder

of communism, is moulded above all in the sphere of labour. Socialist society—a society of working people—can alone—and in effect does—ensure that all the sections of society have basically the same way of life. Soviet scientists and scholars have studied the vast opportunities opened up by exploitation-free labour for the development of individual interests, tastes and requirements, how men's social activity, creative initiative and independence in every sphere of life have been growing. Alongside extensive studies of socio-economic and cultural conditions in which the socialist way of life is being shaped, more attention is being devoted to its basic components and characteristic features both as a whole and in concrete manifestations as applied to various groups of the population.

Marxist scholars studying the socialist way of life have not confined themselves to tackling the problems of the positive impact of production relations, social structure and the political system of socialism on the life of society and its members. They have also sought to show how social relations and the objective and subjective processes characteristic of socialism influence the formation and development of the socialist way of life, and what needs to be done to make this influence most progressive and fully in line with the great purpose of the new social system.

V

The socialist mode of production and the socialist way of life are being established and developed as the two world systems compete with each other. Soviet social scientists have given constant attention to studying the problems of the *present stage in the general crisis of capitalism*. They have elaborated many of these problems in close cooperation with their colleagues in the fraternal socialist countries, and this has contributed to a deeper understanding of these problems.

In analysing the stages of the general crisis of capitalism, notably, the present stage, we are guided by the Marxist-Leninist theory of the world revolutionary process. Let us recall that Maoism's pseudo-revolutionary concept denying the crucial role of economic competition between the two systems, claimed that only another world war would usher in a new stage in the general crisis of capitalism. Historical reality shows that in the postwar period the new stage in the general crisis of capitalism was conditioned not only by its internal contradictions, which had earlier led to world wars. The course of the general crisis of capitalism has been tremendously influenced by the confrontation between the two socio-economic systems—capitalism and socialism—which has generated new laws of world development. These have been expressed in the capability of the world revolutionary forces to put up an effective fight for a relaxation of international tension. Socialism and the revolutionary forces allied with it, have succeeded in dealing crushing blows at the most reactionary groupings of imperialism. Socialism has actively helped to bring down the imperialist structure of the world economy and to strengthen the new

national states and promote their development along the path of social progress. Socialism has the decisive role to play in shaping the new world economy. This is an expression of the dialectics in the competition between the two systems in peaceful coexistence.

Some tend to reduce the general crisis of the capitalist system to a crisis of state-monopoly capitalism. We hold that the crisis of the state-monopoly structure is a component part of the general crisis of capitalism. State-monopoly capitalism has failed to cope with inflation, the international monetary crisis, the energy crisis, the problems of the environment, etc. All of this is an expression of the crisis of state-monopoly capitalism, but it is also an expression of the general crisis of the capitalist social system.

Analysis of the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism is an intricate and complex topic, in which the *problem of the competition between the two systems* should be singled out in the first place. This problem is being tackled by research institutes specialising both in the economy of socialism and in the economy of capitalism. In this area, we have succeeded in reaching some essential theoretical and practical conclusions.

First, in the last few years, criteria and new methods have been formulated for a more precise comparison of the basic indices of the economic potential and economic development levels in the socialist and capitalist countries, the USSR and the USA in the first place. The volume of production and labour productivity have been compared in many branches of industry in the USSR, the USA, Japan, the FRG, Britain, and France in the same currency.

Second, various changes in the economic competition between the two systems at the present stage have been identified, showing that from its competition with capitalism in the volume of production the socialist world passes over to competition in efficiency of production, organisation and quality of goods.

Third, in analysing the problems of the competition between the two systems we have been increasingly aware of the fact that over the past decades the ruling circles of the capitalist countries have been using more flexible tactics in the class struggle, creating the impression that social problems are being tackled. In this context, on the basis of the generalised experience in the competition between the two systems the lines along which the socialist way of life has been exerting an influence on mankind's progressive development have been more clearly defined. The socialist way of life with its priority of social interests, mutual assistance of members of production collectives, the people's solidarity in pursuing their national aims and fulfilment of their internationalist duty, confidence in the future and absence of crises and inflation is becoming ever more attractive to the working people in the capitalist countries.

Fourth, now that the bourgeois "consumer society" has been hit by a profound crisis, it becomes increasingly obvious that in its competition with the advanced capitalist countries socialism has no need at all to imitate their economic structure. Marxist scholars have been purposefully working out the long-term prospects for socialism's

advance into the van of scientific and technological progress and have been studying the socio-economic premises and conditions for doing so through the use of the advantages of the planned economic system.

In the new situation, exceptional importance attaches to the concrete scientific elaboration of the problems of the relations between states of the two world systems as they move from "cold war" to détente, and as peace and the security of nations are being consolidated.

Soviet scientists and scholars have achieved tangible results in studying the causes of the ever greater *economic, social and political instability in the citadels of imperialism*, which is a characteristic feature of the deepening general crisis of capitalism at the present stage. Their analysis helps to gain a better understanding of the specific nature of the present economic crisis, the heaviest in the postwar period, which has now hit the whole capitalist world and which, in contrast to earlier crises, has, for the first time in the history of capitalism, developed against the background of inflation of unparalleled proportions in peacetime.

The impact on the course of inflation of the spiralling price hikes by the major corporations is ever more pronounced, for these giants have put on much weight in a tide of mergers and takeovers stimulated by government measures to intensify concentration and centralisation of capital.

Inflation cannot be regarded as a phenomenon confined to the monetary sphere. We regard it as an expression of the class policy of the monopoly bourgeoisie, which has been inflating prices in order to multiply its profits and nullify any wage increases and other social gains achieved by the working people in persistent class struggle.

Research has shown that the most profound energy and raw material crises could only have arisen under inflation and the arbitrary acts of international monopolies. These crises have gone beyond the limits of a phenomenon in a market situation and have become long-term factors in the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism. In particular, they have caused a heavy upheaval in the system of economic and political relations between imperialism and the developing countries, which has taken shape on the basis of neocolonialism, an upheaval that is having a substantial influence on the changing structure of the world capitalist economy.

Many groups of Soviet scientists have been carrying on complex studies of the environment and the ecological crisis as substantial factors in the aggravation of class contradictions in the advanced capitalist countries.

The profound social and economic upheavals through which capitalism is now going testify to qualitative changes in the development of its general crisis. Evidence of this also comes from the studies carried out by Marxist scholars of problems of the contemporary working-class movement in the capitalist countries. These studies are based on a comprehensive analysis of the development of the working-class movement in close interconnection with the objective economic, social and socio-psychological proces-

ses taking place in capitalist society, with the changing correlation of the class forces in the world arena, and with the new conditions of the competition and struggle between the two world systems.

Among the factors exerting a profound influence on the working-class movement Soviet scientists have emphasised the current scientific and technological revolution, its impact on the economic condition of the working class, its social development and mental make-up, working conditions and content of labour. These studies refute the inventions of bourgeois ideologists concerning the "bourgeoisification" and "deproletarianisation" of the contemporary working class and its allegedly dwindling weight and role in economic and social development. New data suggest a totally different conclusion: the main tendency of political development in the industrialised capitalist countries is the growth of the proletariat's militant class activity, extension of its demands, and turning of its struggle for the immediate interests into the movement against the entire state-monopoly system.

Soviet studies of new phenomena in the state-monopoly *regulation of the economy and social processes in the advanced capitalist countries* have provided convincing evidence that the attempts to stabilise capitalism by means of such regulation merely engenders a tangled knot of contradictions which tend to aggravate its general crisis.

In the early 1970s, successes in developing inter-state integration brought new elements of instability to the economic system of imperialism. The enlargement of the membership of the European Common Market has generated acute and long-term contradictions between the main participants of the Atlantic Alliance on monetary, market, oil, raw material and military strategy problems.

Alongside the growing integration connected with the activity of state-monopoly institutions, ever greater importance attaches to the integration of private monopoly capital which has been taking place within the framework of economic empires being set up by the multinational corporations. Acting to meet their own selfish ends, the multinationals ignore the interests not only of the countries where they have set up their subsidiaries but also those where they are based, and which are "their" countries. They have frustrated a number of measures envisaged by the state-monopoly programming of the economy, curtail production where the economic situation is unfavourable, transferring masses of capital to countries where the currency is more stable, thus causing flare-ups of the monetary crisis. Multinationals have in some cases simultaneously exported crisis and inflation, thereby intensifying the anarchy both in the economies of individual countries and in the world capitalist economy as a whole.

The interaction and interweaving of the contradictions generated by supranational state-monopoly integration with the integration which spontaneously occurs on the basis of agreements between the multinationals engenders anarchy in capitalist society in new forms.

Let us also note a number of essential changes in *inter-imperialist relations*. The formation of the three centres of modern capital-

ism — the USA, Western Europe (EEC) and Japan — means above all that the contradictions between them have been developing on an ever larger scale. The economic rivalry and competition between these three centres of capitalism has sharply intensified. An analysis of the deepening interimperialist contradictions is, naturally, inseparable from an analysis of the whole complex of interactions between the centrifugal and centripetal forces within the capitalist system. In the present conditions, interimperialist cooperation and rivalry tend to develop into an immensely more intricate system of interactions than they did at the earlier stages of the postwar US-West European relations. Today there is not only a marked intensification of centrifugal tendencies in these relations, generated by the package of old and new imperialist contradictions, but also their close interweaving with the development of the imperialist "partnership".

VI

Soviet science has also been doing important research in the *problems of the developing countries*. The disintegration of the colonial system and the emergence of dozens of new independent states in the world arena has worked a tangible change in the balance of the world forces, adding greater depth to the general crisis of capitalism. Soviet scholars have done much work in analysing the new situation. They projected the non-capitalist way of development at a time when the possibilities of this line of advancement were only to be discerned in theoretical terms. Life has borne out this forecast. A conclusion was drawn about the role of the state sector as a potentially anti-capitalist force, and this conclusion is being confirmed before our very eyes.

The imperialists' policy is designed constantly to reproduce the dependence of the Third World countries. That is the substance of the "new" international division of labour which neocolonialism seeks to establish. Efforts are being made to tie in the economy of the Third World countries to the needs of the modernising structure of the economy of the Western powers. At the same time, the need to shape an independent national economy in the developing countries calls for a fundamental change in their position within the system of the international capitalist division of labour.

The struggle between the two tendencies is the basis and substance of the present-day relations between the two groups of countries within the framework of the capitalist economic system. In the course of this struggle a new historical phenomenon has arisen, namely, the community of the developing countries' tasks in the face of imperialism and their solidarity and awareness of their unity and need for joint action. Soviet scientists and scholars believe that their duty is to analyse both the general and the particular in the developing countries in order to help consolidate their alliance with the countries of the world socialist system.

Recently, ever more importance has attached to studies of the impact exerted by the Third World on the uneven development of the capitalist countries. In the new conditions, the imperialist powers' loss of their monopoly of raw material resources should be seen as a manifestation of the uneven development of capitalism. This tends to produce a totally new balance of forces in the world economy. The dependence of the advanced capitalist countries on the developing countries for their raw material supplies is ever more pronounced.

In order to study the prospects for the further development of the Third World countries it is important to gain a correct understanding of how their social structure is shaped. Its specific features are determined by the multistructural make-up of the economy, the socio-economic backwardness, the coexistence of social entities connected with different structures, traditional and modern sectors of the economy which, in effect, belong to different epochs of world history.

In most countries which have gained independence, hegemony in the struggle for political independence has not been in the hands of the proletariat or the bourgeoisie; spokesmen for "revolutionary democracy" consisting of intermediate social forces, have acted as the leaders of the liberation movement. That is evidence of the crisis of the bourgeoisie's political positions and its inability to tackle the tasks of independent development. But this is also an expression of the weak influence being exerted by the proletariat in many Third World countries, which circumstance hampers progressive development.

The creative elaboration of questions bearing on the laws underlying the development of revolutionary democracy, its specific features, and the peculiarities of its social basis is of great practical importance for solving the problem, which is vital to the countries taking the socialist orientation, of choosing ways, methods and forms for uniting all the progressive anti-imperialist forces within the framework of a single national-democratic front and establishing cooperation between the revolutionary democrats and the communists as a necessary premise for giving greater depth to the social revolution.

An important factor for the overcoming by the developing countries of their dependent, subordinate and exploited position in the world market is their growing economic ties with the USSR and other socialist countries. Soviet scientists and scholars have been working on a scientific concept of the long-term development of these ties.

* * *

Thus, the basic conclusion which follows from the studies made by Soviet economists and other social scientists over the past few years in the problems of social development clearly shows that:

it is the Marxist-Leninist view of the contemporary epoch that most adequately reflects the actual development processes going on in the world;

it is Marxist-Leninist social science that is capable of formulating ideas which are most in tune with the present epoch;

it is Marxist-Leninist theory that is capable most successfully of formulating and solving the basic problems of today's social progress and finding the answers to the most important questions bearing on mankind's present and future.

NOTES

¹ See, in particular, O. Bogomolov, "Two Types of International Economic Integration", *Social Sciences*, No. 4(22), 1975.

² See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 29, p. 420; Vol. 30, pp. 111-113.

³ See *ibid.*, Vol. 25, p. 469.

⁴ *Ibidem.*

Socio-Economic Problems of Developed Socialism

Planned Use of Economic Laws

REM BELOUSOV

One of the main directions of perfecting the planned management of the socialist economy lies in a fuller and more comprehensive use of the objective laws of its development when elaborating and carrying out national economic plans. This is the essence of the problem of raising the scientific level of planning, which is an important requisite for increasing the efficiency of social production and intensifying its development.

As is known economic law is an essential, constantly recurrent cause-and-effect relationship between the processes and phenomena of society's economic life. However, this definition, although it discloses the most important inner and outer features of economic law, does not reflect its functional role in regulating individual sections of an economic system and ensuring its unity and integrity. This is a very important point. Lenin said that "the concept of law is one of the stages of the cognition by man of unity and connection, of the reciprocal dependence and totality of the world process".¹ This means that the regulating influence of economic law is not confined to those phenomena and processes whose interrelationship and interdependence it expresses; it embraces the entire system of production relations, determining the trends of their development.

In socialist society, it is the basic economic law² and the law of balanced, proportional development of the national economy that

R. Belousov, D. Sc. (Econ.), Professor; Head of the Chair of Scientific Management of the Socialist Economy, Academy of the Social Sciences under the CC CPSU. Author of the books *Plan, Interests, Activity of the Working People*, *Theoretical Problems of Management of the Socialist Economy* (co-author) and of the lecture series *Principles of Scientific Management of the Socialist Economy*, in two parts, and other works on problems of the political economy of socialism.

have a primary coordinating influence on production relations. However, such laws as the law of saving time, or the law of distribution according to the work done also have a considerable impact on forming and regulating the entire system of production relations under socialism.

This is confirmed by Lenin's remarks in his *conspectus of Hegel's Science of Logic*. At the place where it is said that the concept of law draws nearer to the concept of order, homogeneity and necessity, Lenin made a note in the margin: "This approximation is very important."³ From this it follows that the laws of political economy, too, express not only simple relationships, but relationships which ensure integrity, unity, order and coordination in economic development. Lenin's remark has direct bearing on the practical use of economic laws. It shows that one should not approach these laws from mechanistic positions, failing to discern the active role played by laws in regulating the economy and ensuring its integrity and proportionality behind the stable connection between two or several phenomena and processes. It also means that a violation of any one law upsets, to a certain degree, the entire economic system.

And there is another aspect that deserves attention. First, the interaction between individual economic phenomena and processes takes place along several "channels" of communication simultaneously forming a stable system of operation of economic laws, and, secondly, this interaction passes through several stages. Here one should make a distinction between the direct connections of the first stage and the feedback connections of the second. Direct connection is a cause-and-effect dependence where one phenomenon is the source of development and another — its result. Such dependence between the two extreme points is expressed by law. At the same time feedback connection emerges, as a rule, when the result influences the cause as well as other phenomena and processes. For instance, under developed commodity-money relations goods are exchanged (realised) on the basis of the equality of the socially necessary labour expenditures for their production. This dependence manifests itself as direct connection which is established as the law of value and determines the price movement. From this it follows that the price level of the given product results from the socially necessary labour expenditures for its production, with due account of its quality. In other words, there is direct connection between expenditures and price. But there is also feedback connection stemming from dependence of price on the norm of socially necessary expenditures and exerting a great influence on economic processes, necessitating a policy of economy and stimulating the growth of labour productivity.

One of the feedback connections of the law of value has a regulating influence on the structure of demand and production. The influence of these connections in a socialist economy is different from that in a capitalist economy. Under socialism, such economic relations as public ownership and planning considerably weaken the regulating role of the law of value: the proportions of the distribution

of the material and labour resources between individual industries are fixed here by planning bodies independently of the level of prices and profitability, and in accordance with the objective necessity to satisfy the socialist society's requirements as fully as possible. Of course, an optimal state is that in which the feedback connection of the law of value operates in the same direction as the law of the balanced, proportional development of the national economy. This presupposes a flexible price policy.

Why is it necessary to make a distinction between direct and feedback connections in the mechanism of operation of economic laws? The answer is that they are essentially and qualitatively different. Direct, primary connection, that is, law, is more stable; it cannot be repealed or weakened. As for feedback connection, it can, in a number of cases, be weakened or even reduced to a minimum, if this is in society's interests, by carrying out appropriate economic measures. For instance, in a planned economy one of the feedback connections of the law of demand and supply, which presupposes a rise in prices under tense commodity-money relations, is considerably weakened. This is made possible by resorting to the law of balanced, proportional development of the national economy and other economic laws of socialism. And here is another example. The feedback connection of the law of distribution according to the work done presupposes inequality in incomes per member in different families. This inequality diminishes as the social consumption funds increase, which makes it possible to equalise the incomes of members of socialist society, with due regard for the unequal number of children and pensioners in individual families.

At the same time it should be emphasised that the division of cause-and-effect connections into direct (primary) and feedback (secondary) is always concrete and therefore relative. In his letter to C. Schmidt in October 1890, F. Engels wrote about bourgeois philosophers: "What these gentlemen all lack is dialectics. They always see only here cause, there effect. That this is a hollow abstraction,... while the whole vast process goes on in the form of interaction — though of very unequal forces, the economic movement being by far the strongest, most primordial, most decisive — that here everything is relative and nothing absolute — this they never begin to see."⁴

This statement is corroborated by numerous instances. Analysing the dialectics of interconnection between economics and politics, Lenin pointed out that politics is a concentrated expression of economics, that is, politics, is ultimately determined by the production relations of the given society. However, without an active policy, without a correct political approach the working people cannot fully satisfy their economic interests and will be unable to consolidate and increase socialist property in a planned way. In this sense politics cannot but have precedence over economics.⁵

Of great importance for perfecting the methods of planning and managing the socialist economy is Lenin's thesis that law can

manifest itself in a great variety of forms, some of which, fully or partially, exclude others, or are in contradiction with one another. For example, a rise in living standards can take place in the form of a lowering of retail prices, or in the form of an increase of the monetary incomes of the population, or in the form of an expansion of the social consumption funds. It is not always possible to combine all these forms in planning, and this is completely in keeping with operation of the basic economic law of socialism. This circumstance is explained by the fact that law is a scientific abstraction which is always relatively "quieter" than the real world it reflects. "Law takes the quiescent—and therefore law, every law, is narrow, incomplete, approximate," wrote Lenin.⁶ Although law is something stable (enduring) in a phenomenon, "a phenomenon is *richer* than law";⁷ it is more varied than that stable, essential but still relatively monotonous connection which science singles out as an economic law.

Since in economic planning one often comes across a great variety of completely or partially interchangeable forms of manifestation of economic laws, economists sometimes disagree as to on what basis one should define the aims and the main directions of socialist society's economic activity over a long period of time. Some economists believe that it is necessary to use the laws of political economy, i.e., knowledge concerning the objective, essential and constantly recurring connections between the phenomena and processes of economic life. Others maintain that inasmuch as the laws of science are abstractions of a quiescent character, economic policy can actively influence only the concrete forms of their manifestation, i.e., the mechanism of their operation.

In our opinion it is incorrect to oppose these two aspects of the use of laws to each other. The laws of political economy express real, objective connections ensuring the unity, the social purposefulness and the historical conditionality of production relations. These connections manifest themselves, i.e., operate, in concrete economic forms, in their movement and changes. Therefore, it is not possible to use laws without knowing them, without defining them scientifically. At the same time it is not possible to purposefully use objective laws while ignoring the mechanism of their operation, which is a sum total of direct and feedback connections between the concrete forms of economic relations (for example, interconnections between price movement, labour productivity, average wage and net income). These relationships should be regarded as a constantly developing historical phenomenon.

The concrete forms of the operation of economic laws are characterised by certain features. First, these forms express the mechanism of the operation of not just one but of an entire system of economic laws. Inasmuch as the system of laws is dynamic, the concrete forms of their manifestation during each period of planning vary constantly. They are not so simple, not so definite as the laws themselves. For instance, the law of socialist accumulation in different socialist countries is far from simple in its manifestation: the share of accumulations in the national income and their structure

fluctuate considerably in these countries. The forms of the operation of this law also change considerably with the passage of time. Comparatively recently the bulk of capital investments in the USSR was concentrated in the heavy industry, whereas now there is a noticeable trend of increasing capital investments in industries producing consumer goods.

The multitude of forms of the operation of the basic law of socialism and other economic laws is a very important feature, which presupposes certain freedom of manoeuvring in economic policy and at the same time places great responsibility on managerial bodies entrusted with planning these forms and influencing them. As has been noted above, the concrete forms of the manifestation of a law are not only more varied, but also more contradictory than the law itself. This feature, too, explains certain characteristics of the use of economic laws in economic management.

Another feature which should be noted in an analysis of the operation of economic laws is that their form can, to some degree, deviate from their content. True, the objective laws exert the strongest regulating and stimulating influence on production relations when economic forms correspond to their content. Thus, the highest stimulating effect is produced by wages and salaries when they correspond to both the quantity and quality of expended labour. Price as a factor of the economy of expenditure of working time exerts the strongest effect when it draws as near as possible to the norm of socially necessary labour inputs.

In a number of instances, however, it may be necessary and expedient to cause a deviation of the form from the content. This may be the case where such deviation makes it possible to increase the influence of form on some bottleneck in the production process and concentrate its stimulating effect on reaching a strictly defined target. For example, it has been theoretically established and practically confirmed in the USSR that an increase in the wholesale price of new machines and equipment stimulates their producers and that during the first two or three years at least a system of economic benefits should be created for those production teams who have developed and mastered more economic means of producing high quality and more economical goods.

Here is another instance of purposeful manoeuvring of the economic form in the USSR. When managerial bodies plan the influx of manpower to the country's eastern and northern regions, they deliberately set higher wages and salaries for people working in these regions, thereby calling forth feedback connections which regulate the distribution of the country's work force along desired lines. From these instances one can draw a conclusion which is of great importance for the planned use of laws, namely, that economic laws manifest themselves as trends. This is explained by the fact that the mechanism of their operation, i.e., the forms of their manifestation and the connections between them, can essentially deviate from the initial, stable connection, which is the absolute law.

As is known, economic laws operate only in a system. There is no phenomenon or process in economic life which could be said to reflect an isolated influence of some one law. Therefore, in planned economic management it is not possible to use only one law, or even a set of laws. This would inevitably lead to one-sidedness, to disproportions and contradictions.

As said earlier, each economic law plays a part in regulating the economic system, and its violation always upsets, to a greater or lesser extent, the smooth functioning of the economy. This explains certain contradictions which some economists erroneously ascribe to the law of value or the law of demand and supply. It should be emphasised that the dependence of price on the level of socially necessary labour inputs (the law of value), and the objective necessity of coordinating effective demand with the volume of stock funds and paid services, far from contradicting, facilitate the operation of the basic economic law of socialism, the law of balanced proportional development of the national economy, the law of the growth of labour productivity, the law of distribution according to the work done, and other laws of socialism. Contradictions arising sometimes in commodity-money relations are explained, in our view, not by the operation of the law of value or the law of demand and supply but, on the contrary, by a disregard of their operation.

The economic laws of socialism are the principal guides indicating the main directions of the development of socialist economy, its basic aims both for the near and distant future; they determine economic strategy. In our opinion they are the "framework" for long-term plans. At the same time management and current planning are more closely connected with the mechanism of the operation of economic laws in their concrete forms. Planning bodies use these forms, for instance, within the lower and upper limits of the size of wages, bonuses, prices, etc. The purpose is to achieve a definite result for a definite planned period, concentrating the forces of the participants in socialist production on some of its leading sectors.

The question of *how* an economic law should be used is one of the most complicated questions in planning and one that still requires serious study. Unlike the laws of nature, the laws of social life, including economic laws, manifest themselves through the conscious activity of men. Engels wrote that "in the history of society... the actors are all endowed with consciousness, are men acting with deliberation or passion, working towards definite goals; nothing happens without a conscious purpose, without an intended aim".⁸

A close intertwining of objective and subjective factors creates a number of difficulties for a correct understanding of the mechanism of the purposeful use of economic laws in a planned economy. To examine this question and to avoid both a fetishist and subjectivist interpretation of it, it is necessary first of all to understand the essence of the concept of the objective. A characteristic feature of objective connections known in science as economic laws, consists in that they emerge, develop and wither away irrespective of human consciousness, will or desire; they are determined by the development

level of the productive forces and the state of production relations. Lenin explained that the objective in society should be taken "not in the sense that a society of conscious beings, of people, could exist and develop independently of the existence of conscious beings..., but in the sense that social being is *independent* of the social consciousness of people".⁹

Thus, in the interdependence between economics and consciousness economics is the initial, starting point. The conditions of society's material life and the laws of its development determine social consciousness, including economic planning.

However, it would be a vulgar simplification to assert that the connection between the economy and the subjective factor, including the system of planned management, is a straightforward and direct one. It is a dialectical and complex connection. It is expressed through politics, science, education and other forms of social consciousness. Economic planning as the basic instrument in the conscious use of economic laws plays a relatively independent role here, exerting an active reverse influence on social production. In a letter to J. Bloch Engels clearly defined this problem: "According to the materialist conception of history, the *ultimately* determining element in history is the production and reproduction of real life. More than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted. Hence, if somebody twists this into saying that the economic element is the *only* determining one, he transforms that proposition into a meaningless, abstract, senseless phrase."¹⁰

The fact that under socialism planning plays an active role in turning the objective necessity of planned development into reality, does not at all mean a diminishing of the role played by the objective factors or a narrowing of the sphere of their operation. Planning bodies do not limit the objective character of concrete economic laws but prevent their spontaneous manifestation.

As said earlier, economic laws operate as trends and the forms of their manifestation are not simple and may vary considerably depending on circumstances, including those of a fortuitous character. Economic planning—a conscious, subjective factor—consistently and considerably restricts the spontaneous manifestation of economic laws, although certain elements of spontaneity remain. However, as the socialist economy advances, the conscious, planned use of forms of the manifestation of economic laws becomes broader and more effective. The more correctly the management bodies evaluate the possibilities and complexities of economic growth, the better they understand both the essence and the concrete mechanism of the operation of economic laws, the wiser and sounder will be the decisions adopted, the higher the optimum level of state economic plans and the narrower the basis for the emergence of spontaneous phenomena.

The conscious and purposeful use of economic laws in planning, in the creation of material incentives and in organisation of social production is not a single act but an uninterrupted process which can conditionally be divided into several relatively independent stages.

First, it is necessary to create corresponding scientific requisites for the use of the laws, i.e., to understand their system. Lenin wrote on the subject: "For until we know a law of nature, it, existing and acting independently of and outside our mind, makes us slaves of 'blind necessity'. But once we come to know this law, which acts (as Marx repeated a thousand times) *independently* of our will and our mind, we become the masters of nature."¹¹

The first of the above-mentioned requisites is a theoretical analysis of the existing production relations and of historical practice, the purpose of which is to discover the most essential cause-and-effect connections between the phenomena and processes of economic life and quantitatively, as far as possible, to express the degree of closeness of these connections and their tendency to change. Another scientific requisite is a fairly well substantiated forecast about changes in the operation of certain laws in the future. For instance, there are grounds to believe that within the next 10 to 15 years the impact of the basic law of socialism and the law of balanced, proportional development of the national economy on social production will be greater.

This means that with the further socialisation of production and consolidation of socialist property, regulation and coordination in the development of the national economy will become more extensive and more effective, and this will be reflected in the country's high standard of living and in its continued rise. At the same time the influence of the law of value on price formation will become greater: the prices will be drawing ever closer to the level of socially necessary labour inputs. This forecast, together with scientific forecasts concerning the development trends of other economic laws, makes it possible to form a general idea about the operation of their entire system, and on this basis to foretell, with a certain degree of probability, the concrete forms of their manifestation over a long period of time.

The second stage of the use of objective economic laws is connected with social actions for which knowledge alone is not enough. There must also be a will capable of leading to these actions, and organisation ensuring their coordination and purposefulness. The possibility of displaying will and organisation in economic management is a major advantage of socialism.

The conscious use of economic laws can be passive or active. An example of a passive use of economic laws is the planning of actions of the participants in social production in such a way as to make them conform as much as possible to objective processes and become part of the planned movement. Such use of laws proceeds from a stable repetition of definite phenomena or their change, preserving or changing the causes. With a knowledge of, say, the level of socially necessary expenditures over a long period (approximately, of course), the state price-setting bodies can change the correlations and structure of planned prices.

The active use of laws has the aim of causing quantitative or qualitative changes in the final and intermediate results in the chain of

direct and reverse cause-and-effect relationships. Here politics, using the state economic development plan as an instrument shows its primacy over economics. The feedback connection between plan and laws is effected in two ways. The first consists in purposefully influencing phenomena or processes which act as a source of definite cause-and-effect relationships in the national economy. Such influence can be exerted through measures for further raising the socialisation level of production by the creation of self-supporting associations, combines, large agricultural-industrial complexes, including mixed state-cooperative enterprises; this increases the impact of the basic law of socialism, and raises the level of planning and labour productivity. An instance of the active use of economic laws is a consolidation, or weakening, of feedback connections engendered by the operation of economic laws. Thus, the creation of material incentives for work teams and individual workers to fulfil targets of the state economic plan is an important aspect of the question.

The other instance of the active use of economic laws is more complicated. It envisages an increase, or weakening, of impact of one law on the economy with the help of another law, inasmuch as all the laws act in a system, in definite unity. Men have long been using the laws of nature in this way. It is known, for example, that a body in free space falls under the force of gravity, with the acceleration of the fall subordinated to a definite objective law. However, on the strength of other laws, men can, when it is in their interests and within their powers to do so, lower the velocity of the fall of a body to the parameters they need (parachute jumping, for instance), stop it, keep it at a definite height or even make it move in the opposite direction.

Something of a similar nature goes on in the planned management of the national economy. During the almost entire postwar period (up to 1967) iron-ore mining was unprofitable: the wholesale price did not compensate for production expenditures. In these conditions the feedback connection of the law of value demanded a curtailment of the volume of production of iron ore. However, the planning bodies, on the basis of the law of balanced, proportional development of the national economy, instead of curtailing, envisaged an expansion of iron-ore mining, and thus raised it to the world's highest level.¹²

Such examples confirm the Marxist thesis that only under socialism "will man himself, with full consciousness, make his own history—only from that time will the social causes set in movement by him have, in the main and in a constantly growing measure, the results intended by him".¹³

In formulating its economic policy the CPSU aims at making the concrete forms of production relations under socialism—wages, profit, credit, autonomous economic accounting, etc.—reflect to the greatest possible extent their essence, i.e., the direct stable connections and dependence that have emerged between the social owners of the means of production. At the same time, the centring of economic interests in concrete tasks (stimulation of scientific and technological progress, evening up the living standards of all sections of the population, consolidation of the alliance between the working class

and peasants) makes it necessary to consciously deflect these forms from their content, which, as a rule, increases the regulating or stimulating function of feedback connections. However, the limits of such deflections are determined by the interests of each of the contracting parties in production relations—producers and consumers.

The principal sphere of the conscious use of the objective economic laws in managing socialist production is planning, including forecasting and the creation of material incentives. Here are great possibilities for perfecting the mechanism of the use of laws.

The perfection of the forms of the conscious use of economic laws is a major problem and in recent years it has become an especially urgent one. To handle it correctly it is necessary to conduct a large-scale programme of fundamental and applied research in this field.

NOTES

- ¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol.38, pp. 150-151.
- ² The basic economic law of socialism is a law of advancing the socialist economy which aims at ensuring the well-being and allround development of all members of society, and fully satisfying their constantly growing material and cultural requirements. This is being achieved through the steady growth and improvement of socialist production on the basis of scientific and technological progress.— *Ed.*
- ³ *Ibid.*, p. 185.
- ⁴ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, p. 495.
- ⁵ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 83.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. 38, p. 151.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 152.
- ⁸ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Op. cit.*, pp. 365-366.
- ⁹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 325.
- ¹⁰ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Op. cit.*, p. 487.
- ¹¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 190.
- ¹² In 1967 the price of iron ore was raised from 3.4 rubles to 7.65 rubles per ton, in accordance with the operation of the law of value.
- ¹³ F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 336.

Socio-Economic Problems of Developed Socialism

The Integrated Approach to Improving Economic Planning and Management

NIKOLAI FEDORENKO

Among the characteristic features of life in the Soviet Union today one finds the steady increase in the scale of economic activity, rapid structural change in production, the growing requirements of the population both in volume and variety and the increasing impact of social and scientific and technological factors upon the economy. All this demands, as the Communist Party of the Soviet Union points out, a radical improvement in the quality of economic management, a substantial increase in the Soviet economy's efficiency, making it better and smoother functioning and the pursuance of a consistent policy aimed at the allround intensification of social production.

In preparing their recommendations for improving economic planning and management, Soviet economists concentrate on the promoting accelerated rates of national economic development, scientific and technological progress, and more efficient social production and ensuring, on this basis, a rapid and steady rise in the well-being of the Soviet people. Both in theory and in practice priority is given to improving the most important sectors of national economic planning. As the country's economy undergoes structural change and its individual elements become more interdependent, the integrated approach to planning and the adoption of crucial national economic decisions grows in importance. Experience has furnished convincing

N. Fedorenko, Academician, Academic Secretary of the Economics Division, USSR Academy of Sciences, Director of the Central Institute of Economics and Mathematics, USSR Academy of Sciences, Editor-in-Chief of the journal Economics and Mathematical Methods, State Prize Winner. Author of the books: Economics and Mathematics, Mathematics and Elaboration of the System of the Optimal Functioning of the Economy; Problems of the Economics of the Industry of Organic Synthesis.

proof of the beneficial results and efficacy of such an approach. Currently in the Soviet Union an in-depth elaboration is being made of a considerable number of long-term individual programmes and their coordination with the general plans for the country's economic development. Solutions are being sought for a whole number of theoretical and practical questions, pertaining to the further improvement of the organisational structure of national economic management, the functioning mechanism, the provision of material incentives and the wider involvement of the working people in managing economic affairs.

All this demonstrates time and again the need for systems approach to improving planning and management of a socialist economy, including reciprocally interdependent elements of this process like forecasting, planning, the structural organisation of the planned economic management and the creation of the appropriate technical and material and information basis.

IMPROVING THE METHODOLOGY OF NATIONAL ECONOMIC PLANNING

The integrated approach to the elaboration of national economic development plans attaches increasing importance in view of the greater influence social, scientific and technological factors have on the economic development of socialist society.

One solution to this crucial problem could be the comprehensive planning system being worked out at the Central Economico-Mathematical Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, based on the generalisations drawn from the planning experience accumulated so far in the Soviet Union. This system is intended to achieve such an improvement of national economic planning methodology and techniques which ensures a synthesis of the target and resource aspects of the plan, a coherent fusion of scientific and technological progress planning, production and the functioning of the economic mechanism, the extension of the scope of planning and the transfer of the planning system to a new scientific and technological basis employing economico-mathematical methods and models and computers.

The point of departure in national economic planning are the goals of social development formulated in the policy documents of the CPSU. At the initial phase of the planning process they are specified in the objectives of the national plan of economic development, which are worked out on the basis of comprehensive socio-economic and scientific and technological forecasts.

Multi-period forecasts for national economic development are an integral part of socialist planning. As CC CPSU General Secretary L. I. Brezhnev indicated, improving the methods of national economic planning "must rest on a more precise study of social requirements, on scientific forecasts of our economic possibilities, on allround analysis and evaluation of different variants of decisions, and of their

immediate and long-term consequences".¹ The thesis that there is an organic relationship between socio-economic, scientific and technological forecasting and the entire centralised planning system has been substantiated in a comprehensive and profound way in Party and Government documents and in the works of prominent economic executives and scientists. This conclusion is confirmed by the objective conditions of the Soviet economy's development and the entire experience of socialist planning. The effectiveness of the Marxist-Leninist economic theory lies precisely in the fact that it did and does allow the main contours of the future to be predicted on the basis of those regularities in the development of society that have been discovered.

Forecasting helps predict and elaborate not only different variants of development of production complexes but also their interaction with scientific and technological progress, the demographic, social and political processes and changes in the natural environment.

It should be borne in mind that the possibilities of long-term scientific and technological planning are relatively limited because, by its very nature, this process contains an element of uncertainty. One could, for example, plan for the introduction of inventions but to plan for inventions as such would, perhaps, be a task too difficult to handle. At the same time the socio-economic consequences of scientific and technological progress are having an ever greater impact, with the more efficient use of production resources through the employment of achievements in science and technology providing the main source of economic development. In these circumstances scientific and technological forecasting is one of the main prerequisites for drawing up sound plans for national economic development. Another factor enhancing the role of forecasting is that the consequences of planning decisions are becoming increasingly diverse and more far-reaching.

All this also increases the role of forecasting as an indispensable prerequisite of national economic planning and as an integral part of the entire system of the socialist economy's planned management.

Definite practical results have been obtained, in the first place, in the medium-term forecasting during the preparation of scientific materials for five-year plans, in particular, for the 1971-1975 national economic development plan. The Central Economico-Mathematical Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Research Institute of Economics under the USSR State Planning Committee and a number of other research centres have accumulated positive experience in this field. Considerable effort was put into drawing up numerous long-term forecasts as elements in elaborating the national economic development plan which is to extend until 1990. This exceedingly complicated task had its share of difficulties and problems. Here are the most important of them. Whereas in medium-term prognostication economic forecasts (rates of growth, structure of production, reproduction of fixed assets and labour resources, the dynamics and structure of consumption, the development of branches of production and economic areas, external economic ties), could in large measure

be drawn up independently, long-term prognostication puts in the forefront social and scientific and technological forecasts that must serve as a basis for economic forecasts, and calls for a comprehensive solution of its problems.

The "genetic" approach, and the extrapolation method as a variant, applicable in medium-term forecasting within definite, strictly defined limits, can only be used in long-term forecasting to a very minor extent. In the latter case, the main role should belong to the so-called "normative-objective" approach consisting in determining possible ways, means and time-limits for the attainment of major socio-economic goals of the country's development, with the scientifically-established consumption norms being taken into account. A wider scope of forecasting makes this approach, objectively, all the more important. It is obvious that this approach is in no way identical to subjectivism since the objectives are derived from the objective conditions of socio-economic development.

Improvement of national economic forecasting raises a series of important organisational problems and calls, in particular, for a better coordination of the work of planning and economic agencies so as to make forecasting an integral part of the national economic planning and management system.

Forecasts should provide the information necessary for formulating the objectives of the plan, specifying the social development goals for a given period. The objectives of the plan are checked for consistency, coordinated and dovetailed in priorities, all of which allows the purposes pursued in the plan to be represented in a certain pattern ("tree") to serve as a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of both the comprehensive programmes and the national economic development plan as a whole.

Composing a system of purposes should be concluded with the justification of the desired level of realisation of some purpose or other, with due regard for the productive resources necessary to this end.

The objectives of the plan provide an orientational framework for the elaboration of nationwide intersectoral programmes, i. e., large-scale comprehensive measures which are coordinated as regards time, resources and executors and which cover a number of economic sectors and areas and ensure the solution of the most important socio-economic tasks.

Comprehensive planning implies, first, a close coordination of the target and resource aspects of the plan and, second, the adoption of a wider planning horizon as well as ensuring continuity between the long-term, medium-term and current plans. The national economic development plans are called upon to provide for those levels of production and distribution (in terms of volume and time) which can ensure the most effective attainment of the country's socio-economic development goals. This has always been the planning agencies' main task. Today, however, with the present complexity, magnitude and rate of change in social and economic relations, technique and production technology, a radical improvement in planning methodolo-

gy and the consistent application of the programme-objective principle in planning and managing the national economy is indispensable.

Comprehensive national economic programmes are used to coordinate the key objectives of the plan and the production resources necessary for their achievement. These programmes, which are elaborated within the framework of the plan, must become the most important means for the balanced introduction of scientific and technological achievements into production and an effective instrument of socio-economic policy.

The decisions of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government regarding the key economic problems, such as the development of agriculture, the extensive use of chemicals and so on, are, in fact, examples of such programmes. At present, efforts are being concentrated on elaborating a uniform methodology for drawing up such programmes and for making them an integral part of the national economic plan.

It is important to bear in mind, however, that the planned management of resource production cannot be organised other than in conformity with the technological specifics of production which determine the division of the national economy into branches, as well as the formation and specialisation of economic areas. The initial information about the production resources and the designation of directive plan targets should conform to the sectoral and territorial structures of the economy. That is why the production-technological structure of the national economy calls for a further development and improvement in the sectoral and territorial principles of planning and not for their rejection which is often associated, without any ground whatsoever, with the introduction of the programme-objective approach.

At the present stage in history, the country's development goals are so diverse that their direct reflection in the sectoral and territorial structures, with the indication of priority sectors and areas is becoming increasingly difficult. As a way out, we would suggest that the programme-objective approach be combined with the sectoral aspect within a single system of elaboration of national economic development plans, supported by appropriate measures to improve the organisational structure of planning and management.

This combination can be effected on the basis of the socio-economic aims of the country's development as specified in the programmes, determining to a considerable extent the volume and structure of the final social product. This should be the basis for planning and balancing output patterns and for elaborating the territorial aspect of the plan.

The integrated approach to planning presupposes not only a fuller coverage and account of the complex interconnections between the processes planned but also an overall expansion of the horizons of national economic planning. Elaborating the USSR's 1976-1990 long-term national economic development plan has demonstrated the need to ensure the methodological continuity and reciprocal

dovetailing of three types of plans: long-term, five-year and annual. This task is solved, within the comprehensive planning system, in the following way.

The long-term plan (for 15 years), whose main parameters of management consist in the planning of scientific and technological progress and social development, is elaborated once every five years and includes provisions for the main directions of development for the coming five-year period. The five-year plan is the main element of nationwide planning. Its main parameters of management are investment and the functioning of the economic mechanism. Its division into one-year plans provides the framework for current planning. Thus, planning for a full cycle is effected once every five years, which ensures the regular continuation of the long-term plan and its specification in five- and one-year plans. The five-year plan is given a more detailed form, in terms of a wider spectrum of indicators, in the annual plans, which are the responsibility of the ministries and departments of the Union republics. When drawing up a state budget it is also necessary to tie in these indicators as regards material and technical supply. However, the overall balancing of short-term plans as concerns the indicators of a five-year plan is to be ensured by the USSR State Planning Committee.

It stands to reason, however, that the work aimed at improving the planned management of the national economy can only give the desired effect if it results in the planning system being transferred to a modern scientific and technological basis by employing economic-mathematical methods and models and computers.

Let us dwell on the situation in this field.

The development of the socialist economy and the determination of the main indicators of reproduction at the initial and terminal stages of the elaboration of the national economic plan can be successfully forecast with the aid of various types of macro-economic models which reflect quantitative relationships between the key indicators of reproduction and permit assessing the dynamics of national income, the factors of its growth and distribution for consumption and accumulation and so on.

During the last five or seven years macro-economic models have been tested in elaborating variants of medium-term and long-term forecasts and plans by a number of the country's scientific organisations. The most notable achievements in this field are the use of multi-factor models of economic growth (macro-economic production functions) and models of the optimal distribution of the national income or final product for consumption and accumulation.

Multi-factor models make it possible to determine and give a long-term assessment of the sources for production expansion and at the same time to take account of the expenditure of live and materialised labour. This approach conforms to the directive of the 24th Congress of the CPSU to the effect that "a substantial increase of output and of the national income per unit of labour and material and financial inputs should be achieved. That, in the final analysis, is what raising the productivity of social labour amounts to".²

The range of models employed includes the intersectoral balance of production and distribution. This model allows the magnitude of gross output to be calculated for any given final product and the necessary investment and labour resources to be fixed for each specific branch of production.

Optimisation models based on the intersectoral balance help to solve the converse task, i.e., to calculate the maximum magnitude of the final product that is possible with the given volume of investment and labour resources. The intersectoral balance of production and distribution has long since been developed and used in planning. It has not yet become, however, an integral part of the technology of national economic planning though the problem of its introduction still remains relevant. Of extreme importance is, in particular, the elaboration of current and planned regional balances and their coordination with the national intersectoral balances.

At present there is a real way for the elaboration and practical use of optimisation models in drawing up the long-term national economic development plan for 1976-1990 on the basis of a multistage complex of optimisation economic-mathematical models. This way is to embrace three levels: the branch of production, the national economic complex (group of industries), the national economy as a whole. A model is to be developed for each of the levels and, in combination, such models should form a single system of optimisation. All these calculations, when correctly organised and mutually tied in, will make it possible to obtain a more balanced and efficient variant of the national economic development plan.

The experience so far accumulated in theoretical and experimental research has provided the basis for the Central Economico-Mathematical Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Main Computer Centre and the Main Department of Long-Term Planning of the USSR State Planning Committee to jointly participate in preparing the USSR's long-term national economic development plan for 1976-1990.

Soviet economists have also solved a number of fundamental problems as regards the method of studying and planning people's welfare, which have not only theoretico-methodological value but are also of great practical significance in the system of national economic management.

A complex of models has been developed describing the distribution processes that take place in the socialist society and permitting the solution of a wide range of planning-economic tasks in regulating labour remuneration and planning income distribution. These include income and wage formation models, the models for the distribution of social consumption funds, demand formation models and others. They have already been put to good use in forecasting the growth of incomes and wages up to 1990.

The problem of consumption and demand has been intensively researched. A methodology for forecasting demand and trade turnover has been developed based on the combined use of statistical and normative information. Depending on the prescribed planned and

normative indicators (incomes, rational consumption norms for various goods), such models allow several variants of a future development of consumption and demand to be obtained and compared with the planned objectives and the available resources.

Considerable progress has been made in employing economic-mathematical methods in planning the material and technical supply. This is a problem to which the agencies of the USSR State Supply Committee pay serious attention. As early as 1972, with the aid of these methods and computers a freight shipment scheme was devised involving 601 million tons of produce, saving a considerable sum of 59.4 million rubles on transportation services. It has now been proposed that such a scheme be worked out for 1,000 million tons of bulk goods. The anticipated saving in this case would reach 90 to 100 million rubles and release 25,000 railway cars. The USSR State Supply Committee is currently engaged in working out an optimum allocation scheme for supply orders which is also expected to yield a significant effect.

An impressive volume of scientific material has now been accumulated providing a basis for a wider practical employment of economic-mathematical methods in supply planning: stock planning and control, finding rational proportions between two forms of supplying the consumers (directly from producers or from warehouses), calculating delivery schedules and so on.

It should be noted that the macro-economic and balance models, though very valuable both theoretically and practically, cannot in themselves be used for solving the problem of multiple variants in economics, or the multitude of possible alternatives in economic development, which the growing complexity of the structure of production and requirements give rise to. The planners have always had the problem of choosing the best possible plan variant. But the lack of methods for accurately describing the numerous economic alternatives and the lack of the necessary technical means for processing information were a serious handicap to accurate quantitative comparisons of plan variants. The properties of macro-economic and balance models, determined by their mathematical structure, are such that, whether the variants are compared or not, the solution, in fact, solely depends on the initial information (for example, the given volume and structure of the final product).

Solving the problem of multiple variants—optimising planning—involves describing the multitude of possible alternatives for the development and functioning of the national economy and its individual cells, with varying degrees of aggregation and with due regard for the long-run consequences of their interaction with social and ecological processes. It also involves determining the comparable quantitative characteristics of the elements of this multiplicity. This task arises at every level of the national economic structure—from the country's economy as a whole down to the primary production unit.

At present, *optimal* planning models for individual economic cells, above all industries and industrial associations, have found wide

application. They have, however, one common drawback in that the most important information that has to be used in such models autonomously (volume of investment, output assignments, prices, and so on) is in large measure determined without the use of optimisation methods.

Analysis of theoretical results and of attempts to use optimisation models has prompted an increasing number of researchers and practical workers to conclude that an optimal national economic planning system for a socialist economy can only be worked out if the economy is viewed as a single, integral organism having a hierarchical organisation. The economic-mathematical trend has definite achievements with regard to elaborating procedures for coordinating individual planning solutions within the optimal planning system. However, the latter's "technology" is so complicated that its full practical realisation will not be possible until some time later.

IMPROVING THE MECHANISM OF ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT

An essential feature of the integrated approach to improving the socialist economy is that the problems both of a further improvement of the mechanism by which it functions and those pertaining to a further development of the planning systems are regarded as a single whole, in conformity with the "single organism" concept of the national economy.

A point of principle that emerges in solving the problem of optimising the components of the above-mentioned mechanism is the need to take into consideration the existence of the organic unity between them and the centrally established plan. The economic valuations are determined quantitatively (as demonstrated both in theory and by experimental calculations) by proportions laid down in the optimal national economic development plan and they can be used to promote its effective realisation.

Analysis of the task of optimising the economic mechanism of management shows that questions like improving the price system, economic accounting, the finance and credit mechanism, the charges for the use of productive resources, the organisational structure of our economy and improving the relations between self-supporting units and planning agencies should be regarded as being interconnected and interdependent. Such an approach allows one to see more clearly the way in which, for example, the self-financing system may result in lower rates of economic development when there is no well-developed and effective credit mechanism.

A vast amount of work has been done in recent years by the agencies responsible for the state of affairs in planned price formation. The result was the introduction in 1967 of a reform of wholesale prices which was followed by a number of steps to coordinate prices existing in various industries. But it should be acknowledged, however, that the existing price system is still not

good enough to meet the present-day tasks of economic development and, what is more important, the tasks of stimulating technological progress. Besides, the prices do not adequately reflect the national benefit to be derived from using new types of material, machinery and equipment.

To remove these shortcomings, it is very desirable that the following principle be observed in fixing prices: the price level for new products should be directly related to *the economic effectiveness of their use in the national economy*. Prices should not only reflect the direct costs of production but also product use efficiency in the various spheres of activity and by the various users. It is only in this way that prices can fulfil their function as economic levers for an effective distribution of production resources, act as a barrier to their irrational use and become a *truly national-economic yardstick* for the economic evaluation of products.

It should be noted here that the theory of optimal price formation, far from denying the need, as its critics erroneously believe, for the costs of production to be thoroughly taken into account in fixing prices, gives quite definite recommendations with regard to improving the existing methods of cost calculation for the purposes of planned price formation. Let us consider two of the most important aspects of cost calculation in this context—anticipated (incremental) costs as the basis of price-fixing and the need for a fuller calculation of the social costs of individual types of products.

One of the fundamental tenets of the Marxist-Leninist theory of value is the notion of socially necessary costs of *reproduction* as the basis for calculating the value of products and their price. This tenet acquires a special relevance today when, under the impact of the accelerated rates of scientific and technological progress, the quantitative gap between the *past* costs of production and the *anticipated* costs of *reproduction* in the planned period becomes ever more significant. If the rates of technological progress and change in costs in various industries were similar this gap could be ignored. But it is not so in reality, and thus an orientation on past costs in price-fixing may heavily distort, in present-day conditions, the level of socially necessary costs of reproduction.

The policy of stimulating the intensification of production calls for the universal application of the principles of *efficiency and returns*, which could be best implemented through the credit form of resource distribution, for the latter alone really places on the ministries, associations and enterprises material responsibility for the use of the means at their disposal in a rational way. But capital investment is still distributed mainly through budget financing. Besides, the procedure for the distribution of bank loans does not sufficiently take into account the efficiency of various economic projects, which results in credit dispersion. Loans are repaid by enterprises, in fact, out of their free profits left, which, coupled with a low rate of interest, practically nullifies the advantages offered by the credit form of resource distribution.

Special attention needs to be devoted, in this connection, to improving the system of charges for the use of production assets and the amortisation policy. It is necessary to establish the same rate of charge, be it for the use of assets or for loans. And whatever source of investment the enterprise may decide to resort to, a loan from the state budget or its own expansion fund, the charge for the use of production assets, just as the rate of interest, should characterise the minimal national economic demands as regards the efficiency with which the accumulation fund is to be used. A procedure should be established for levying separate charges for the use of new production assets and those which have already been functioning for some time with due regard for the degree of their obsolescence.

The problem of the economic evaluation of natural resources—land, forests, water and mineral deposits—is closely related to the whole range of questions pertaining to economic management of technological progress and its stimulation.

One result of the mammoth growth of the country's industrial potential is that agricultural land is taken out of production to meet the needs of industrial construction, for building transport arteries, hydroelectric power stations and other projects. It is necessary for designing organisations to evaluate the damage sustained by the economy through the loss of agricultural land. The question of a procedure whereby the monetary value of such lands would be fully included in techno-economic calculations to justify new projects deserves a special study. The economic evaluation of such lands is also necessary for choosing technical development variants and stimulating the rational use of natural resources.

One of the main consequences of technological progress is the substitution of machines for labour. It is extremely important to correctly estimate the expenditure of live labour thus displaced, for it bears closely on the introduction of new original machine designs. Should the estimates of the labour savings be too low, the cost of the machines outweighs the saving of labour, resulting in their introduction being hampered despite the saving in labour, they provide for the economy as a whole. As a result, the investment seems inefficient, is therefore not made, and the rates of production automation and mechanisation slow down.

In calculating the efficiency of new technology the saving of labour is taken to be equivalent to wages plus deductions for social insurance. This results in an underestimation of the efficiency of mechanisation especially in labour-intensive branches and spheres and in sparsely populated areas, i. e., where it is needed the most.

In our view, it is necessary to introduce a system of differentiated rates of compensation for the expenditures made by society on the use of labour resources in the areas with surplus labour and in those experiencing a great labour shortage. These rates should also take into account the level of skills. The compensation sums might add to the

budget of a special all-Union agency responsible for additional retraining and redistribution of labour resources and for creating the conditions necessary to regulate migration flows into areas experiencing labour shortages.

With a view to a further development and strengthening of the system of full-scale economic accounting we deem it necessary to carry out a number of measures designed to bring into a closer relationship the method for the economic justification of technical solutions and that for the evaluation of the efficiency of enterprises and industries run on the economic accounting basis. The first thing it is necessary to do, is to discontinue reliance on the multitude of existing asset-forming factors (the volume of produce to be realised, profit, level of profitability, labour productivity and so on). The asset-forming indicator of the work of industrial associations (enterprises) should be one explicitly reflecting the magnitude of the economic effect produced by the development, production and use of the product and the efficiency or profit of the production unit operating on the economic accounting basis, given the restrictions (as regards nomenclature and other indicators) laid down in the centralised plan.

It is desirable that the government-established indicators should include assignments as regards the key range of output, the basic economic ties with suppliers and users, including contract building organisations, the commissioning of production capacities at the expense of centralised investment, contributions to be made to the state budget. The rates of payment for the use of assets, labour and natural resources, interest on credit, prices on the main types of product, tariffs and wage scales should also be fixed centrally.

It is extremely important to ensure a long-time character of all planned economic normatives. This will create conditions for the industrial associations realistically to evaluate the results of measures which have an economic effect during a number of years and to show concern for the prospects of their technical and economic development.

Large-scale industrial and scientific-industrial associations are now becoming the main links in managing technological progress and current production as a whole: these are responsible to the state for the full satisfaction of the national economy's requirements in their products, improvement of the technological standards and quality of the latter, modernisation of their production capacities and renewal of their output range.

It is desirable to give these associations wider discretion in disposing of material and financial resources so as to create the conditions necessary for their most efficient operation and raise their sense of responsibility for the results of their activities. They should be allowed to freely dispose of depreciation allowances for capital repairs and the complete replacement of the fixed assets, and also to

retain a share of profit large enough to enable them to develop normally above all out of their own resources.

Automated planning and management systems (AMS) are to play a major role. They represent a new, progressive form of management organisation based on a radical improvement in the methodology of solving planning and economic problems, the technology of management operations and information supply.

A number of the country's research centres have prepared manuals for the development of AMS, which contain details of their formulation and the principles to be observed in setting up and organising such systems and procedures for developing them and regulating the relations between enterprises and research establishments. This signifies an important step forward in regularising research and work in developing AMSs.

AMSs were mainly developed for solving management's economic planning and organisational problems. Automated technological management systems (ATMS) were developed quite separately from the latter. At present, the task of integrating the ATMS into a single automated system is being successfully fulfilled.

Two important points have been experimentally proved in developing and setting up AMSs. First, the efficiency of using economico-mathematical methods and computers is the greater the more complicated are the problems to be solved. Second, the introduction of the AMSs at the enterprise level should conform to the requirements of establishing a single nationwide automated system (SNAS). This determines the importance of introducing economico-mathematical methods into planning and management.

The development of AMSs should largely be oriented towards solving complex optimisation problems, and towards working out optimal economic solutions in planning. This is to be the main guideline in using economico-mathematical methods and computers in management.

The establishment of automated systems in the country's central planning and economic bodies will be of extreme importance for improving the national economy's planned management system. The quality of the decisions adopted by these organs greatly influences the efficiency with which socialist society's productive resources are used. The automated economic projecting systems (AEPS) at the USSR State Planning Committee and the state planning committees of the Union republics are the most important of these systems. They are national economic planning systems making wide use of economico-mathematical methods and models and computers. In the final analysis, AEPSs are oriented towards developing an optimal national economic planning system and should be based, methodologically, on a comprehensive planning system whose main features have been described above. Developing AEPSs will require the planning bodies and scientific research centres' coordinated efforts based on a single theoretical and methodological concept of planning.

* * *

The main trends in the work to further develop the planning and management theory are now absolutely clear. There can be no doubt that the systems approach to economic management, methods of programme-objective planning and economic-mathematical modelling are the most important trends in research holding out the promise of reliable practical results in the vitally important field of national economic planning and management. It is also obvious, however, that there are still many "white spots" in the field of economic-mathematical research. A concerted and coordinated effort by the entire, many thousand strong, detachment of Soviet economists to further improve the theoretical foundation of modern economic planning and management may significantly contribute to a more effective and speedier application of scientific achievements.

NOTES

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, 1971, Moscow, 1971, p. 80.

² Ibid., p. 67.

Socio-Economic Problems of Developed Socialism

The Socialist Way of Life as a Socio-Economic Category

EVGENY KAPUSTIN

The creation of developed socialism in the USSR and the building of such a society in other countries of the socialist community, the scientific and technological revolution and its impact on socialist society, and the ideological struggle between the two world systems have made the question of the socialist way of life extremely topical and drawn to it the attention of representatives of all the social sciences.

For a long time economists endeavoured to confine the question of the socialist way of life to the range of issues united in the concept "standard of living". However, they increasingly felt that concept's limitations and much too narrow framework. This was seen in bold relief in the attempts to work out mathematical models of the phenomena included in the concept "standard of living". It was found that the formalised economic models of the standard of living had the fundamental shortcoming since they did not take into account the social, political and other superstructural phenomena that mirror the manifold conditions of the life of society and of the life of the individual in that society. Without taking this into account it is impossible to forecast society's advancement adequately and to draw up long-term plans for the development of socio-economic relations.

E. Kapustin, D. Sc. (Econ.), Director of the Institute of Economics, USSR Academy of Sciences, Professor of Moscow University. Specialises in problems of the political economy of socialism. Author of the monographs: The Quality of Labour and Wages, Methodological Problems of the Economics of Labour, and of a number of text-books on political economy (in co-authorship), and of other scientific works.

Indicators of the living standard give a more or less comprehensive idea of the actual incomes of the population and its consumption of material goods and services. They mirror the size of the national income and the consumption fund as a whole and in terms of per capita; the size of the population's nominal and real incomes and its consumption (all and individual material values, including housing and services — medicare, education, and so on); the length of the working day and leisure time; the structure of the population's incomes and expenditures; the pattern of consumption; the differentiation in the population's incomes and expenditures by social and professional groups, by town and countryside, by regions and so forth; differentiation in consumption per person and per family by the size of incomes, by regions and so on; longevity, population increment and other demographic indicators, and the dynamic of all these indicators.

Some economists contend that the concept "standard of living" also shows the extent the population's requirements are satisfied. However, this can only be done by comparing the living standard with some norm, for it is extremely difficult to work out such a norm, a task that is still far from being carried out. Today we can compare the level of the consumption of material goods and services with scientific norms of consumption. These norms give an approximate idea of rational consumption ensuring the necessary conditions for the reproduction of labour power and the development of the individual with account of society's possibilities of satisfying the requirements of its members in each given period. These norms are founded, first, on scientific recommendations on the consumption of food required for man's normal physical development with account of the specific conditions of his life (sex, age, region, national food specifics, and so on) and the full restoration of the energy expended in the process of labour depending on its conditions and difficulty; second, on a study of the budgets of families with different income levels; and, third, on present-day notions about the rational consumption of clothes, footwear, household and cultural goods with account of scientific norms of wear.

There is today no other basis for determining the extent the requirements of various groups of the population are satisfied. The ideal could be norms that would not be influenced by society's possibilities for satisfying the requirements of its members in the immediate future. Present-day norms are, of course, to some extent under that influence. It is unquestionably possible and even necessary to make an analytical comparison of the consumption level of the population of a given country with other countries or a given group of the population, and also of the average level of consumption in a country as a whole with the consumption of high-income groups of the population, but this method will hardly give a sufficiently complete picture of the extent requirements are satisfied.

Thus, if in the system of quantitative indicators of the "living standard" we include a comparison of the achieved actual level of consumption with norms, we shall receive what is still a far from accurate idea of the extent the requirements of the population are

satisfied. All this, needless to say, does not exclude but, on the contrary, requires the elaboration of a special indicator of the satisfaction of the people's effective demand. This is particularly necessary in planning.

However, the concept "standard of living" is clearly inadequate for a full and comprehensive characteristic of man's condition in society, his physical and cultural development, his purposes and methods of achieving these purposes. For instance, this concept cannot without stretching a point include such an important aspect of man's life as his satisfaction with his labour. Yet this satisfaction, the possibility of expressing oneself as an individual in the results of one's work, to obtain not only the right to a certain sum of consumer values, but also a definite moral and creative satisfaction, is particularly important under developed socialism.

The unhampered and guaranteed possibility of creatively applying one's capabilities is not a secondary but the prime feature of man's life in a socialist society. However, this indicator of the life of the individual and of society as a whole can be included in the concept "standard of living" only with considerable reservations. This fully applies also to the character and content of labour, to the characteristic of its socio-economic heterogeneity, to the incentives that attract man to labour, and so on. Besides, this would then be not the same concept and it would be necessary to look for a suitable term to express the spectrum of indicators that are today united in this formula.

For that reason, parallel with the fairly definite concept "standard of living", it would be expedient to adopt a much broader formula — "way of life" and "socialist way of life". To a large extent this meets with the aim of socialist production formulated in the basic economic law of socialism and covering not only the fullest satisfaction of physical and cultural requirements but also, the harmonious development of the individual; but this cannot be fully included in the concept "standard of living".

An analysis of the substance of socialism's basic economic law and the all-sided characterisation of the aim of socialist production are inconceivable without the use of such a socio-economic category as the socialist way of life. Without this category one cannot have a thorough understanding of the operation of the law of balanced development that brings into the sphere of planning not only the development of the productive forces but also socio-economic relations, of whose progress the socialist way of life, its formation and improvement, is a major summarised indicator.

Without an account of this category the planning of socio-economic relations under developed socialism cannot be complete either. Directly linked with it are the operation of the law of distribution according to work and the development of distribution in the form of social funds of consumption, for all forms of distribution are directly mirrored in man's way of life, and this cannot be ignored. The socio-economic concept of the "socialist way of life" is thus an inalienable element of the political economy of socialism.

Interest in the elaboration of question relating not only to the standard of living but also to the Soviet man's way of life was heightened considerably with the drawing up of long-term plans of the Soviet Union's socio-economic development. Medium-term (five years) and, especially, long-term plans provide for the growing consumption of material goods, and create the conditions for the harmonious development of the Soviet citizen, for the formation of the socialist way of life. Moreover, society's possibilities to ensure this formation increase considerably with the development of social production, with the enhancement of its efficiency, with the growing possibilities of satisfying the population's requirements more fully.

The heightened interest in the question of the socialist way of life is also due to the need for exposing the attempts of bourgeois propaganda and Right-wing revisionism to idealise and embellish the "welfare state", "consumer society", the "American way of life" and so on, and, at the same time, maliciously distort the way of life under socialism. This chorus has been joined by "Left" revisionism, which endeavours to portray socialism as a society of universal levelling and asceticism.

The concepts "way of life" and "socialist way of life" are extremely complex and many-faceted because they embrace all the aspects—material, spiritual and social—of man's life. For that reason the formulation of these concepts, as the study of the problems of the socialist way of life, can be fruitful only with the participation in this work of the representatives of all the social sciences.

The attempts to tackle this task from the positions of a definite science are also important. Although this does not ensure a comprehensive study, it allows synthesising the results of research by representatives of different social sciences and thus working out a common formula giving an all-sided characteristic of this concept.

Without claiming to the solution of the question of the socialist way of life as a whole, we should like to approach it from the standpoint of the political economy of socialism and thereby attempt to define its economic aspects. We have in mind precisely the economic aspect of this category and not the economic basis of the socialist way of life. To show the economic basis of the socialist way of life means to set forth the entire sum of socialist relations of production with all their economic laws and categories. Attempts of this kind will evidently yield little because they do not and cannot give anything new compared with existing descriptions of socialist relations of production. The way of life is a synthetic concept that covers many economic and superstructural indicators and gives an additional, extremely important characteristic of the given socio-economic system.

An independent study of the economic aspect of this question is also justified because the various aspects of the way of life are not of equal value. In the given question the economic aspect is the determining factor, although there is no direct connection between a person's economic status in society and his way of thinking or purposes. Had there been we would not have been able to note

innumerable facts showing how man's spiritual development lags behind his economic condition. "Human psychology," Leonid Brezhnev pointed out, "is remade much more slowly than the material foundations of life."¹

In a political economic study of the socialist way of life the objects are:

— first, the economic aspect of the socialist way of life, in other words, the material and spiritual requirements of people characteristic of this way of life, the extent and forms of their satisfaction in their work, the economic links between people, their purposes, and the economic stimuli of man's vital activity;

— second, the economic conditions that are the foundation on which the socialist way of life takes shape and asserts itself in opposition to the bourgeois way of life, in the struggle against left-overs of the past such as survivals of petty-bourgeois thinking, philistinism, individualism and egoism;

— third, the economic levers which socialist society uses purposefully and systematically to give shape and consolidate the socialist way of life and facilitate its evolution into a way of life that will be intrinsic to the higher phase of communism; effective influence of these levers on the way of life and the ways and means of continuing to use them.

Of course, in reality all these objects of a political economic study do not exist in isolation from each other. They interact and intertwine. It must be noted that economic science is called upon to study not only the socialist way of life but also the economic conditions and levers on the basis of which and under whose influence that way of life forms and develops. It also has the purely practical task of working out recommendations that would enable the socialist state and production collectives (by using the economic levers at their disposal) to influence the formation of the Soviet man's way of life more effectively.

It would be advisable to preface an analysis of questions related to the socialist way of life with some remarks about the substance of the general concept "way of life". First and foremost, it is necessary to stress the fact that this concept is much broader than the category "standard of living". It covers not only the consumption of material and spiritual blessings but also the social aspect: satisfaction with work, relations between people in the process of production, in every-day life and in the family, the attitude to society and to the motherland; vital ideals and the ways of achieving them, which are selected by members of a given society. Also included are the socio-economic rights and duties of the members of society, political and spiritual values, social feelings and sentiments, customs, traditions, rules of human association, morals and culture. The "way of life" is the mode of people's vital activity, the way of life of each individual, social group, class and nation in a given socio-economic formation. Ultimately, it is the concentrated expression of the economic, social, political and spiritual relations prevailing in a given society, the result of the interaction of all aspects and phenomena of

social life. The relations of production actively influence and determine the way of life, but they cannot be included directly in this concept.

However, the point is, of course, not only that the "way of life" is a much broader concept than the "standard of living". Here we observe essential, qualitative distinctions. Although there is an inalienable link between these concepts, it is not a direct, hard and fast link, because under one and the same standard of living there may be sharply different and even antipodal ways of life. The superiority of one country or another in the living standard is not yet evidence of its superiority in the way of life of its people. At the same time, under essentially different living standards the way of life may be basically similar. As distinct from the way of life, the standard of living may fluctuate considerably within a short span of time and in the same socio-economic formation. Before the way of life can be changed there must be fundamental socio-economic changes in society. Moreover, it is precisely the way of life that determines the character and orientation of the changes in the living standard, while, in its turn, a change in the standard of living is only gradually reflected in the way of life.

The category "standard of living" makes it possible to compare the consumption level in socialist and capitalist societies. Here use is made of various quantitative indicators. But in analysing the way of life in different social systems use must be made not only of quantitative but also, and chiefly, of qualitative indicators.

While the level of consumption of material and spiritual blessings is relatively similar in socialist and developed capitalist countries, the ways of life of their people differ fundamentally. As socialism develops these distinctions cannot help but grow because the socialist way of life differs basically from the bourgeois way of life. This difference is seen in the boldest relief at the phase of developed socialism. The historical character of the category "way of life" manifests itself most strikingly in the fact that the bourgeois way of life is inevitably superseded by the socialist way of life.

Addressing the 24th Congress of the CPSU the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the USA Gus Hall said:

"In the minds of millions in the capitalist world, there is growing a new criterion by which they measure and compare the two world systems.

"The comparisons are not now limited to industrial charts or prices of goods.

"What is placed on the scales now is the overall quality of life. Standards of physical comforts remain very important in determining the quality of life, but the yardstick is much broader now. It includes the total spectrum of human values, the order of priorities, dictated by the inherent laws of each system. It includes the moral, cultural and philosophical concepts nurtured by each system. Many of the new components that add up to a quality of life cannot be measured by charts.

"How can you weigh the growing sense of insecurity, alienation and frustration of not being involved, not being a factor, under capitalism with that of being totally involved and relevant, of being able to determine the course of life that flows from the inner nature of socialism?

"How can one compare by charts the quality of life, of distortions, humiliations, the brutal suffering and pain that is the product of racism, fostered by capitalism, with the flowering of a quality of life under socialism, a life without racism, based on equality and dignity of each individual?"²

By and large, the "way of life" is a historical category. It undergoes fundamental changes with the replacement of socio-economic formations. Deep-going changes in uniform fundamental principles may be observed at different phases of the development of the same system. Particularly striking qualitative changes are undergone by the way of life of society and the individual when capitalism gives way to the communist mode of production. The socialist way of life is a new socio-economic category that emerges with the appearance of socialism and develops with it in proportion to the development and strengthening of socialist relations of production, social consciousness, collectivist social psychology and morality, in the struggle with survivals of proprietary, individualist mentality and morality.

The concept "quality of life" has come into wide use in the West in recent years. Here most economists make no essential distinction between the concepts "quality of life" and "way of life". In our view, the use of two different designations for the same phenomenon is hardly justified, it only complicates seeing these two concepts in their proper aspect. It is hardly advisable to replace the formula "way of life" by the formula "quality of life". When we deal with the concept "quality" generally, we are justified in raising the question of its gradations: high or low quality, higher, lower, and so on. However, there is no justification for the use of such gradations of quality for a comparison of the condition of the working man under capitalism and under socialism. In fact we see fundamental distinctions in the ways of life: one is bourgeois and the other is socialist.

At the same time, we feel that the concept "quality of life" may and must be used in characterising man's life, but in a different sense. The life of society and of the individual is increasingly influenced by external conditions, by the environment. The formula "quality of life" should be used as a concept uniting the system of the quantitative indicators of the state of the environment and its influence on man, i.e., indicating the ways and means of solving the ecological problems in a given society. This interpretation of the concept "quality of life" is most closely linked with the category "standard of living", and they must be considered in their close interaction, otherwise serious mistakes may be made. For instance, the automobile over-satiation of capitalist society gives rise to atmospheric pollution and considerably worsens the population's state of health, which in its turn leads to a growing incidence of disease and a forced expansion of the health

services. Formally, the living standard grows (as a result of the increase in the use of cars and an expansion of the health services), but human conditions of life in fact deteriorate.

The way of life has several levels of concretisation. At the highest, most abstract level it is characterised by the most important, fundamental, determining and, at the same time, most general aspects of man's vital activity in a given socio-economic formation. Here the concept "way or mode of life" is brought considerably closer to the concept of "mode of production". However, it would be a mistake to confuse the concept "socialist way of life" with the category "socialist mode of production". On the one hand, the former concept is wider than the latter, for it covers, in addition to economic aspects, such superstructural phenomena as morals, ideology and so on, and, on the other, the socialist way of life is obviously not socialist relations of production in their pure form but the result of their influence on man in a given society, on his purposes, attitude to work, to the production collective, on the level and structure of his consumption, and so on. In a given socio-economic formation the development of the productive forces determine the character of the development of the relations of production—they influence the entire spectrum of social relations and, ultimately, man's way of life.

Karl Marx wrote that the "way in which men produce their means of subsistence depends first of all on the nature of the actual means of subsistence they find in existence and have to reproduce. This mode of production must not be considered simply as being the reproduction of the physical existence of the individuals. Rather it is a definite form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of expressing their life, a definite *mode of life* on their part. As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production both with *what* they produce and with *how* they produce. The nature of individuals thus depends on the material conditions determining their production."³ Here, of course, one should not forget the reverse influence of the way of life on the development of the productive forces, on social, production relations, i.e., their interaction.

At this highest level of abstraction we see most clearly the most general, most fundamental distinctions in the way of life of man in a given society, his place in the system of social relations, in the possibilities created by the social system for his vital activity. Each socio-economic formation is characterised not only by its socio-political system but also by its way of life. Thus; the socialist way of life differs fundamentally from the bourgeois way of life chiefly by the fact that the former is founded on public, socialist ownership of the means of production and is characterised by the absence of exploitation, by comradely cooperation among people engaged in social production, by collectivism, internationalism and socialist patriotism, while the latter, on the contrary, is based on private capitalist ownership and brings with it exploitation of man by man, anarchy, competition, antagonistic contradictions between the ex-

ploiting and exploited classes, relations of domination and subordination, and nationalism.

The socialist way of life spells out relations of cooperation, of social equality, i.e., an equal relation of all members of society to the means of production owned publicly. In the socialist way of life competition is superseded by entirely new relations between people, relations characterised by socialist emulation, whose purpose is not the attainment of success at the expense of others but, on the contrary, the achievement of overall progress on the basis of comradely mutual assistance and the dissemination of the finest, advanced accomplishments in work.

The way of life in capitalist society is inseverably linked with the deepening of that system's antagonistic contradictions. This is mirrored by the aggravation of the class struggle, by uncertainty and pessimism, by the striving of many people to escape from their environment, to shrink into themselves. Under socialism, the way of life is characterised by the fact that progress steadily weeds out the existing contradictions, which in socialist society are not antagonistic. The essential distinctions between work by hand and by brain, between town and countryside, and so on are gradually erased. This is leading to increasing social homogeneity in socialist society, while the capitalist way of life exacerbates contradictions and gradually destroys society.

Herein lies the most characteristic specificity of the American way of life, which is extolled by bourgeois propaganda in every way. Judging by objective indicators and not by propaganda and the pronouncements of bourgeois leaders, the American way of life is marked by an intensification and refinement of all forms of exploitation, by a widening gulf between haves and havenots, by an aggravation of the class struggle, competition and anarchy of production. It is a society of racial violence and a certain degradation of cultural life, a society where organised crime is growing; it is a society which cannot provide all the working people with the possibility of effectively applying their capabilities and talents; it is a society in which corruption flourishes; it is a society characterised by the militarisation of the economy and by unbridled inflation, the growing burden of which falls squarely on the shoulders of the working people. These are, of course, not all but only the most salient features of the American way of life.

The next level of concretising the concept "way of life" is the way of life of individual social groups, classes and nations in a given socio-economic system. On that level, in addition to elements in common that are determined by the given mode of production, there are more or less fundamental distinctions in the way of life of individual social groups, classes and nations. For example, under socialism there are some distinctions in the way of life of the intelligentsia, the working class and the collective farmers. These distinctions do not affect what is most important, for all the classes and social groups of socialist society are united by public ownership of the means of production and have the common aim of building

communism. However, there are distinctions in the size of incomes, certain features in the pattern of consumption of workers by brain and by hand, of urban and rural inhabitants, of the worker and the collective farmer, of different republics, territories and regions, in the level of general education and culture, in the conditions of work and life. These distinctions are closely studied and taken into account in the charting of Soviet economic policy. However, they do not determine what is most important in the way of life of socialist society, and as its development proceeds they are gradually erased.

On this level of abstraction the distinctions in the ways of life of classes and social groups in antagonistic societies are fundamentally different. The way of life of the bourgeoisie, for instance, basically differs from the way of life of the proletariat as a result of qualitatively different relations to the ownership of the means of production. These basic distinctions are growing more and more pronounced and this is manifested in the mounting class struggle of the proletariat and all other working people. At the same time, this does not rule out the influence of the bourgeois way of life, ideals and purposes on the working class. To this end use is made of the bourgeois propaganda machine, the mass media, schools, literature, and so on. The Communist and workers' parties are relentlessly combating the corrupting bourgeois influence on the proletarian masses.

The formula "Soviet way of life" appears naturally at the second level of concretising the concept "socialist way of life". This formula implies the socialist way of life concretised in its application to the USSR with account of its historical, national and other conditions. In this case elements reflecting the specificity of the Soviet Union's development are added to the features that characterise the socialist way of life as an internationalist concept. The Soviet way of life takes shape as a way of life of the Soviet people, who are a new historical community in a multinational state, founded on the basis of socialist ownership of the means of production, Marxist-Leninist ideology, unity of economic, socio-political and ideological interests and unity of socio-political and cultural life. It is a uniform way of life for all the citizens of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet way of life is a socialist way of life. Its underlying socio-political and spiritual features, and main principles are common, internationalist to all the countries of the socialist community.

The second level of abstraction has, in its turn, some levels of concretisation that bring this concept closer to the surface of phenomena. Thus, the concept "way of life" of definite people is followed by the concept of the "way of life" of a definite class in a given society, of a definite social group in a class, of a group by profession, of one nation or another (if the given society is multinational), of the inhabitants of a given region or district (if there are marked distinctions springing from historical, natural and other specifics). Moreover, it must be taken into account that local conditions — national, historical, geographical — are reflected in the

way of life, but the way of life is determined chiefly by the nature of the socio-economic system, by the mode of production.

At the lowest level of abstraction the concept "way of life" implies the distinctions in the way of life of individual members of society. Of course, the way of life of an individual is strongly influenced by his character, psychology, physical and mental development, upbringing, and so forth, thus to a certain degree making it the sphere of research by psychologists and sociologists. Every person has relatively large possibilities for independently choosing his purposes and the ways and means of achieving these purposes. It is clear that under the same income level and affiliation to the same social group there are essential distinctions in the way of life of one person or another.

However, in its basic features the way of life of each member of socialist society is determined by the fundamental specifics of socialism. To a larger or lesser extent these basic specifics are manifested in the great diversity of individual features of the life of all members of society. As socialism matures, the underlying principles of the socialist way of life manifest themselves more and more fully, though in an individual way in the life of each person.

Socialist society influences the way of life of each of its members mainly through the conditions of life: mandatory and universal character of work, the level and differentiation of incomes, the possibilities that society creates for the satisfaction of people's spiritual and cultural requirements, people's need for leisure and medical attention that are ensured by a definite investment policy, by the channeling of investments into the services industry, and so on. It influences the way of life through education, culture, art and, particularly, such mass media as television and films. Immense influence is exercised by the production collective by fostering conscious discipline, organisation and a sense of civic duty. This influence is decisive.

Moreover, socialist society influences the formation of the way of life by definite normative acts that mirror the interests of society as a whole. By legislation the state ensures the proper balance and optimal combination of the interests of society and the individual.

The entire stage of developed socialist society witnesses the direct building of the material and technical basis of communism, the further improvement of socialist relations of production, the development of the superstructure and their gradual evolution into the socio-economic relations of communism proper. The socialist way of life develops on this basis and in indivisible unity with these processes. Now it gradually evolves in some of its features and elements and later entirely into the communist way of life.

NOTES

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Moscow, 1972, p. 80.

² *Our Friends Speak. Greetings to the 24th CPSU Congress*, Moscow, 1971, pp. 344-345.

³ K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, Moscow, 1968, pp. 31-32.

Vanguard of Struggle for Peace, for the Social and National Liberation of Peoples

Last year the world communist movement widely marked the 40th anniversary of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International. This historic event was the subject, in particular, of a scientific conference "The Communist Movement in the Vanguard of Struggle for Peace, Social and National Liberation", held in Moscow in the Hall of Columns on July 4-7, 1975. It was organised by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the CC CPSU, the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Academy of Social Sciences and Higher Party School under the CC CPSU.

Noted scientists, Party and public figures, representatives of leading research institutions and of Party and other public organisations took part in the work of the conference. Present as guests were prominent figures of the international communist movement, among them Rodney Arismendi, First Secretary, Central Committee, Communist Party of Uruguay; Luis Carlos Prestes, General Secretary, Central Committee, Brazilian Communist Party; Knud Jespersen, Chairman, Communist Party of Denmark; Nicolas Chaoui, General Secretary, Central Committee, Lebanese Communist Party.

The conference was opened by Academician Pyotr Fedoseyev, Vice President of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Mikhail Suslov, Member of the Politburo, Secretary of the CC CPSU, gave the opening address. In the world communist, working-class and entire anti-imperialist movement, he said, there are momentous events and dates which are important landmarks in its forward movement. The Seventh Congress of the Communist International is such an event.

We have gathered today in the hall whose walls have witnessed many outstanding events in the life of our country and in the development of the international revolutionary working-class move-

ment. The great Lenin often spoke from this rostrum. Many international forums of working people and their organisations were held here. Forty years ago, in July 1935, the Seventh Congress of the Comintern opened here. Guiding itself by the Leninist theory, creatively applying and developing it further, the Congress adopted decisions which reflected the objectively urgent demands of the international working class, and stimulated a new upsurge of the struggle of the working people of all countries against fascism and the war danger, and for peace, democracy and socialism. The documents adopted by the Congress were a substantial contribution to the further enrichment of revolutionary social thought and to the elaboration of the strategy and tactics of the international communist movement.

In their activities the Communists are always true to the general principles of Marxism-Leninism which are internationalist in their essence; theirs is a truly creative approach to the pressing problems of the liberation struggle. They combine revolutionary fortitude and tactical flexibility, bold presentation of new slogans in response to the new demands of social life with a realistic approach to their practical implementation. It was this combination of a strict scientific and realistic approach and a clear perspective, resting on Leninist traditions, that ensured the high degree of effectiveness of the political line collectively evolved by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern. It was precisely this that made for the great and effective influence of that political line on the entire subsequent development of the world revolutionary process and of the mass anti-fascist, democratic movement.

Dwelling on the international situation in the first half of the 1930s M. A. Suslov noted that the Soviet Union, which was in capitalist encirclement, was successfully building the foundations of socialism all difficulties notwithstanding. In the countries of the capitalist system which was experiencing the consequences of a most profound economic crisis, class contradictions were intensifying and the class struggle of the proletariat was mounting. Imperialist reaction, relying heavily on fascism, was preparing for a new world war spearheaded against the Soviet Union, the world's first socialist state. Fascism was aiming to establish throughout the world a terrorist regime of the most reactionary circles of monopoly capital, to interrupt society's development toward socialism and to halt social progress.

In that difficult historical period the Communists were the only ones who mapped out a correct political strategy and tactics, showed the masses the way out of the situation that had arisen and who scientifically defined the tasks of the struggle against fascism and imperialist war and the ways of waging this struggle.

The strategic orientation evolved by the Seventh Congress was not a purely defensive one, dictated only by the tasks of repulsing the fascist offensive and menace of war. It was dictated by the major conclusion that the struggle of the working class and its allies against fascism and imperialist reaction would lead to the strengthening of the democratic forces and to the establishment of popular front regimes

or, similar to them, anti-fascist and democratic regimes which would be the approach and then transition to the socialist stage of the struggle. This strategic orientation was an instance of concrete definition and further elaboration of the Leninist teaching on the interconnection of the struggle for democracy with the struggle for socialism and on broad unity of the working class and other sections of the working people in this struggle. It took profound account of the changes taking place in the world and the fact that general democratic and socialist tasks were drawing closer objectively and becoming intertwined.

The policy of a united working-class and popular front was to be of great importance for the entire subsequent struggle of the peoples against fascism and war.

The vitality of the ideas of the Seventh Congress was graphically revealed during the Second World War. The Soviet Union, as is generally known, bore the brunt of the struggle against Hitlerism which threatened to enslave the whole world. Our country, led by the Communist Party, made the decisive contribution to the historic victory over fascism, the 30th anniversary of which we recently celebrated.

All progressive forces battling against the German invaders rallied round the Soviet Union in the war years. We pay high tribute to the big role played by the anti-fascist Resistance in which the Communists fought as the most courageous and consistent fighters for freedom and for the unification of all anti-fascist and patriotic forces in national fronts. This struggle, which was directed against the fascist invaders and for national liberation, was, at the same time, a struggle for the establishment of anti-fascist and democratic regimes.

The consistent implementation by the Communists of the policy, propounded forty years ago, of uniting all anti-fascist forces was thus one of the important conditions that made possible the peoples' advance to victorious 1945 when, as L. I. Brezhnev said, "the rout of fascism in which the Soviet Union played the decisive role, generated a mighty tide of socio-political changes which rolled across the globe..."

The Seventh Congress decisions aimed at further raising the social role of the working class and its communist vanguard. The Communists continued and carried forward the political line elaborated in that period and achieved as a result successes of world historic significance.

The world has changed beyond recognition compared to what it was like 40 years ago. Most characteristic of contemporary development, continued the speaker, are the following factors:

First, the successful building of a communist society in the USSR. This construction and its achievements, the fusion of the advantages of socialism with the scientific and technological revolution and, in particular, the completion of the Ninth Five-Year Plan, which is a big step forward in communist construction—all this is exerting a tremendous influence on the correlation of class forces in the world and on the entire world revolutionary process.

Second, the dynamic development and economic and political consolidation of the world socialist system—the main gain of the international working class—and all-round development of the cooperation between the countries of the socialist community. As a result of this the world socialist system, of which the USSR is an inseparable link, is more and more proving to be a determining force in the social development of mankind. The epoch-making achievements of real socialism which has given the working masses genuine democracy, the all-round development of the individual and the economic, social and cultural prosperity of the peoples of the socialist community are exerting an increasing influence on international events, on the condition and struggle of the working class and its allies in the capitalist world. These achievements serve as a powerful factor in accelerating world progress.

Third, the new victories of the international working-class and national liberation movement in the fight against imperialism and for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. The victory of the Vietnamese people, won as a result of their heroic struggle of many years and of the international solidarity of the socialist countries, the development of the anti-fascist revolution in Portugal, the downfall of the regime of the military junta in Greece, the successes of the Left forces in France, Italy and Japan, the appearance on the map of the world of newly-free countries, and the mounting struggle in these countries for social changes and for socialist-oriented development—all this clearly shows what is the main content of mankind's progress in our epoch. The whole capitalist world is in the grip of class battles. Tens of millions of people are participating in the strike movement. The expansion of the social base of anti-monopoly actions is exacerbating the contradictions between finance capital and the broad masses and is creating the prerequisites for intensifying the struggle for progressive social and political changes. And as always the Communists raise high the banner in defence of democratic liberties and of the social gains of the working people.

Fourth, the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, the weakening of its positions and the aggravation of all its contradictions. Today we witness in capitalist countries a falling-off of production or sharp slowing down in its development rates, inflation, mounting unemployment, the rapacious exploitation of natural resources and pollution of the natural environment. Social development ever more convincingly demonstrates that capitalism is an obstacle to socio-economic progress.

Fifth, the shift to relaxation of international tension in the world arena. A major role in this is played by the USSR and other socialist countries and their consistent Leninist foreign policy of peace.

The Communists and peace fighters everywhere have incomparably greater opportunities today for rallying the masses to active struggle against the threat of war and for the preservation and consolidation of peace than they had in the prewar years. As a result of the steady growth of the economic and defence might of world

socialism, the strengthening of the positions of all revolutionary and democratic forces and the further weakening of imperialism's positions, not only has a real possibility arisen in the present epoch of preventing a new world war; also the conditions are being created for eliminating it for all time from the life of mankind. It was from this premise that the 24th Congress of the CPSU proceeded when it put forward the Peace Programme which, embodying the results of the long struggle for peace waged by the socialist countries and the international working-class and democratic movements, covered the most vital aspects of this important issue of world politics and mapped out concrete and constructive ways of solving it.

Today we can say that many of the tasks raised in the Peace Programme are being realised. This is a striking illustration of the effectiveness of the peace policy of the Soviet Union and of world socialism and of the increased potentialities of the world working-class and democratic, anti-war movement.

The major concrete achievements of the USSR and the fraternal countries of socialism and of all progressive forces in the struggle for peace are well known. Their central feature is the shift from military confrontation of states belonging to different social systems to peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial cooperation, from the cold war, fraught with a global missile-nuclear conflict, to détente and the deepening and strengthening of this détente. This opens up real prospects for establishing a durable peace on earth.

There is no doubt that the relaxation of international tension and the strengthening of the relations of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems lessen the chances of so-called "export of counter-revolution". But continued vigilance in the face of the intrigues of imperialism and its agents remains, needless to say, an important task of all progressive and democratic forces. We must not lose sight of the fact that the forces of reaction, of the cold war want, as before, to exacerbate the international situation, to reverse the course of history.

In the conditions when détente not only makes for a new political situation in the world arena but also actively influences the internal situation in capitalist countries, the crisis of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism grows more acute and more favourable conditions are created for the expansion of the working-class and democratic movement. The principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems has, as is generally known, nothing in common with the class peace between the exploiters and the exploited, the colonialists and victims of colonial oppression, between the oppressors and the oppressed.

The entire course of international events, Suslov went on to say, convincingly demonstrates the vitality and relevancy of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the world historic mission of the working class which is in the forefront of our epoch and which is its most advanced revolutionary class. The present stage of social development bears out anew the correctness of the conclusion of Marxist-Leninists about the natural growth of the working class and steady enhance-

ment of its leading role in the revolutionary struggle and in the creation of a new society. The objective conditions for cementing the political unity of the working class are increasing. As the contradictions between labour and capitalism intensify and the working class advances to a higher political and cultural level, increasing significance is acquired by the common features that unite all its detachments and sections — though differing in professional skills and the nature of labour — into a class, namely, as V. I. Lenin underscored, its place in a historically definite system of social production, its relations to the means of production, its role in the social organisation of labour and its common interests in the struggle against the exploiters.

Thus the most important factors of contemporary development speak of the further expansion and deepening of the world revolutionary process. This naturally opens up new possibilities in the fight for peace, democracy and socialism.

Realisation of these growing revolutionary possibilities depends in large measure on the strength and cohesion of the communist movement, on its ability to correctly combine the international and national tasks of the working class and all working people, and on its ability to rouse the broadest masses to struggle. The international communist movement is the most powerful political force of our times precisely because it most fully expresses the vital needs of contemporary social development, consistently defends the interests of the working class and all working people and precisely because it is inseparably linked with the working masses and marches in the van of these masses.

Our Party, continued the speaker, has always acted as one of the detachments of the international communist movement; it is always aware of its close affinity with the destinies of the international communist movement, of its responsibility for its common causes, for its role in the world struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. True to the ideas of Lenin and to its internationalist duty, the CPSU strives by its policy to facilitate this struggle and the social progress of mankind. The CPSU sees it as its sacred duty to successfully build communism in our country, to strengthen the world socialist system and, in close cohesion with the countries of the socialist community, to further its unity and prosperity and the growth of the advantages of socialism.

The CPSU sees it as its task to promote the relaxation of international tension and to make it irreversible. In his speech to the electorate of the Bauman District of Moscow on June 13, 1975, L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, said: "Now the world is entering a period when the task of translating the principles of peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial cooperation into daily practical actions is coming to the fore."

We emphatically reject the speculative statements and allegations of bourgeois ideologues that détente is advantageous only to the Communists. Yes, it is advantageous to us. But it is no less advantageous to all peoples and states, they all need it, it serves the

cause of world progress. That is why the CPSU will continue with unremitting energy to give practical effect to its Peace Programme, to work for the further improvement of the international climate and to strengthen world peace. In this connection we attach great importance to the successful culmination of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The CPSU sees it as its duty to promote the unity of all revolutionary and democratic forces of today and to secure the consolidation of their solidarity in the common struggle. Our Party and our country support all movements that are against imperialist reaction and oppression and for national and social liberation.

The communist movement, continued M. A. Suslov, is strong because it adheres to the great teachings of Marxism-Leninism and to the ideals of proletarian internationalism. At the same time, at its various stages the communist movement's international unity takes forms corresponding to definite historical conditions.

The transition to new forms of international unity that meet the new conditions of the life and struggle of the Communist parties have yielded positive results. Witness the historic achievements of the communist, democratic and national liberation movements, the successful employment by Communist parties of such effective forms of contact as international and regional conferences, bilateral and multilateral consultations on various problems concerning the strategy and tactics of the anti-imperialist struggle, the coordination of positions and joint foreign-policy actions, the holding of international solidarity campaigns, the ever expanding creative cooperation of Marxists of different countries in the ideological and theoretical spheres.

The CPSU considers the further consolidation of the unity of the international communist movement an important task. Substantial successes have already been achieved in this direction. The attempts by the adherents of anti-communism to weaken and undermine the communist movement are in vain. The splitting policies of the Maoists to destroy the unity of the world army of Communists, which are prejudicing the cause of world socialism and the relaxation of international tension, are meeting with more and more resolute rebuff. Our Party will continue to strive persistently for close international unity of Communists on the granite foundation of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism; it will continue to oppose all and every attempt to introduce various opportunist and nationalist ideas in the international communist movement. The CPSU will continue to strive to make its worthy contribution to the international struggle of the working class and of all working people, to the elaboration of basic problems of the world liberation struggle and thus make for new victories in the battle for peace, democracy and socialism.

In the course of the preparations for the forthcoming 25th Congress of the CPSU, said M. A. Suslov in conclusion, the Party is drawing up plans for further communist construction the successful fulfilment of which it will regard as a contribution to the development

of the entire world revolutionary process and to the struggle of the international working class and its allies, and of all progressive forces for peace, democracy, national and social liberation.

* * *

"Communists in the Struggle Against Fascism and War, and for Peace, Democracy and Socialism" was the theme of a report by Academician **Boris Ponomarev**, Alternate Member of the Politburo, Secretary of the CC CPSU.

In celebrating the 40th anniversary of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, he said, we pay a tribute of deep respect to the perspicacity, fighting spirit and courage of the Communists of the world who stood up staunchly in those years in defence of freedom and democracy and against the threat of fascism and war. We are rightfully proud of the fact that at the most complicated and crucial periods in historical development Communists were in the front ranks of the fighters for the happiness and a better future for the working people and all mankind. The activities of Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific socialism, the great life exploit of Lenin, the founder of our Party and the Soviet state, have always been an inspiring example to the Communists.

After giving a picture of the historical situation in which preparations for the Seventh Congress were carried out, the reporter noted that in marked contrast to the crises rending the capitalist world was the steady progress of the world's first worker-peasant state. Its peaceful foreign policy began to play an increasingly appreciable role in international affairs. On the whole the situation was characterised, on the one hand, by the growth of the forces of aggression and reaction and, on the other, by the growth of the possibilities for countering these forces.

At the Congress the fraternal parties working jointly and collectively, in a comradely spirit, in the spirit of proletarian internationalism, gave a profound analysis of the situation and mapped out a political line of the international communist movement corresponding to the new historical conditions.

In the centre of the attention of the Communists, the reporter continued, was the struggle against fascism and the war danger. One of the main merits of the Seventh Congress is that it substantiated a new approach to the problem: the working class and unification of forces against fascism and war. Why had this become possible? Because, replied the Congress, one of the detachments of the world working class — the working class of Russia — had taken power into its own hands and created a powerful state possessing the necessary means of defence and pursuing a consistent policy of peace. At the same time in the capitalist world too the forces of resistance to war had increased. This essentially changed the situation compared with the one existing on the eve of the First World War.

The Congress charted a clear line of action in the struggle against fascism and the war danger. It called on the working people of all countries to give all possible support to the Soviet Union, the world's first socialist state. The peace policy of the USSR, stated the resolution of the Seventh Congress, is directed not only toward the defence of the Land of Soviets, "it also protects the lives of the workers of all countries, the lives of all the oppressed and exploited; it means the defence of the national independence of small nations, it serves the vital interests of humanity, it defends culture from the barbarities of war".

The Congress raised in all its magnitude the problem of unity of action of the working class and first of all the problem of the relations between the Communists and Social-Democrats. While calling to fight persistently for unity of action with Social-Democracy, the Congress at the same time stressed that the Communists are ever aware of their independent class position and their firm adherence to Marxism-Leninism.

A major contribution to the elaboration of the communist movement's new orientation on questions of the struggle against the war danger and fascism was made by Georgi Dimitrov, outstanding figure of the Bulgarian and international communist movement. He closely collaborated with the representatives of the CPSU(B), the French, Italian, Spanish and other Communist Parties. The report by Dimitrov formulated and substantiated the main ideas that underlay the work of the Seventh Congress.

The question of establishing a popular front occupied a special place in the work of the Congress. In the historical conditions obtaining at that time the Popular Front slogan opened up new perspectives for drawing the broad masses in the capitalist countries into the anti-fascist struggle, for strengthening the alliance of the working class with the middle strata of the population. As is generally known it was the Popular Front that barred fascism's way to power in a number of countries.

The historic significance of the Seventh Congress, said B. N. Ponomaryov, lies, in the final analysis, in the fact that it prepared the communist movement ideologically and politically for struggle in new conditions and in one of the most crucial periods in the history of mankind. During the Second World War the Communists showed themselves to be the most staunch fighters and they made the most substantial contribution to securing the victory in which the USSR, the world's first socialist state, played the decisive role. The unity of the anti-fascist forces found concrete embodiment in the Resistance. This unity laid the foundation for the victory of a new social order in a number of countries of Europe and Asia.

The Congress laid the beginning of new forms of relations between the Communist Parties, such as would correspond more to the changing objective conditions and to the level of maturity reached by the communist movement. That is when the seeds were cast from which there burgeoned the present system of cooperation of the fraternal parties, based on their complete independence and on the

enduring fidelity of the Communists to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

In the post-war decades the Communists, basing themselves on the results of the great victory over imperialism's fascist forces, again raised aloft the banner of peace. And if today the skies over our planet are not covered with threatening war clouds, if it has become possible to avert a thermonuclear holocaust and to put strong barriers in the way of imperialist aggression the main, indeed, historic credit for this should go to the Soviet Union, the world socialist community and the communist movement.

Dwelling on the present international situation B. N. Ponomaryov pointed to the qualitatively new possibilities for winning a stable peace. The defence of peace has now become a still more important matter than it was at the time of the Seventh Congress and consequently occupies a greater place in the activities of the Communist parties than it did then. First of all, because in fighting for peace we are, in the words of L. I. Brezhnev, "working for something which billions of people all over the world cherish most of all: the right to life itself, and deliverance from the danger of its destruction in the flames of war". The struggle against the material preparation for war is more closely and directly linked up in our times with the daily, vital interests of the working people.

Today we particularly clearly see how justified and far-sighted was the Seventh Congress' conclusion on the reality of victory in the battle for peace. Noting that major successes have been achieved in this battle in recent years, the reporter cited L. I. Brezhnev's words at the election meeting in June 1975 of the Bauman District, Moscow, that, "The relaxation of international tensions have become possible because a new relationship of forces now exists on the world scene... The norms of peaceful coexistence between states have already been recorded in many binding official documents of a bilateral and multilateral character, as well as in political declarations. Of course, all this did not come about of itself. An enormous amount of political work had to be done to do away with the cold war and reduce the threat of a new world war."

The Central Committee and its Politburo, headed by L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, give much and constant attention to international affairs, to the key issues of world politics which are considered and resolved by the Central Committee and its leadership along the general lines of the CPSU's Leninist international strategy. The historic results of this activity are evident: the cause of peace and social progress has been advanced to a qualitatively new stage. The turn from the cold war to détente has become the dominant tendency. The course of events has clearly demonstrated the vitality and effectiveness of the foreign-policy line of the 24th Congress of the CPSU and the Peace Programme put forward by it.

Today the fight for peace calls for still broader unity of action by the peace forces. As before the Second World War so too now it is the communist movement that is the initiator of such unity.

B. N. Ponomaryov dealt, in this connection, with some of the urgent problems of the struggle to promote détente. At the present moment, he said, hundreds of millions of people are concerned with the question: how to impart to détente a stable, irreversible character, how to use its fruits for the good of all nations and all people in the most direct, perceptible and material sense of the word.

The Soviet Union's answer to this question is clear: it is quite necessary to achieve that all states honour the commitments undertaken, that they display constructive initiative and a willingness to settle issues at the negotiating table on the basis of the equal participation of the interested parties; that it is necessary to achieve an expansion of mutually beneficial cooperation, to promote in every possible way an atmosphere of trust in international relations and to curb the arms race so that the billions consumed by it be used to solve the vital problems of the present and future generations.

However, the opponents of détente—militarist and military-industrial circles—are trying to block the way to realisation of the policy of peaceful coexistence. They urge increasing NATO's military budget, building up a US "superior" material potential. This was the tenor of the recent NATO session. The NATO countries are exerting undisguised and provocative pressure on the democratic forces of Portugal although this is in crying contradiction to the elementary norms of non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states.

The policy of the Peking leadership, spearheaded against socialism and the cause of peace, seriously complicates the anti-imperialist struggle and the fight for a stable peace on earth.

Advance along the path of the relaxation of international tension, continued B. N. Ponomaryov, is a political battle in which each step is hard won. It would be a big mistake to underestimate the difficulties and barriers which the opponents of détente put in our way. But it would also be a mistake to exaggerate these difficulties, to consider them insurmountable. Whatever the resistance of the cold war adherents the international situation on our planet is developing in the right direction. A great, a truly epochal task faces the peace forces, that of eradicating aggression as an instrument of foreign policy and of putting "finis" to the war history of states.

The reporter then went on to deal with problems of the world revolutionary process noting in this connection how broadly these problems were posed by the Seventh Congress. Today, he said, we are witnessing the revolutionary transformation of the world on a scale unprecedented in scope and breadth. It is taking place thanks, first and foremost, to the firm and steady advance of our country toward communism, thanks to the successful development of the fraternal socialist countries and of their entire great community. Active participants in the transformation of the world are also the countries which, having thrown off the chains of colonial oppression, have opted for the socialist orientation and the countries where progressive reforms are being carried out. A constant factor, and one that is rapidly accumulating energy for fundamental changes in the capitalist countries, is the working-class movement which is being

joined by the movement of other working masses. The action of all these forces is propelling the world stream of fundamental changes in the direction of progress, in the direction of a socialist future.

The Marxist-Leninist parties, said B. N. Ponomaryov, draw conclusions with due account of the present situation and the enormously increased possibilities of the forces operating now in favour of world social progress. Their composition, influence and potentialities have changed considerably since the time of the Seventh Comintern Congress.

But the lessons of history have not been lost on capitalism either. The results of imperialism's efforts to preserve and fortify its rule are being tested in the conditions of an economic crisis, that has turned out to be the most serious and acute one for the entire postwar period. What is more, B. N. Ponomaryov went on to say, it is attended by processes whose significance goes far beyond the usual. Present is a crisis of the very system of the state-monopoly regulation of the economy. If we add to this the sharp intensification of the environmental problem, the energy and food crisis and the critical processes under way in the political superstructure of bourgeois society it becomes clear that the issue is one of a definite qualitative change in the growth of the general crisis of capitalism.

The struggle to find ways out of the economic crisis is intensifying in capitalist countries. The bourgeoisie want to place the burden of the crisis on the working class and other sections of the working people, and on the peoples of the less developed countries. However, in the present conditions the size, character and degree of organisation of the forces resisting the monopolies make it possible to prevent a reactionary "way out" of the crisis and to ensure a way out that will spell advancement to genuine democracy along the road of social progress. It is on the fulfilment of this task that the fraternal parties in the capitalist countries are bending their efforts.

Pointing out to the relevance in this respect of the conclusions and ideas of the Seventh Congress, B. N. Ponomaryov drew attention, in particular, to the problem of unity of the working-class movement and, in the first place, to the relations between the Communists and Social-Democrats. The consistent and purposeful struggle of the Communist parties for working-class unity, he noted, has yielded definite results. This is reflected in the joint actions in support of the struggle of the Vietnamese people, the broad campaigns of solidarity with the democrats of Chile, in a number of major joint actions aimed at making Europe a continent of peace, security and cooperation, and in many other similar actions. A considerable contribution to the establishment of fruitful contacts between the Communists and Social-Democrats is made by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

At the same time, the reporter noted the harm being caused by the actions of some Social-Democratic leaders, particularly in connection with the events in Portugal. While favouring joint actions by Communists and Social-Democrats where this is possible and necessary, the CPSU stipulates that the latter must discontinue the

anti-communist and anti-Soviet attacks and actions in their policy and propaganda; it conducts and will continue to conduct concrete, well-reasoned criticism of the ideology and policy of social-democracy.

B. N. Ponomaryov devoted the closing part of his report to the struggle against contemporary anti-communism. The enemies of socialism, he said, have stepped up their anti-communist activities in recent months. Again threadbare fabrications and much else in that vein are being put into circulation. But the outlook for the anti-Communists is a poor one. It is impossible to halt the inexorable advance of the vast material force in the shape of real socialism, the world communist and entire liberation movement, represented by scores of states, parties and organisations.

The reporter dwelt at length on the aims and tasks which the Communists of the socialist and non-socialist countries, including the Communists of Latin America, Asia and Africa, are aspiring to accomplish; he noted that those who try to discredit these noble aims, to cause harm to the socialist countries and Communist parties are either themselves the tool and mouthpiece of reaction, or objectively play into its hands.

The times in which we are living, said B. N. Ponomaryov in conclusion, will go down in history as a momentous, crucial period, a period laden with rapid and profound changes in all spheres of world development. It is a period of great prospects and hopes and, at the same time, one of valid anxious concerns.

The Marxist-Leninist parties realise their responsibility and by deeds prove their readiness and ability to carry out their duty. Communists have always acted and continue to act in the main directions of the major political battles for peace and security of peoples, for the national and social liberation of peoples and against reaction and imperialist aggression, for democracy, national independence, socialism and communism.

The Communists of the Soviet Union too are devoting all their energies to the attainment of these goals. The communist movement, true to Leninism, faces the future with optimism. It is not only proud of its militant and glorious past. It knows that the coming battles will bring still greater successes to the cause of peace, democracy and socialism.

* * *

The conference participants unanimously adopted a letter of greetings to Luis Corvalan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Chile, and to other patriots of Chile languishing in fascist prisons.

After the plenary session the conference continued its work in sectional meetings.

The section "The Communist Movement in the Fight for Unity of All Revolutionary and Democratic Forces" heard a report "The

Communist Movement on the Role of the Soviet Union as the Centre of Attraction of All Revolutionary and Democratic Forces", by Academician A. Yegorov, Director of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the CC CPSU. The reporter showed the ways in which socialism influences the course of mankind's development, the importance of the unity of the world communist movement under the banner of Marxism-Leninism and of all forces of the world revolutionary process in the anti-imperialist struggle.

The increasingly bigger role being played by the international working class and the Communist parties in present conditions was the underlying theme of a report by A. Sobolev, D. Sc. (Philos.). The papers by other scholars treated of the vital importance of the ideas of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern for raising the fighting value of the Communist parties and for the cohesion of the trade union and youth movements.

The sectional meeting "The New Phenomena in World Development and the New Possibilities of the Working-Class Movement and of All Anti-imperialist Forces" was addressed by T. Timofeyev, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute of the International Working-Class Movement, USSR Academy of Sciences. In his report, "The Struggle of the Working Class and Its Allies in the Conditions of the Intensification of the General Crisis of Capitalism", he noted that a comprehensive study and scientific generalisation of the rich international experience of struggle of the revolutionary working class and its allies was an important task of Marxist-Leninist collective theoretical thought.

Professor V. Zagladin in his report underlined that the Seventh Congress was a brilliant example of how the collective thought of the Communists furnished a profound and clear analysis of the new situation that obtained in the world in the mid-1930s, and to draw constructive conclusions from this analysis which subsequently underlay critical appraisals of that period in contemporary history.

Current problems of the development of the working class were dealt with in a report by R. Kosolapov, D. Sc. (Philos.).

Several papers discussed problems of joint action by Communists and Social-Democrats, unity of the anti-imperialist forces, class solidarity of the working people and the correlation of the international and the national in the world communist movement.

The Revolution of 1905-1907 in Russia

STEPAN TITARENKO

The 70th anniversary of the first Russian revolution is a momentous date in the history of the world revolutionary movement. "It was the first people's revolution of the epoch of imperialism. It showed that a new period had begun in world history, the period of political upheavals and revolutionary battles. Even though it was defeated the revolution dealt the autocracy, landlord and capitalist rule a powerful blow, inscribed a vivid page in the history of class struggle."¹

The revolution of 1905-1907 took place in the period when world capitalism, including Russian capitalism, had already entered the monopoly stage of its development. This determined the new alignment of class forces in the revolution. The revolutions which took place in Western Europe in the 17th-18th centuries were headed by the bourgeoisie, who relied on the support of the urban plebs and the peasantry. In the Russian revolution a new class, the proletariat, supported by the peasant masses, acted as the main motive force and hegemon. This left a deep imprint on the entire course of the revolution. Bourgeois-democratic in socio-economic content, it was at the same time a proletarian revolution in methods of struggle, with the proletariat playing the leading role. It is not accidental that Lenin called it a "dress rehearsal"² without which neither the victory of the February bourgeois-democratic nor of the October socialist revolution in 1917 would have been possible.

The scope and historical consequences of the first revolution were determined in large measure also by the fact that the working class already had its own political party with a clearly expressed programme of struggle for democratic and then socialist goals. From

S. Titarenko, D. Sc. (Hist.), Associate, Institute of Marxism-Leninism at the CC CPSU. Specialises in the pre-October history of the CPSU. Author of a number of works in this field.

the very beginning the Bolshevik Party, headed by Lenin, clearly defined the specific feature of the revolution, its motive forces and most probable perspectives. The Bolsheviks showed scientifically that only the working class, at the head of the entire people, is capable of leading it to complete victory over the autocracy, of ensuring profound democratic transformations and thus preparing the necessary conditions for passing on to the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism.

By the beginning of the 20th century bourgeois revolutions in the leading West European countries had long since become a thing of the past. The cycle of social upheavals, connected with the transition from the feudal-absolutist system to the bourgeois system, had come to full circle. The bourgeoisie, having achieved absolute sway, increasingly became a reactionary force. In June 1848 already, when the proletariat of Paris with arms in hand rose up against the bourgeoisie, it became clear that a new class, the antipode of the bourgeoisie, had entered the arena of active public life. Karl Marx noted in this connection that not a single one of the many revolutions of the French bourgeoisie, beginning with 1789, had been an encroachment on the existing order, for they all preserved class rule, slavery of the workers and the bourgeois order, irrespective of how often the political form of this rule changed. "June encroached on this order. Woe to June!"³

After the June insurrection of the Paris workers, the ruling circles of the European powers and also the bourgeoisie of those countries where it was still not in power were in mortal fear of the revolutionary proletariat. This was seen, in particular, in the behaviour of the German bourgeoisie in 1848-1850 when it was compelled by the course of revolutionary events to choose between revolution and counter-revolution. An even greater impact on the thinking and behaviour of the bourgeoisie was made by the Paris Commune of 1871 which represented "a certain advance of the world proletarian revolution".⁴

After 1871 a period of revolutionary lull set in Western Europe and the centre of the revolutionary movement began to shift from Western Europe to Russia where a bourgeois revolution was maturing. Beginning with the 1870s Marx and Engels more and more often turned their gaze towards Russia. They foresaw that because of its objective position, it could become the advance detachment in the liberation struggle. At the turn of the 20th century, when the process of the growth of capitalism of free competition into monopoly capitalism was completed in the main, Russia became the focal point of the contradictions of the world capitalist system. It contained all the antagonisms typical of this system: between labour and capital, between developing capitalism and the considerable survivals of semi-feudalism, between highly developed industrial regions and backward outlying areas. The autocracy's system of political, national and spiritual oppression intensified these antagonisms. Lenin subsequently noted that because of the weight of tsarist oppression progressive thought in Russia "sought eagerly for a correct revolu-

tionary theory", and followed every "last word" in this sphere in Europe and America.⁵

The forthcoming bourgeois-democratic transformations in Russia would be carried out in conditions of much more developed class relations compared with the epoch of bourgeois revolutions in the West. Russia embarked on the path of capitalist development much later than the West European countries. But it traversed this path much more quickly. It did not, like the West European countries have, in the words of Marx, to pass through a long incubation period⁶ in order to introduce machine production, railroads, banks, credit societies, etc. The introduction of the latest technological achievements of Western Europe and North America into Russia enabled it in its industrial development to cover in a matter of decades (after the peasant reform of 1861) the path that took the West, for example, England, centuries to cover. This did not mean of course that in its level of industrial production Russia could compete with the most developed capitalist countries of that period. What we have in mind is that various branches of heavy industry arose in the country, bypassing the long manufactory stage. These branches developed particularly rapidly in the last two decades of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. The output of coal, iron, oil and of the metallurgical and machine-building industries greatly increased. The industrial boom speeded railroad construction.

A feature of Russian capitalism was the early concentration of industrial production and centralisation of capital. Important contributing factors were the introduction of Western ready-made forms of large-scale machine production, active state support in building up a heavy industry, the availability of big enterprises inherited from the epoch of serfdom, and the inflow of foreign capital. The concentration and centralisation of capital stimulated the formation of monopolies and banks and afterwards the merging of bank and industrial capital and the subsequent emergence of a financial oligarchy.

The growth of industry naturally brought with it a corresponding growth in the proletariat who was concentrated mainly in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Donbas, Krivoi Rog, Baku, the Baltic provinces, Poland and in other regions. The working class increased in number particularly rapidly at the big capitalist enterprises. In scale of concentration of the proletariat Russia ranked first in the world. On the eve of the first Russian revolution the number of industrial workers reached three million (including those employed in mining and on the railways). Of these, more than half were concentrated in big enterprises, employing 500 or more workers each.

A particularly characteristic feature of the country's economic development was that the rapid growth of industrial and financial capitalism proceeded in conditions of the existence of an extremely backward, semi-feudal system in agriculture. Russia was predominantly an agrarian country. At the end of the 19th century the peasant population accounted for 97 million of the country's total population of 125 million. Ruined and reduced to pauperism, the peasants

cultivated their allotments, cut by the reform of 1861, with primitive implements. The lion's share of the best land belonged to the landlords. Various forms of semi-feudal exploitation were widespread in the countryside. The peasants' lot continued to be one of bondage and corvée, they suffered from social-estate and civil inequality, the unlimited rule of Zemstvo officials and from the system of mutual responsibility in the village commune under which the tsarist authorities extorted all kinds of payments.

Thus advanced industrial and financial capitalism in Russia was combined with an extremely backward, semi-feudal agrarian system and the existence of a feudal-absolutist political superstructure — the tsarist autocracy. The big landed estates were the mainstay of the survivals of serfdom in the countryside. It is true, the penetration of capitalism in the countryside compelled the landed estates to participate increasingly in commodity-capitalist relations. This, in turn, influenced the condition of the peasants. But in Russia the peasants suffered not so much from capitalism as from insufficient capitalist development. The march of events inexorably put on the order of the day the question of transition to the commodity-capitalist form of agriculture.

Such a transition, as Lenin noted, could be effected either in the "Prussian way" of gradual transformation of the landed estates, which were closely intertwined with the survivals of serfdom, into purely capitalist "junker" farming; or through the revolutionary destruction of the survivals of serfdom and landlord proprietorship, in the first place, and the provision of conditions for the free development of small peasant farming on the basis of commodity production. The two possible forms of solving the agrarian question corresponded to two different tactical lines: the liberal-bourgeois and the revolutionary-proletarian. The liberal bourgeoisie was interested in the landed estates developing gradually along capitalist lines in the interests of the landlords and without any revolutionary break-up, since the liberal bourgeoisie itself had a stake in landownership. The line of the revolutionary proletariat, on the contrary, was to help the peasantry put an end radically, in a revolutionary way, to landlord proprietorship and to all other survivals of serfdom, and to carry out the fundamental democratic transformations that were essential for the further struggle for a socialist revolution.

* * *

What path the further development of Russia would take depended on what class would be at the head of the liberation struggle: the bourgeoisie or the proletariat. In the period when the tide of a people's revolution began to rise in the country this question was the subject of a sharp struggle between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, the opportunists in the working-class movement. The latter asserted that only the bourgeoisie could be the hegemon, the leader in a bourgeois revolution. They referred to historical

experience in an attempt to prove that a Russian revolution could only be a simple repetition of the type of bourgeois revolution that had taken place in France in 1789-1794.

Such analogies were untenable, for they completely ignored the different historical eras and the fundamentally different correlation of class forces. The French revolution took place at a time when capitalist development was on the ascent, when the bourgeoisie still played a progressive role as the spokesman of the new, the capitalist mode of production. In that revolution (as in earlier bourgeois revolutions) the proletariat and other strata of the urban population which did not belong to the bourgeoisie, either had no interests separate from those of the bourgeoisie, or did not yet constitute independently developed classes or parts of classes. As a matter of fact, they fought for the realisation of the interests of the bourgeoisie although not in the fashion of the bourgeoisie.⁷ A different situation was to be observed in Russia. The formation there of the bourgeoisie as a more or less independent political force took place at a time when the industrial proletariat with its class interests had already entered the arena of social struggle. And where the proletariat acts as an independent class the bourgeoisie ceases to play a revolutionary role.⁸

In the bourgeois revolutions in the West, in particular, the French revolution of the end of the 18th century, the bourgeoisie formed part of the third estate, deciding the fate of the feudal-absolutist system. In the Russian revolution of the beginning of the 20th century the liberal bourgeoisie constituted an independent political camp whose interests and aims differed from those of revolutionary democracy. The attempts of the Mensheviks to include the liberal bourgeoisie in the revolutionary camp were untenable for the latter's ideal was not revolution but reforms which would secure the establishment of a constitutional monarchy. Even in 1917, when the tsarist monarchy began to crumble under the blows of the people, the Cadets (the main party of the liberal bourgeoisie) tried in every way to save it through reforms. If the liberal opposition sometimes threatened revolution it was only in order to force tsarism to be more tractable. The liberal bourgeoisie reckoned that if it achieved hegemony in the revolutionary struggle it could compel tsarism to make a peaceful deal, one which would benefit the bourgeoisie most of all and the people least of all. The very concept "revolution" frightened the bourgeoisie. The class antagonism between it and the proletariat at the time of the first Russian revolution was already very sharp. This was the root cause of the cowardly counter-revolutionary behaviour of the bourgeoisie.

The course of events fully bore out the conclusion of the Bolshevik Party that only the working class could be the hegemon, the leader of the general struggle for a democratic revolution in Russia. As far back as 1894, Lenin predicted that it would be the working class that would rise at the head of all democratic elements and overthrow absolutism.⁹ Revolutionary Social-Democracy always focused on the working class, fostering in it awareness of its hegemony and helping it to organise itself as the leading force in the liberation struggle. Lenin's intolerance, and that of his comrades, of

the tactical line of Menshevism was precisely because this line prevented the working class from playing an independent political role in the revolutionary struggle and was aimed at turning it into a subsidiary of the liberal bourgeoisie.

A number of contemporary Western historians allege that in the first Russian revolution the differences between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks were due to the Bolsheviks wanting to thrust on the working-class movement the authoritarian principle, while the Mensheviks advocated broad democratism and independence of the proletariat.

Thus S. Schwarz declares that by their tactics the Mensheviks helped to develop the political independence of the workers and that the Bolsheviks, on the contrary, feared that independence of the proletarian masses might lead to their falling under bourgeois influence. It is from this angle that Schwarz examines the attitude of the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks to the strike struggle and trade unions, and to the Soviets of Workers' Deputies.¹⁰ But he misinterprets historical reality, keeps silent about the fact that the Mensheviks by their policy of compromise repressed the revolutionary initiative of the masses and their organisations, sought to confine the working-class movement to fighting for paltry demands so that the bourgeoisie should not "recoil from the revolution". It was the Bolsheviks, and not the Mensheviks, who worked tirelessly for the establishment of a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. It was the Bolsheviks, headed by Lenin, and not the Mensheviks, who saw in the Soviets of Workers' Deputies organs of the new, revolutionary power. The tactics of the Bolsheviks in the revolution pursued proletarian-revolutionary aims, whereas the tactics of the Mensheviks objectively played into the hands of the liberal bourgeoisie who wanted to extinguish the flame of revolution.

A. Asher, for his part, tries to ascribe to the Bolsheviks a tendency based, as he writes, on "permanent tutelage of the proletariat by the intelligentsia" which allegedly had no faith in the capacity of the workers to attain that degree of consciousness that would enable them to take a decisive part in the revolutionary events.¹¹ The activities of the Bolshevik party in general and in the first Russian revolution, in particular, refute this assertion. The Bolsheviks were concerned not with ensuring tutelage of the working class by the intelligentsia but with ensuring that the proletarian party did not lag behind the revolutionary movement, that it always be in the van of the masses, showing them the true and most direct way to victory. Criticising the Mensheviks for trailing behind the revolutionary events of 1905, Lenin wrote: "Good marchers but poor leaders, they disparage the materialist conception of history by ignoring the active, leading, and guiding part which can and must be played in history by parties that have realised the material prerequisites of a revolution and have placed themselves at the head of the progressive classes."¹²

Lenin and the Bolsheviks strove to give the spontaneous movement of the masses an organised and purposeful character and thus ensure the most favourable conditions for the people's victory

over tsarism. If the revolution was to develop it was essential to ensure the proletariat its independent organisation and leading role as the hegemonic class. Hence the need for leadership by the Party as the organised, vanguard detachment of the working class. The objective necessity for the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution stemmed from the fact that it developed in that historical epoch when the proletariat had already come to the fore, determining the main content and trend of development.

It is significant that the Russian proletariat created its own political party before the Russian bourgeoisie managed to do so. On the threshold of the revolution the working-class movement demonstrated its growing strength and high degree of organisation. The years 1900-1904 witnessed a powerful upswing of the strike movement. A new form of struggle came into being—the mass demonstration.

The beginning of the 1905 revolution was marked by a great wave of economic and political strikes that swept the country after “Bloody Sunday”, January 22 (January 9 according to the old calendar), when a peaceful procession of St. Petersburg workers to the Winter Palace to present a petition to the tsar was shot down. As Lenin noted, the mass strike was the main means of drawing millions of working people into the revolutionary struggle. Later, when analysing the lessons of the revolution, Lenin wrote: “The Russian revolution was the *first*, though certainly not the last, great revolution in history in which the mass political strike played an extraordinarily important part. It may even be said that the events of the Russian revolution and the sequence of its political forms cannot be understood without a study of the *strike statistics* to disclose the *basis* of these events and this sequence of forms.”¹³ During the ten years preceding the revolution, the average annual number of strikers totalled 43,000, that is, 430,000 for the whole decade. In 1905 in January alone 440,000 downed tools. The total number of strikers for 1905 was nearly three million.¹⁴ If we include railwaymen, miners, workers employed at small enterprises, the number of strikers in 1905 reached close on five million.¹⁵

The economic strikes often grew into political strikes and these paved the way to armed uprisings. The most significant of these was the uprising in Moscow in December 1905. Like the all-Russia strike in October, the uprising showed the capacity of the working class to play the leading role in the general democratic revolution, to inspire the non-proletarian working masses to rise up in open struggle against the autocracy and its social prop—the landlords and the nobility. Up to 1905 mankind did not yet know, in the words of Lenin, what a great, what a tremendous exertion of effort the proletariat was capable of when it was a question of fighting for really great aims and, what is more, fighting in a revolutionary manner.¹⁶

The heroic struggle of the Russian proletariat exerted a strong influence on the revolutionary movement of the peasantry. In 1905 there were over 3,200 peasant actions, in 1906—2,600 and in the first seven months of 1907—about 900.¹⁷ Peasants destroyed the estates of the landlords, seized the land and other means of production which they divided among themselves. The peasant movement, it is true,

was not powerful enough to destroy landlord proprietorship. The peasants' actions were not organised enough and not aggressive enough. All this notwithstanding, the beginning was laid for a firm alliance of the peasantry with the working class. In the course of the revolution and after it, the peasants saw for themselves that only in an alliance with the workers and only under their leadership could they hope to free themselves from landlord bondage and obtain land.

In previous bourgeois revolutions the peasantry had acted as an ally of the bourgeoisie which then still believed in the harmony of its interests with the interests of the masses and had no fears for the stability of its rule. As Marx noted, the French bourgeoisie at the end of the 18th century began with the liberation of the peasants and with the help of the peasantry conquered Europe.¹⁸ But already in the German revolution of the middle of the 19th century the bourgeoisie no longer believed in the harmony of its interests with those of the peasants and preferred to have an alliance with the monarchy. The class stratification of the German peasantry had by then become more pronounced than in the period of the French revolution of the end of the 18th century, and the contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the broad masses therefore stood out more sharply.

In the Russian revolution of 1905 there were two social wars: one—against the autocracy and the survivals of serfdom, the other—against capitalist exploitation. Of decisive importance, however, especially in the countryside, was the first social war upon the winning of which depended the success of the struggle for the liberation of labour from capital. The struggle against the dominance of the latifundia and other survivals of serfdom connected with them was the focus of the peasant movement. Lenin called the first Russian revolution a peasant one essentially. Not every bourgeois revolution, he stressed, is a peasant one, but every peasant revolution directed against the remnants of mediaevalism, when the whole of the social economy is of a capitalist nature, is a revolution of the bourgeoisie.¹⁹

The definition of the Russian bourgeois-democratic revolution as a peasant revolution was of the utmost importance for the policy of the working class and its party towards the peasant movement. Since there still remained the class antagonism between the peasants and the landlords, characteristic of a serf-owning society, the working class and its party could not but be on the side of the peasantry as a whole in its struggle against the remnants of serfdom. This underlies the tactics of the Bolsheviks aimed at achieving a revolutionary alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry and neutralisation of the liberal bourgeoisie. “At the head of the whole people and particularly of the peasantry—for complete freedom, for a consistent democratic revolution, for a republic!”²⁰ is how Lenin formulated the political line of the proletariat and its party at the democratic stage of the revolution. He explained in this connection that the abolition in a revolutionary way of landed proprietorship and the transfer of the land to the peasants would lead to capitalist development and not to socialist development as the Socialist-Revolutionaries (the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie), believed.

The complete release of the peasants from semi-feudal fetters and their transformation into free farmers on the "labour principle" and on the basis of the equalised distribution of the land would only place them in conditions of bourgeois social relations. Criticising the Socialist-Revolutionaries who called the peasant movement a socialist movement, Lenin stressed that this movement was a necessary concomitant of the democratic revolution, which was a bourgeois one in its socio-economic content. It was directed not against the foundations of the bourgeois order, not against the commodity exchange economy and capital but against the old semi-feudal, pre-capitalist relations in the countryside and against landlord proprietorship. At the same time, Lenin exposed the fundamentally incorrect views of the Mensheviks who asserted that the struggle of the peasants for the "equalised" distribution of the land was reactionary in character. He pointed out that the utopian peasant ideas about "equalisation" of the small farmers in the conditions of commodity production expressed the revolutionary democratism of the peasantry and their determination to fight against the survivals of serfdom.²¹

In regard to the peasantry the Mensheviks did not, as a matter of fact, differ from the liberal bourgeoisie who were not at all interested in the complete abolition of landlord proprietorship. The path of agrarian evolution which Lenin called the Prussian way fully suited them. It is not accidental that even after the overthrow of tsarism in February 1917, when the bourgeoisie was in power, it did nothing to satisfy the demands of the peasantry regarding the landed estates. Even more. The bourgeois Provisional Government used punitive detachments in an attempt to suppress the peasant actions against the landowners. This explains why the bulk of the peasantry supported the working class in its struggle for a socialist revolution. In his speech to the Third Congress of the Communist International (1921) Lenin said: "We were victorious because the vast mass of the peasants were revolutionarily disposed against the big landowners."²² Only the Great October Socialist Revolution fundamentally settled the agrarian question in the interests of the peasantry.

* * *

Owing to a number of reasons, the people did not succeed in overthrowing the autocracy in the first Russian revolution. Despite the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants and the mutinies in the army and the navy, despite the exploits of the heroes of the revolution such as the sailors of the battleship *Potemkin*, tsarism was able to defeat the revolutionary forces. Like the Mensheviks, Plekhanov held that the revolution's defeat was due to the conservativeness of the peasantry. The revolutionary explosion of 1905-1907, he wrote, "turned out to be less significant than it had seemed at first to our revolutionaries and our protectors. The said explosion was a combination of two forces, utterly different in their

nature. One of them was created by the process of the Europeanisation of Russia, which began as far back as the end of the 15th century, the other was engendered by our old Eastern mode of life. One was essentially revolutionary even when it avoided violent actions; the other preserved its conservative character even when it took the most violent actions"²³

Such an over-simplified and, in essence, falsified explanation of the reasons for the defeat of the revolution ignored the concrete correlation of class forces in it, the behaviour of the liberal bourgeoisie, not to mention a number of other important factors. The revolution was defeated because the alliance of the working class and the peasantry was still not sufficiently stable. The revolution failed to win over to its side the army which largely consisted of peasants. The necessary unity in the ranks of the working class was lacking. The establishment of such unity was hampered by the Mensheviks, by their policy of compromise and their attempts to subordinate the working class to the leadership of the treacherous liberal bourgeoisie. Another important factor was the financial and political support rendered tsarism by the West European bourgeois governments. It took another decade to forge the stable alliance of the working class and the peasantry which ensured the success of the struggle to overthrow the tsarist monarchy. In February-March 1917 it crumbled within several days under the blows of the insurgent workers and soldiers. However without the first revolution which, as Lenin put it, deeply ploughed the soil, awakened millions of workers and tens of millions of peasants to political life and political struggle, such a rapid victory of the people over tsarism would have been impossible.²⁴

Comparing a number of revolutions of the beginning of the 20th century, Lenin noted that the Portuguese (1910) and Turkish (1908) revolutions, for example, were bourgeois and not people's revolutions, for the overwhelming majority of the people did not actively and independently come forward with their own economic and political demands in these revolutions. In the Russian revolution, on the contrary, "the mass of the people, their majority, the very lowest social groups, crushed by oppression and exploitation, rose independently and stamped on the entire course of the revolution the imprint of *their own demands, their attempts to build in their own way a new society in place of the old society that was being destroyed*".²⁵ The mass character of the revolution was expressed in the strike struggle of the working class, in the armed insurrections which advanced definite social and political demands and in the broad peasant movement which pursued the object of abolition of landlord proprietorship and all survivals of serfdom in the countryside.

This revolution gave vivid expression to the revolutionary creative genius of the people which left a deep imprint in the minds of the working people. One of the greatest examples of the people's creative genius was the Soviets of Workers' Deputies which were to play an outstanding historic role. Already at the beginning of 1905 workers' commissions, deputies' and delegates' meetings, and strike commit-

tees began to be formed at factories and mills as organs of the strike struggle. Thus in the textile centre of Ivanovo-Voznesensk a Council of Workers' Representatives (deputies) was elected on May 13 to conduct negotiations with the factory owners and local authorities and to direct the strike that had broken out. In the course of the strike the Council's functions broadened. It actually began to exercise authority in the town: it annulled the old laws and on its own authority introduced freedom of speech, the press and assembly, and formed a workers' militia.

Thus the beginning was laid for the establishment of the organs of the new revolutionary power. In the course of the October all-Russia strike Soviets of Workers' Deputies arose in St. Petersburg, Moscow and in many other cities and working-class centres.

The Soviets came into being as a product of the creative activity of the people, as a manifestation of the revolutionary spontaneous activity of the masses who were freeing themselves from their old political fetters. They were organs of the new power, Lenin stressed, for all their rudimentary, spontaneous and diffusive character as regards their composition and the way they functioned.²⁶ The St. Petersburg Soviet captured the printing works, on its own authority introduced an 8-hour working day, helped to organise fighting squads at factories and mills, called on the people not to give money to the government, to arrest the police who tried to prevent revolutionary actions by the masses. To police interdictions the workers replied: "We have our own government. We will inquire of the Soviet and act accordingly."²⁷ Soviets in other cities carried out similar functions.

The Mensheviks could not, and did not want to, for that matter, understand the mass character of the first Russian revolution, having vulgarised the very definition "bourgeois revolution". They believed that the victory of this revolution should lead to a period of long capitalist rule with all its inherent attributes, including the parliamentary system. They therefore derided any mention of organs of power that were of a non-bourgeois, people's character. As H. D. Mehlinger and J. M. Tomson admit "the Mensheviks warmly embraced the Soviet [St. Petersburg Soviet. — S. T.] but were not always certain exactly what it was or what it should be".²⁸ Such "ignorance" was explained by the fact that in their assessment of the character of the Russian revolution the Mensheviks used the old yardstick, not wanting to recognise that it was a bourgeois revolution of a new type.

In 1906 the Mensheviks appealed to the leaders of West European Social-Democracy with a view to enlisting their support for their (Mensheviks') assessment of the character of the Russian revolution. Plekhanov, in particular, asked Karl Kautsky to express his views on some of the questions put to him. Kautsky did so in his pamphlet *The Motive Forces and Perspectives of the Russian Revolution*. In it he wrote that the time of bourgeois revolutions in which the bourgeoisie had been the motive force had passed and that the proletariat was no longer a simple subsidiary and instrument of the bourgeoisie as had been the case in the bourgeois revolutions of the past. The proletariat acts as an independent class with its own revolutionary aims.

Therefore the Russian revolution cannot be regarded as a bourgeois revolution in the usual sense of the word. But it cannot be regarded as a socialist revolution either. This revolution should be seen as a specific kind of process "taking place on the borderline of a bourgeois and a socialist society, furthering the abolition of the first and preparing the conditions for the formation of the second".²⁹

In his assessment of the Russian revolution Kautsky still stood on Marxist positions. In the preface to the Russian translation of the pamphlet Lenin noted the Marxist presentation of the question on the character of the revolution and on the class forces that were capable of ensuring its victory. He drew attention to the fact that Kautsky, despite the Mensheviks, was not afraid at that time to say that the Social-Democrats must strive for victory in the Russian revolution. "But victory in the present revolution," wrote Lenin, "cannot be the victory of the proletariat alone, without the aid of other classes. Which class then, owing to the objective conditions of the present revolution, is the ally of the proletariat? *The peasantry*."³⁰

The objective situation was such that only the workers and peasants, and not the liberal bourgeoisie, were interested in a real victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia. The Mensheviks were incapable of understanding what at first sight appeared to be a paradox and strove to achieve an alliance of the proletariat with the liberal bourgeoisie. Subjecting the views and policy of the Mensheviks to devastating criticism Lenin showed that the victory of the bourgeois revolution in Russia was impossible as the victory of the bourgeoisie. "The preponderance of the peasant population, its terrible oppression by the semi-feudal big landowning system, the strength and class-consciousness of the proletariat already organised in a socialist party — all these circumstances impart to *our* bourgeois revolution a *specific* character."³¹

Proceeding from the specific character of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia as a revolution of the people, Lenin treated the question of state power in a new way. As distinct from the Mensheviks who oriented themselves towards power passing into the hands of the bourgeoisie and a long period of capitalist rule, Lenin substantiated the conclusion about the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. He showed that only such a dictatorship could decisively crush the attempts of the reactionary forces to restore the old regime, could uproot all survivals of serfdom and carry out fundamental democratic reforms in the interests of the people, could prepare the real conditions that would enable the proletariat to pass to the struggle for its immediate socialist goals.

The experience of the mass struggle of the workers and peasants against the tsarist autocracy, as well as the experience of the treacherous behaviour of the liberal bourgeoisie in the revolution enabled Lenin to draw the conclusion that in the new historical conditions not the bourgeois-parliamentary republic as the organ of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie can secure the gains of the working people, but precisely the organ of the revolutionary-democratic

dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, that is, the overwhelming majority of the people. Such a dictatorship must be the transitional form from the dictatorship of workers and peasants to the dictatorship of the proletariat. The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, Lenin noted, has a past and a future. Its past is the struggle against the autocracy, with its survivals of serfdom. Its future is the struggle against private property and for socialism.³²

The Mensheviks tried to refute the Bolshevik slogan of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants by advancing the sophistic argument that there was no unity of will between the workers and peasants. This denial of their community of interests at the democratic stage, of the revolution stemmed from the entire system of the Mensheviks' views regarding the character of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, its motive forces and prospects and the essence of bourgeois democracy in general. In their theoretical and political thinking the Menshevik ideologues clung to the conception of bourgeois democratism established by the bourgeois revolutions of the past. They believed that revolution must develop according to an invariable pattern: at the initial stage the big bourgeoisie will be in power and will ensure a certain minimum of liberties on the basis of a constitutional monarchy; then at some later stage it will be replaced by a petty-bourgeois democratic republic; and only afterwards, when capitalism has reached a high stage of development and the proletariat has become the overwhelming majority of the nation can the question arise of passing directly to the struggle for socialism. This dogmatic pattern ignored the features of the new historical epoch, the new alignment of class forces when the working class already stood at the head of the liberation struggle of the working people, when the revolutionary creative genius of the masses had already produced a type of democracy incomparably higher than the usual bourgeois democracy.

The Bolshevik slogan of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry was opposed by Trotsky who advanced the so-called theory of "permanent revolution". He declared that after the overthrow of the autocracy only a dictatorship of the proletariat must be established since the peasantry is not capable of forming its own party with which the workers' party could enter into a bloc.³³ This argument, first, ignored the democratic stage of the revolution and, second, denied the revolutionary role of the peasantry as the ally of the proletariat. This was, so to speak, Menshevism inside out. The Mensheviks did not recognise the revolutionary potentialities of the peasantry and urged the proletariat to form an alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie to avoid finding themselves isolated; Trotsky did not believe that the Russian proletariat, in alliance with the many-millioned peasantry, could be victorious and ensure the democratic transformations that would be the necessary prerequisite for the struggle for socialism. Hence his negative attitude to the slogan of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry.

Lenin exposed both the Menshevik and the Trotskyite position and pointed out that the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship presupposes not an agreement of parties but the real correlation of class forces that could take shape as a result of the people's victory over tsarism. Under the leadership of the proletariat the peasantry was undoubtedly capable of playing a tremendous revolutionary role in the democratic revolution without which the transition to the struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution was inconceivable. "Whoever wants to reach socialism by any other path than that of political democracy, will inevitably arrive at conclusions that are absurd and reactionary both in the economic and the political sense,"³⁴ wrote Lenin. He scrutinised the question of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants from the point of view of the possibilities and the necessity of the bourgeois-democratic revolution growing into a socialist revolution. The hegemony of the proletariat in the democratic revolution being in alliance with the entire peasantry prepared the conditions for the hegemony of the proletariat in the socialist revolution now being in alliance with all the oppressed and the exploited and, in the first place, the poorest peasantry.

The alignment of class forces in the country was such as made it possible to pass from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the socialist revolution without a long historical interval. In September 1905 Lenin wrote that "from the democratic revolution we shall at once, and precisely in accordance with the measure of our strength, the strength of the class-conscious and organised proletariat, begin to pass to the socialist revolution".³⁵ Thus Lenin shattered the Menshevik dogma about the inevitability of a long period of capitalist rule between the bourgeois-democratic and socialist revolutions. It is characteristic that contemporary bourgeois historians prefer often to keep silent on this score or to twist the facts. Thus H. Seton-Watson, for example, claims that "after 1905 Lenin believed that a long interval would be required between the bourgeois revolution... and the socialist revolution... in order that the polarisation of peasant society... should be completed...."³⁶

But Lenin considered the transition from one revolution to another to be dependent on the degree of class-consciousness and organisation of the proletariat. And the required degree of class-consciousness and organisation is forged in the process of class struggle. Struggle and struggle alone determines the measure of strength and possibilities of the proletariat. In the first Russian revolution each month of this period, in the words of Lenin, was so far as teaching the masses, classes and parties the fundamentals of political science equivalent to a whole year of "peaceful" development.³⁷

Lenin's proposition on the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one was a new concept in the revolutionary theory and practice of the class struggle of the proletariat. It opened up new prospects with due account of the new historical situation that took shape at the beginning of the 20th century.

The first Russian revolution gave a great lesson of mass struggle against the oppressors. In its development it passed through periods of upsurge and decline. Each of these periods was characterised by special methods and means of struggle. When the revolution was on the upsurge the proletariat and its party guided themselves mainly by offensive tactics and pursued a course towards armed insurrection as the only possible means of overthrowing the feudal-militarist tsarist clique and winning a democratic republic. When the revolution was on the ebb other forms of struggle — legal and illegal — were tested, including parliamentary (the Duma), the press and trade unions for preparing the masses for new revolutionary battles.

The revolution of 1905-1907 in Russia was a brilliant test of the theory and tactics of Bolshevism. The Bolshevik party emerged from this test ideologically and organisationally stronger and with firmer and broader ties with the masses. The Bolsheviks showed in practice their ability to tackle the urgent problems of the revolutionary struggle and solve them, to defend both the immediate interests of the working people and the ultimate goal of their liberation movement. By coming out under Bolshevik slogans the Russian proletariat influenced broad democratic sections of Russian society. Opposition mounted in the army and also among the petty-bourgeois sections of the population who were drawn into the struggle. The broad masses of the working people of Russia's outlying national regions convinced themselves more and more through the experience of the revolution that only the proletariat was the most staunch fighter for their rights and against all forms of national oppression and inequality. In the course of the revolutionary battles the cohesion of the working people of the country's different nationalities grew under the banner of proletarian internationalism.

In the revolution of 1905-1907 for the first time in Russia all the classes came out openly, all programme and tactical propositions were tested by mass action. In open revolutionary struggle the masses passed through a school of political education, widened their horizon, forged their will. The revolution once and for all buried patriarchal Russia and turned it into a country of a revolutionary people. The rich lessons of the revolution were fully taken into account by the Bolshevik Party in the subsequent struggle to prepare the working class and the peasantry for the new revolutionary battles which ultimately led to the overthrow of the domination of the landowners and capitalists and to the establishment of the world's first socialist state.

* * *

The revolution of 1905-1907 was an event of tremendous international significance. It graphically confirmed the fact that the revolutionary centre had shifted to Russia. The revolution stirred up the broad masses and the oppressed in many countries of the West and the East.

Rosa Luxemburg noted that the effect of the Russian events on Social-Democracy in Germany was particularly evident in the attitude to the general strike.³⁸ Assessing the significance of strike struggle by the proletariat, Henriette Roland-Holst, a leading Dutch Social-Democrat, wrote that the mass strike is able to disorganise the machinery of state, to revolutionise the army and to create the necessary conditions for armed insurrection which decides the fate of the whole revolution.³⁹ All who really aspired to the liberation of the working class considered it necessary to study the experience of the Russian revolution, to re-examine the arsenal of tactical means, in particular, those connected with the problem of spontaneity and degree of organisation in the working-class movement, the role of the proletarian party in organising mass struggle, etc.

The Russian revolution exerted a strong influence on the intensifying struggle between the revolutionary and opportunist elements in the parties of the Second International and facilitated the further demarcation between them. The Bolshevik party, taking into account the experience of the revolution, waged a successful struggle against opportunism and reformism, as well as against petty-bourgeois pseudo-revolutionism, in the Russian and international working-class movement. Without such a struggle the victory of the working class over the bourgeoisie would not have been possible. On the basis of an in-depth study of the experience of the revolution the Bolshevik party raised and solved a number of theoretical problems that were of vital importance for its subsequent revolutionary activities.

The revolution of 1905-1907 with its own specific proletarian means of struggle stimulated the upsurge of the working-class movement in Europe and America. The workers in many countries responded to the revolutionary events in Russia with mass strikes, demonstrations and protest movements against the bloody crimes of the tsarist government. The proletariat of Germany and Britain prevented the ruling circles of their country from rendering direct armed support to tsarism. German workers furthermore helped to stock weapons for the Russian revolutionaries and ship them to Russia. In France, mass meetings protesting the shooting down of workers in St. Petersburg were held in the very first days of the revolution. "Aid to the Russian revolution cemented the unity and cohesion of all socialists."⁴⁰ Mass demonstrations took place in Italy, Austria-Hungary, Belgium and in other countries.

The proletariat of the whole world looked, in the words of Lenin, with feverish impatience at the Russian working class. "The overthrow of tsarism in Russia, so valiantly begun by our working class, will be a turning point in the history of all countries; it will facilitate the task of the workers of all nations, in all states, in all parts of the globe."⁴¹ The heroic struggle of the workers and peasants of Russia was an inspiring example to the working people of all countries and continents. Romero Flores, a participant of the Mexican revolution (1910-1917) declared: "We were inspired by the revolution-

ary impulse of Russia in 1905 which was suppressed by the tsar. For us the struggle that took place in Russia then was a lodestar; we saw in this great people our hope."⁴²

Although the revolution ended in defeat and did not yield the expected results the international liberation movement of the proletariat advanced to a higher stage thanks to this revolution. It armed the working class with a new method of struggle, that of a general political strike, applied for the first time by the workers of Russia. It heightened awareness of international proletarian solidarity as one of the major conditions for the success of labour's struggle against capital on an international scale.

The revolution of 1905-1907 was spearheaded not only against the feudal-absolutist system, but against imperialism as well. It stimulated the national liberation movement in a number of countries of the colonial East. The democratic revolutions in Asia (Iran, Turkey, China) were engendered by the Russian revolution. "World capitalism and the 1905 movement in Russia," wrote Lenin, "have finally aroused Asia. Hundreds of millions of the downtrodden and benighted have awakened from mediaeval stagnation to a new life and are rising to fight for elementary human rights and democracy."⁴³ The revolution in Russia struck the first telling blow to the colonial system of imperialism, showed an example of how to combine the proletarian struggle against capitalist oppression with the national liberation movement of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries.

The lessons of the great revolutionary whirlwind of 1905-1907 were and remain a subject of close study by historians and also by those who are in the van of the struggle of the working people for democratic and socialist ideals in many countries of the world. The various forms of struggle against the absolutist system and exploiter classes, which were tested in the first Russian revolution, the combination of the democratic and socialist tasks of the proletariat, its hegemony in the general democratic movement, its alliance with the non-proletarian working masses and particularly with the many-millioned peasantry — all this has become a part of the arsenal of the revolutionary strategy and tactics of the communist and workers' parties.

A characteristic feature of the present epoch is the transition from capitalism to socialism on an international scale. It is a historical process in the course of which various forms of mass movements are being evolved, and anti-monopoly and democratic alliances formed in the countries of developed capitalism, a process in the course of which the people's struggle against imperialism and for national independence and social progress in the developing countries is intensifying. At the same time, the historic competition between the two different systems is being conducted on an ever wider front, the socialist system representing the main force in the anti-imperialist struggle, a mighty bulwark of peace, democracy and socialism. And if today various revolutionary detachments possess immeasurably greater experience and more varied methods and means of struggle

than they did at the beginning of the century, they are indebted for this in no small measure to the traditions, ideas and behests of the revolution of 1905-1907 — the first people's revolution of the epoch of imperialism.

NOTES

- ¹ Resolution of the CC CPSU "On the 70th Anniversary of the Revolution of 1905-1907 in Russia", *Kommunist*, No. 2, 1975, p. 3.
- ² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 29, p. 310.
- ³ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 140 (in Russian).
- ⁴ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 413-414.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 25.
- ⁶ See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, p. 153.
- ⁷ See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1969, p. 139.
- ⁸ For more details see: N. Druzhinin, "The Specific Features of Capitalism in Russia as Compared with Western Europe and the USA", *Social Sciences*, No. 3, 1973; A. Chistozvonov, "Stage and Regional Study of Bourgeois Revolutions in Europe in the 16th-18th Centuries", *Social Sciences*, No. 4, 1973.
- ⁹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 300.
- ¹⁰ See S. Schwarz, *The Russian Revolution of 1905, The Workers' Movement and the Formation of Bolshevism and Menshevism*, Chicago-London, 1967.
- ¹¹ See A. Asher, *Pavel Axelrod and the Development of Menshevism*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1972, p. 177.
- ¹² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 44.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 23, p. 239.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. 23, p. 240.
- ¹⁵ See *Historical Notes*, Moscow, Vol. 52, 1955, p. 182 (in Russian).
- ¹⁶ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 240.
- ¹⁷ See S. M. Dubrovsky, *The Peasant Movement in the Revolution of 1905-1907*, Moscow, 1956, p. 142 (in Russian).
- ¹⁸ See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. 6, p. 131 (in Russian).
- ¹⁹ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 351.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, Vol. 9, p. 114.
- ²¹ See *ibid.*, Vol. 13, p. 237.
- ²² *Ibid.*, Vol. 32, p. 473.
- ²³ G. V. Plekhanov, *Works*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1925, Vol. 20, p. 114 (in Russian).
- ²⁴ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 297.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. 25, p. 416.
- ²⁶ See *ibid.*, Vol. 10, p. 242.
- ²⁷ P. Gorin, *Essays on the History of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies in 1905*, Moscow, 1930, p. 88 (in Russian).
- ²⁸ H. D. Mehlinger and J. M. Tomson, *Count Witte and Tsarist Government in the 1905 Revolution*, Bloomington/London, 1972, p. 136.
- ²⁹ K. Kautsky, *The Motive Forces and Perspectives of the Russian Revolution*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1926, p. 27 (in Russian).
- ³⁰ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 410.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. 15, p. 56.
- ³² See *ibid.*, Vol. 9, p. 82.
- ³³ See L. Trotsky, *Our Revolution*, St. Petersburg, 1906, p. 254 (in Russian).
- ³⁴ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 29.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. 9, p. 237.

- ³⁶ H. Seton-Watson, *The Impact of the Russian Revolution, 1917-1967*, New York, 1967, p. 191.
- ³⁷ See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 25.
- ³⁸ R. Luxemburg, *The General Strike and German Social-Democracy*, Petrograd, 1919, p. 89 (in Russian).
- ³⁹ See H. Roland-Holst, *The General Strike and Social Democracy*, St. Petersburg, 1906, pp. 260, 264, 278 (in Russian).
- ⁴⁰ G. Cogniot, "1905: la première révolution russe et le mouvement ouvrier français", *Cahiers du communisme*, No. 3, March 1975, p. 109.
- ⁴¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 100.
- ⁴² *The First Russian Revolution and the International Revolutionary Movement*, Moscow, 1956, Part II, p. 240 (in Russian).
- ⁴³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 86.

Vietnam: Road to Victory

ANATOLI URALSKY

September 2, 1975, saw the 30th anniversary of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the first state of workers and peasants in Southeast Asia. Throughout these 30 years the DRV has been an impregnable bastion of the selfless struggle waged by the entire Vietnamese people for freedom and independence.

For the first time in 30 years the Vietnamese people are living and working in peace and freedom on their long-suffering land. All progressive mankind is lost in admiration of the victory won by heroic Vietnam. The long struggle against foreign interventionists, first the French colonialists and then the US imperialists and their local myrmidons, has come to a successful close. As a result, an end has been put in the south of the country to the degenerate regime, to the anti-people's corrupt administration that relied on bayonets and political terrorism and was to blame for the long war and the disruption of all efforts to reach a political settlement.

In assessing the significance of the victory, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Vietnam Le Duan said: "With immeasurable joy the 45 million people of our country celebrate the great victory that brilliantly ended the longest, most bitter and greatest patriotic war in the national history of our struggle against foreign invasions.

"We welcome the new era in the 4,000-years' history of our nation, an era of Vietnam's splendid development as a peaceful, united, democratic and flourishing country."¹

The DRV was formed as a result of the revolution of August 1945, in the course of which the Vietnamese people shook off the rule of the

A. Uralsky, specialist in international relations, author of a number of articles and pamphlets on the national liberation movements in Asia and especially in Southeast Asia and on foreign policy problems of the developing countries.

imperialists and the feudal nobility collaborating with them. The revolution triumphed in a colonial and semi-feudal country under the leadership of the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party. The August revolution "was a national liberation revolution and a decisive step of the national people's democratic revolution in Vietnam".²

The mainspring of that revolution was the acute socio-economic and political crisis that stemmed from the exploitation and oppression of the Vietnamese people by foreign invaders, who relied on the local reactionaries. Vietnam was seized by the French colonialists in the mid-19th century. Early in the Second World War the whole of Indochina was overrun by Japanese troops. That occupation led to economic dislocation, inflation and unemployment. Taxation and the sequestration of peasant households reached unprecedented proportions. Famine began.

The Communist Party of Indochina organised and led the movement for national liberation against the invaders. At its eighth plenary meeting in May 1941 the CPI Central Committee passed a decision on the formation of the Viet-Minh, a broad united national front. The Programme and Constitution of the Viet-Minh were published on October 25, 1941. It was proclaimed that the aim of the Viet-Minh was to fight the Japanese and French imperialists, achieve complete independence and form a "revolutionary government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam". It was underscored that the Viet-Minh, which placed the interests of the nation above all else, was prepared to cooperate with all persons and organisations regardless of their property status, sex, age and religious and political views, provided they sincerely desired the expulsion of the invaders and Vietnam's independence and freedom.³

The Soviet Union's victory over German fascism sped up the maturing of a revolutionary situation in Vietnam. "The defeat of the Hitlerite fascists and the Japanese militarists," Ho Chi Minh noted, "by the Soviet Army was the principal factor facilitating our victory in August 1945."⁴ At their Party conference on August 13, 1945, the Vietnamese Communists adopted the historic decision on the commencement of a nation-wide uprising against the Japanese invaders. The Party set the course towards "stirring the masses to the struggle, wresting power from the hands of the Japanese, deposing their puppets, becoming the masters of their own country so as in that status to meet the Allied forces".⁵

The rising triumphed in Hanoi on August 19, in Hueh on August 23 and in Saigon on August 25. In the course of only 11 days the revolution swept triumphantly across all the provinces of Vietnam. A Provisional Revolutionary Government, headed by the outstanding revolutionary and leader of the Vietnamese Communists Ho Chi Minh, was formed in Hanoi on August 27. In the relevant communique it was stated that the power in the entire country had passed to the Committee for National Liberation formed by the All-Vietnam Congress of People's Representatives. The Declaration of Independence, proclaiming the birth of the Democratic Republic of

Vietnam, was read by President Ho Chi Minh on September 2, 1945. A new epoch opened for the people of Vietnam.

The August revolution in Vietnam was the first consistently national people's democratic revolution in Southeast Asia. The liberation movement in Vietnam developed along the road blazed by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, in close interaction with the world revolutionary forces. The specific combination of national and social elements in the Vietnamese liberation movement predetermined the leadership of that movement by the Left forces. Moreover, the Communist Party became the leader of the national liberation struggle.

This was the cardinal specific of the national liberation movement in Vietnam and it powerfully influenced the whole subsequent history of that country. This specific sprang not only from the internal conditions of colonial Vietnam (the existence of a relatively highly concentrated and a relatively nationally homogeneous working class, the massive dispossession of land belonging to the peasants, and the social immaturity of the bourgeoisie and its lack of political organisation), but also from the fact that no political party in Vietnam had such allies outside Vietnam as had the Communist Party of Indochina in the person of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the French Communist Party and other contingents of the world revolutionary movement.

The Communist Party became the acknowledged leader of the Vietnamese people largely as a result of its creative assimilation of international experience and its skilful application of that experience to the conditions obtaining in Vietnam in combination with the flexibility of its policy at different phases of the people's democratic revolution.

However, no sooner had they triumphed than the Vietnamese people had to defend their revolutionary gains against imperialist aggression. As early as 1945, in an effort to restore their rule in Indochina, the French colonialists unleashed hostilities in South Vietnam. They destroyed the organs of people's power and restored the former colonial practices on Vietnamese soil. Thus began the Vietnamese people's heroic War of Resistance against imperialist intervention. The resistance to the colonialists continued for nearly nine years and comprised the main content of the Vietnamese revolution in that period.

The intervention by the French imperialists ended in failure when in the spring of 1954 the Resistance forces crushed a 15,000-strong unit of the French Expeditionary Corps at Dien Bien Phu.

The successful culmination of the Vietnamese people's struggle for liberation was acknowledged by the world and formalised in the Geneva Agreements of July 1954, which provided for the restoration of peace in Indochina, for recognition of the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia and for the further peaceful development of these countries.

A temporary demarcation line running approximately along the 17th parallel and dividing the country into two was established in Vietnam. The French troops were evacuated from North Vietnam south of the demarcation line, while the Liberation forces were regrouped in the North. Article 6 of the Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference states that the military demarcation line was temporary and could not be regarded as a political or territorial frontier. The question of unifying the country was left to the Vietnamese people, to be decided by them at free general elections that were to be held in July 1956.

The Geneva Agreements opened the road to a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam problem. This was a signal victory of the Vietnamese people. "It was the first time," Ho Chi Minh wrote, "that a small colonial country emerged victorious in a confrontation with a large colonial power."⁶

With the victory in the War of Resistance the Vietnamese revolution entered a new phase of its development. In characterising that phase the Second Congress of the Workers' Party of Vietnam (the name assumed by the Vietnamese Section of the Communist Party of Indochina), held in February 1951, declared: "Under the leadership of the working class this revolution, of which the working people are the main force, will not only carry out anti-imperialist and anti-feudal tasks but will facilitate the powerful development of the people's democratic system, sow the seeds of socialism and create the conditions for the advance to socialism. This revolution will consummate the bourgeois-democratic tasks and evolve into a socialist revolution."⁷

Constructive work was started on a huge scale to rebuild and develop the economy and far-reaching revolutionary changes were made in all spheres of social life in North Vietnam following the restoration of peace in 1954. The Workers' Party of Vietnam steered a course towards a gradual transition to socialism, by-passing the stage of capitalist development, in North Vietnam, which was then an economically backward, mainly agrarian country.

Meanwhile, south of the 17th parallel, the national liberation struggle, which changed from an armed to a political struggle, remained the principal content of the revolutionary movement. There the imperialists managed to preserve an anti-people's colonialist regime. The creation of the "Republic of Vietnam" was proclaimed in Saigon in October 1955. Its Constitution "legalised" the dictatorship of the US puppet Ngo Dinh Diem, spokesman of the pro-US elements among the South Vietnamese compradore bourgeoisie, who replaced the Emperor Bao Dai, a close collaborator of the French colonialists. Ngo Dinh Diem obediently carried out the will of the imperialist circles in the USA, who had decided to set up in South Vietnam a regime that would be an instrument of US policy in Southeast Asia. The social mainstay of that regime consisted of landowners, the rural nobility, the compradore bourgeoisie, the Catholic élite, reactionary army officers and officials of the puppet administration. The Saigon

regime relied heavily on the armed forces that were maintained entirely by the Pentagon.

Writing of the specifics of the revolutionary process at that stage, Ho Chi Minh noted: "From 1954 onwards the Vietnamese revolution had two strategic aims: on the one hand, to put socialist reforms into effect and build socialism in the North and, on the other hand, conduct a patriotic struggle for South Vietnam's liberation from domination by US imperialism and its lackeys in order to reunite the country."⁸

The building of the new life in the North commenced as soon as the DRV was proclaimed. The country's first-ever Constitution, which gave legislative embodiment to the DRV's social and state system, was adopted as early as 1946. Steps were instituted to restrict feudal exploitation, restore and promote the economy, strengthen the defence potential and raise the people's cultural level. Broad socio-economic reforms were enforced in the DRV after 1954. The agrarian reform was completed by the end of 1956: a total of 810,000 hectares of land was confiscated from the landowners and turned over gratis to 2,000,000 working peasants' families.⁹ In North Vietnam the national economy was in the main restored in 1957, i.e., within a period of less than three years.

The three-year plan of economic reorganisation and development, adopted in the DRV in 1958, provided for the abolition of capitalist ownership of the means of production in industry and commerce, the reorganisation of agriculture and artisan production on the basis of socialist ownership and the eradication of capitalist exploitation. With the fulfilment of that plan the socialist sector firmly occupied the leading place in the country's economy. By the close of 1960 state-run enterprises were accounting for 100 per cent of the industrial output and nearly 89 per cent of the output of the artisan industry, and handling 91.5 per cent of the retail trade; almost 85 per cent of the peasants had joined cooperatives, and of that number 11.8 per cent had joined cooperatives of the highest type.¹⁰

Even more striking results were achieved by the DRV with the successful fulfilment of its first five-year plan of economic development (1961-1965), when the republic began the full-scale building of socialism. The decisions adopted at the 3rd Congress of the Workers' Party of Vietnam in September 1960 called for the completion of the economy's socialist reorganisation, the consummation of the first phase of socialist industrialisation and the building of the material and technical basis of socialism. By the close of 1965 a total of 80 per cent of the agricultural cooperatives had become cooperatives of the highest type. The first factories of the engineering, metallurgical and chemical industries were built and placed in operation. Whereas prior to August 1945, 95 per cent of the population was illiterate, in 1965 almost the entire population of the DRV could read and write. In 1964, as compared to 1954, the number of pupils at secondary schools increased 3.5-fold, while the number of students at institutions of higher learning and technical schools increased 25-fold.

These achievements were closely linked with fraternal assistance

from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Between 1954 and 1964 they granted the DRV nearly 750 million rubles in the shape of gratuitous assistance and long-term credits. During these years Soviet assistance alone enabled the DRV to build 92 industrial projects. More than 2,500 Soviet experts went to the republic to give it technical assistance.

While building socialism in the North, the Vietnamese people waged a persevering struggle to carry out the tasks of the people's democratic revolution in the South, for the fulfilment of the terms of the 1954 Geneva Agreements, in particular, for general free elections in the North and South with the purpose of reuniting the country.

However, the prospect for Vietnam's peaceful development in line with the principles laid down in the 1954 Geneva Agreements did not enter into the plans of the imperialist circles in the West, chiefly in the USA. The possibility of a peaceful victory of the people's democratic revolution in South Vietnam did not suit them. They feared that the elections envisaged in the Geneva Agreements would bring about the downfall of the puppet regime in Saigon and the country's reunification in an integral state. In turn, this would have meant the "fall" of the whole of Indochina: according to the notorious "domino theory" underlying US policy in Southeast Asia, the loss of one position spelled out the collapse of the entire system of neocolonialist imperialist domination. This apprehension was clearly stated in the secret Pentagon documents relating to the mid-1950s and published in the American press in June 1971.

That was what induced the imperialist circles in the USA to "export counterrevolution" to Indochina. They aimed to perpetuate Vietnam's division, turn its southern part into a military base, a springboard for aggression against the DRV and for the suppression of the national liberation movement throughout Southeast Asia. Washington spent money lavishly to make the puppet army the backbone of the Saigon regime and the assault force against the DRV. Between 1955 and 1959 the USA's allocations to the Ngo Dinh Diem regime amounted to nearly 1,500 million dollars. By the end of 1961 the Saigon puppet army's strength had reached 300,000 effectives.

In keeping with the USA's policy of wrecking the Geneva Agreements, the Saigon regime openly refused to carry out their cardinal terms, in particular, the holding of general free elections. It flatly turned down all the DRV Government's proposals for preparations for the elections, for contacts between the North and the South, and so on. Mass repressions were started in South Vietnam against progressives. By a decree of 1959 the Communists were outlawed.

The liberation struggle mounted in South Vietnam in response to this anti-people's policy, to this betrayal of national interests. Commencing as a peaceful political struggle, it began to evolve into an armed struggle. Essentially, this was a continuation of the people's democratic revolution with a clear-cut anti-imperialist and anti-feudal orientation. The peasants led by the working class, and also large segments of the urban population, formed the social basis of this

revolution. The puppet regime laboured in vain to win over the mass of the peasants. The sharp deterioration of the material condition of the urban petty bourgeoisie and intellectuals led to growing disaffection among them with the policy of the ruling clique. Unbridled terror and repressions evoked an explosion of anger among the broadest sections of South Vietnam's population.

As the masses in the South became convinced by their own experience that the Saigon regime was holding their interests in contempt, the conditions began to take shape for an intensification of the national liberation movement and an extension of the front of struggle. The Constituent Congress of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, attended by representatives of different political, public and religious organisations and groups, was held in December 1960 in a situation that was marked by an upswing of the revolution. The Congress adopted a 10-point programme calling for the overthrow of the Ngo Dinh Diem dictatorship, the creation of an independent, democratic, peaceful and neutral South Vietnam and the country's peaceful reunification.

The formation of the NLF and its conversion into a mass political organisation uniting the broadest sections of the population powerfully influenced the entire further course of the national liberation movement in South Vietnam. It marked the beginning of a new phase of that movement with the initiative in the liberation struggle passing into the hands of the patriotic forces. Liberated areas were formed and enlarged in South Vietnam. In the spring of 1965 three-quarters of the territory of South Vietnam was controlled by the NLF.

In this situation the US ruling circles adopted a new strategy in an effort to save the Saigon regime from inevitable collapse. No longer depending on the puppet army, Washington decided to use mainly its own military strength. At the end of 1964 and the beginning of 1965 the USA openly assumed the principal role in suppressing the national liberation movement in South Vietnam and stepped up its direct military pressure on the DRV. The Pentagon unleashed an undeclared air war against the DRV, beginning the massive barbarous bombing of its territory and spreading hostilities to the whole of Indochina. During the peak of the escalation of the war of aggression in Indochina the USA and its allies had in that region more than 600,000 troops, of whom over 540,000 were American officers and men. An armada of US aircraft, the US 7th Fleet and huge quantities of sophisticated armaments were used against the Vietnamese patriots.

In the mid-1960s the struggle of the Vietnamese people for freedom and independence thus ranged beyond the framework of a liberation movement in one of France's former colonies. Open US armed intervention turned Indochina into one of the most dangerous flashpoints on the planet, while the Vietnam problem acquired vital international significance. Vietnam became one of the main foci of contradictions between the two world systems. One of imperialism's sharpest postwar clashes with socialism and the national liberation movement took place in that region.

In defence of their freedom and independence, the Vietnamese

patriots unfolded a struggle on three fronts — military, political and diplomatic. The Vietnamese people mobilised all their material and spiritual strength and, relying on disinterested assistance from the socialist countries, turned the DRV into an invulnerable fortress (that successfully repulsed the heavily armed imperialist aggressors) and inflicted a series of overwhelming defeats on them in the South. During the war more than 4,300 US aircraft were shot down in the skies over the DRV: these included scores of B-52 strategic bombers and variable-geometry wing aircraft F-111A VSW.

By the summer of 1969 organs of the people's revolutionary power had sprung up in the liberated areas of South Vietnam. The first democratic reforms, particularly in the sphere of agrarian relations, were put into effect in these areas. Land was confiscated from the most reactionary landowners, the peasants received 1,500,000 hectares of arable land gratuitously, and rent was reduced by 40-80 per cent. The peasants' debts to usurers were cancelled. The slogan "land to those who till it" was translated into practice. A congress of people's representatives of South Vietnam, which proclaimed the creation of the Republic of South Vietnam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the RSV, was held on June 6-8, 1969, in one of the liberated areas. This consummated the formation of a system of revolutionary rule in South Vietnam.

Popular discontent with the government's Vietnamese policy mounted sharply in the USA under the impact of the defeats suffered by the US-Saigon forces in South Vietnam and the failure of the US aggression against the DRV. A broad movement was started in the USA at the close of the 1960s demanding an end to the Vietnamese adventure and the withdrawal of US troops from Indochina. International criticism of the USA's Vietnamese policy likewise grew increasingly vehement. Support for the heroic struggle of the peoples of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos was urged from the rostrum of the World Congress for Peace (Helsinki, July 1965), the World Assembly for Peace (Berlin, June 1969), the World Assembly for Peace and Independence of the Peoples of Indochina (Versailles, February 1972) and the World Congress of Peace Forces (Moscow, October 1973). A tangible contribution to the movement of solidarity with the Vietnamese people was made by the World Peace Council. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries waged a consistent struggle to bring the imperialist aggression in Indochina to an end and achieve a political settlement of the Vietnam problem. They rendered not only moral, political and diplomatic but considerable material and military assistance to the embattled peoples.

In 1968 Washington had to agree to quadripartite talks in Paris on a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam problem and halt the bombing of the DRV. At the same time the US ruling circles sought to evolve a new military strategy that would permit them to continue the war with smaller material and moral-political outlays. The principles of a "new Asian policy" known as the Guam Doctrine were formulated. The essence of this doctrine was that the USA intended to give puppet governments in Asian countries every possible support in suppressing

the national liberation movements without direct US military involvement. The "Vietnamisation" of the war was started, the objective being to strengthen the Saigon regime's internal and external political positions and make its army more combatworthy so that it could shoulder the main burden of the war.

Universal military conscription was instituted under the "Vietnamisation" programme in all the areas controlled by Saigon. The numerical strength of Saigon's regular army, local militia and the police grew to 1,100,000. Vast quantities of US armaments and equipment were turned over to the Saigon forces.

However, the implementation of the "Vietnamisation" policy did not yield the results expected by the US invaders and their Saigon puppets. The military and political successes of the Vietnamese patriots, their skilful combination of various forms of struggle, the broad international support for their just cause, and the hopelessness of continuing the shameful war compelled Washington to sign the Paris Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam in January 1973. The USA pledged to halt all military operations against the DRV and evacuate its troops from South Vietnam.

In the very first article of this agreement it is underlined that the USA and all other countries would respect the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Vietnam as recognised in the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

Article 3 states that in South Vietnam there are two zones controlled by two authorities — the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the RSV and the Saigon Administration — each of which has its own armed forces.

The signing of this agreement was a signal victory of the Vietnamese people. "A decisive step has been made towards the complete restoration of peace on Vietnamese soil," CC CPSU General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev said at the time: "The Democratic Republic of Vietnam is returning to creative work. It is now able to focus all its efforts on building socialism, and new prospects are opening for carrying out President Ho Chi Minh's behest — to build a peaceful, reunited democratic Vietnam."¹¹

The Paris Agreement laid the foundation for a political settlement in Vietnam and created the prerequisites for consolidating national independence and democratic reforms in the South and for preparing the conditions for peaceful reunification with the North. Essentially, the Paris Agreement recorded the provisions that in principle met with the aspirations for which the Vietnamese people had waged an armed struggle. These were the very provisions that the Saigon administration headed by Nguyen Van Thieu flagrantly violated as soon as the Paris Agreement was signed. It sabotaged the discussions with the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the RSV of the issues linked with a peaceful settlement and wrecked all the attempts to organise the stipulated mechanism for the fulfilment of the agreement. All the proposals made by the Provisional Revolutionary Government on April 24, June 28, July 18, 1973 and March 22, 1974, were rejected out of hand. Had these proposals been accepted it

would have been possible to create the conditions for forming a People's Council of National Conciliation and for the subsequent elections in South Vietnam. Instead, in violation of the Agreement, the Thieu clique attempted to seize by armed force territory controlled by the Provisional Revolutionary Government. In 1973-1974 the Saigon regime conducted thousands upon thousands of operations to "pacify" and seize territory and systematically bombed liberated areas.

Saigon was able to pursue this policy only as a result of support from the US imperialists, who regarded the Thieu regime as the instrument for asserting their interests in Vietnam. International reaction continued to accord the Saigon regime the role of a mailed fist for the suppression of the national liberation movement in the whole of Indochina. *The New York Times* admitted that it was only massive US assistance that gave Thieu the possibility to preserve his militarised state in South Vietnam, keep a million men under arms, and maintain the police force and the jails, that were filled with political prisoners.¹²

In the period from January 1973 to the end of 1974, in order to keep the Saigon regime in power the USA supplied it, despite the Paris Agreement, with 1,100 tanks and armoured cars, 800 pieces of artillery, nearly 700 aircraft, 200 warships, and a large quantity of firearms, ammunition and equipment. Some 25,000 American advisers continued the training of the Saigon army.¹³

In repulsing the Saigon troops the People's Armed Forces of Liberation of South Vietnam defeated them utterly in a number of battles. By the spring of 1975 the Provisional Revolutionary Government was in control of 17 provinces in South Vietnam. The Thieu regime found itself in a truly catastrophic position. The inevitable climax came in March and April. Hit by the armed forces of the patriots and the population who had risen in arms, the puppet troops fled in panic. Entire units surrendered or went over to the side of the people. As a result, most of the towns in South Vietnam were liberated practically without bloodshed, and this allowed avoiding loss of human life and destruction. On April 30 the patriotic troops entered Saigon, the last stronghold of internal reaction and foreign imperialism in Vietnam.

The historic operation for the liberation of the South lasted for 55 days, despite the fact that Thieu had one of the largest and most heavily armed armies in the world. According to the capitalist press, it had a stock of military equipment worth 5,000 million dollars. It had over 2,000 tanks and armoured cars, nearly 2,500 combat aircraft and helicopters, almost 1,500 pieces of artillery and 160 warships. The puppet regime proved to be bankrupt not only politically but also militarily. This was the natural outcome of its total demoralisation.

The American press has scathingly commented on the results of the USA's imperialist policy of interfering in the affairs of Vietnam. For instance, the *Washington Post* considered it symbolical that the final act of US interference, which continued for an entire generation, took the lives of 56,737 servicemen, cost more than 160,000 million

dollars and affected practically all aspects of the life of Americans, was played out amid chaos, panic and suffering.¹⁴ *The New York Times* has estimated that while the Congress-sanctioned allocations for the war amounted to 150,000 million dollars, the cost of the war to tax payers exceeded 350,000 million dollars. Together with other payments, including grants to war veterans and their families, interest on war loans and so on, the total was evidently in the order of 1,000,000 million dollars.¹⁵ The conclusion to be drawn from this is that it must be recognised, albeit belatedly, that the policy for which so much blood had been spilt and so much material means lost has failed.¹⁶

The heroic victory of the Vietnamese people will go down in history as a major landmark in the struggle of peoples for freedom, independence, peace and social progress. This victory became possible as a result of the continued change of the world balance of strength in favour of socialism. The termination of the war in Southeast Asia, which had been poisoning the international situation on a global scale for many years, will help to further the process of détente and contribute to the spread of that process in the Asian continent. Leonid Brezhnev pointed out that "the elimination of the hotbed of war in Indochina creates the conditions for a further improvement of the international atmosphere. This will benefit the cause of international détente, including, as we hope, the détente in the relations between our country and the United States of America".¹⁷

The victory of the patriotic forces in Indochina creates a new situation in the whole of Southeast Asia, which has for many decades been a sphere of "special interest" of the imperialists. Their military presence in that region is now diminishing, while a movement demanding the dismantling of all US military bases is gathering momentum in countries where that presence still remains. Under the impact of the events in Indochina the masses are displaying growing political awareness and activity, while the Southeast Asian countries are increasing their efforts to ensure the neutrality of the entire region and turn it into a peace zone.

The removal of the flashpoint in Indochina and the new situation in Southeast Asia are creating the conditions for consolidating peace and security in the Asian continent as a whole. This is accentuating the need to strengthen security in Asia by collective effort on the basis of equal cooperation among all countries of that continent regardless of their social systems.

The victory in Vietnam was won, above all, by the courage, staunchness, dedicated patriotism and self-sacrifice of its heroic people, who endured all the hardships of that struggle. The Workers' Party of Vietnam was the organiser of all the triumphs scored by the Vietnamese people. Guided by the Marxist-Leninist teaching and pursuing a policy championing the interests of the entire Vietnamese people, the WPV achieved outstanding successes in the struggle for national independence, democracy and socialism. The victory in Vietnam, Leonid Brezhnev said, "is the result of the skilful use by

them [Vietnamese patriots.—Ed.] of various forms of struggle: military, political and diplomatic. At the same time this victory is a triumph of the effective and militant solidarity of the socialist countries. It is also an indication of the great moral and political importance of the sympathy and support coming from the progressive forces of the whole world".¹⁸

The militant solidarity of the peoples of the socialist countries passed the test of strength. A major factor that contributed to the triumph of the Vietnamese people's just cause was that from the very beginning that cause could rely on the material, moral and political support of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community.

When the aggressors began bombing the DRV, the Soviet Union took the necessary steps to provide the Vietnamese People's Army with sophisticated armaments, including anti-aircraft missiles, artillery and fighter aircraft within the shortest possible time. With the assistance of the Soviet experts who were sent to the DRV and who trained Vietnamese at military schools in the USSR, thousands of Vietnamese quickly learned to handle the latest types of armaments.

"The Vietnamese and Soviet peoples," states a message of congratulations from the Vietnamese leaders on the occasion of the 57th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, "are linked by ties of close friendship and militant solidarity resting on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism... The all-sided support and the immense, invaluable and effective assistance of the USSR to the people of Vietnam in their resistance to US aggression for the salvation of their homeland, to the building of socialism in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and to the revolutionary struggle of the Vietnamese people at the present stage is a splendid manifestation of this friendship."¹⁹

At all phases of the struggle waged by the Vietnamese people the Soviet Union did everything in its power to render them effective assistance and initiated joint actions by all the forces of progress and peace in support of Vietnam. The struggle to end the war in Vietnam became one of the key elements of the CPSU's foreign policy and the Peace Programme adopted by the 24th Congress of the CPSU.

Today the Soviet Union is helping the Vietnamese people to heal the wounds inflicted by the war, to restore their national economy. An agreement on urgent gratuitous assistance to Vietnam was signed in Moscow on May 12, 1975.

Ho Chi Minh, founder of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, repeatedly noted that friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Vietnam was unbreakable. "Throughout their long struggle," he wrote, "the Vietnamese people have always relied on the disinterested assistance of the Party of Lenin, and of the governments and peoples of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community."²⁰ He stressed that "in applying the Leninist principles of internationalism the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism, has always given the national liberation struggle in colonial and dependent countries vast moral assistance", and that as a mainstay for all the peoples opposing the forces of war the Soviet policy of peace

"is of particularly great importance to the peoples of the East, which imperialism regards as sure prey and as a 'natural' supplier of manpower and material resources for its piratical wars".²¹

While paying tribute to the Vietnamese people's historic victory, world progressive opinion does not forget that this victory might have been won earlier and would have involved smaller sacrifice and losses had the present leaders of China not refused to contribute to the joint actions of the socialist community in support of the struggle of the peoples of Indochina. One cannot obliterate from the memory of the peoples facts such as the obstructions erected by Peking to the transportation of Soviet supplies to embattled Vietnam and its unseemly actions to subvert the efforts of the Vietnamese patriots to achieve the earliest possible settlement of the conflict by political and diplomatic means.

The Peking leaders are openly expressing regret over the reduction of the US presence in Southeast Asia. The Western press has given ample evidence of the fact that Hanoi's victory in Indochina worries Peking.²² Baring the reasons for this worry *The Times* wrote that in theory the Chinese "have supported the idea of a united Communist Vietnam, but in practice they have not realised the prospect".²³

US Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger has spoken eloquently of the Peking leaders' view of the situation in Southeast Asia after the victory of the Vietnamese people and of their interest in preserving the US presence in that region. The Pentagon chief declared that the "Chinese no longer regard the Americans as the principal threat to their survival but as a useful balance against the Soviets".²⁴

Peace has opened for the Vietnamese people the prospect of peaceful, constructive labour in both the North and the South, and the possibility of quickly healing the wounds inflicted by the war. The building of the new life in South Vietnam rests on the long experience of constructive work accumulated in the earlier liberated areas. The victory has generated unprecedented social activity by broad sections of the population of South Vietnam. In the newly-liberated areas the Provisional Revolutionary Government is consistently carrying out the programme it had published on April 4, 1975. The principal tasks are clearly defined in that programme: the complete abolition of the old administrative, military and political apparatus, including the dissolution of reactionary parties and other political organisations that had collaborated with the USA and the puppet regime; the earliest possible formation of organs of revolutionary power at all levels; the restoration of democratic freedoms, in particular freedom of religion; the strict observance of legality and order, and the pardoning of repentants; the implementation of a policy of broad national unity, national conciliation and concord; the resumption of the work of industrial, artisan, trade, transport and other enterprises, the guarantee to entrepreneurs of the safety of their property and the possibility of continuing their businesses; assistance to peasants in restoring and promoting farm production; steps to ensure the operation of cultural, scientific, medical and educational institutions.

Economic rehabilitation and development, started in 1973-1974, is successfully proceeding in North Vietnam. Within a short span of time almost all the economic enterprises have resumed normal operation. Many key industries (power engineering, coal, heavy engineering, chemical and the light industry) have achieved or surpassed their prewar output levels.

The Vietnamese people are successfully advancing along the road of national unity, peace and social progress. As was stated by Le Duan at a rally in Hanoi on May 15, 1975, the Vietnamese people "have the spirit, energy, strength and ability to surmount all difficulties, rise to the highest summits of the epoch and turn their country from a poor, backward land devastated by war, during which the USA perpetrated innumerable crimes, into a civilised, flourishing state, into an invincible bastion of national independence, democracy and socialism in Indochina and Southeast Asia".²⁵

An important result of the victory of the patriotic forces in South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos is, unquestionably, the fact that these countries have activated their foreign policy. Progressive opinion throughout the world firmly believes that their policy will help to strengthen peace and security in Asia, draw the great Asian continent into the process of détente and consolidate in it the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

NOTES

- 1 *Nhan Dan*, May 16, 1975.
- 2 *An Outline History of the Workers' Party of Vietnam*, Moscow, 1971, p. 39 (in Russian).
- 3 See *A History of Vietnam for the Period 1917-1965*, Moscow, 1970, pp. 188-189 (in Russian).
- 4 Ho Chi Minh, *Lenin, Leninism and Unbreakable Soviet-Vietnamese Friendship*, Moscow, 1970, p. 45 (in Russian).
- 5 *An Outline History of the Workers' Party of Vietnam*, p. 38.
- 6 Ho Chi Minh, op. cit., p. 198.
- 7 *An Outline History of the Workers' Party of Vietnam*, p. 67.
- 8 Ho Chi Minh, op. cit., pp. 301-302.
- 9 *A History of Vietnam for the Period 1917-1965*, p. 274.
- 10 *Ibid.*, pp. 288-289.
- 11 L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Vol. 4, Moscow, 1974, p. 107 (in Russian).
- 12 *The New York Times*, April 8, 1975.
- 13 *Pravda*, January 16, 1975.
- 14 See *Washington Post*, April 30, 1975.
- 15 See *The New York Times*, April 29, 1975.
- 16 See *The New York Times*, April 9, 1975.
- 17 L. I. Brezhnev, *Immortal Exploit*, Moscow, 1975, p. 19 (in Russian).
- 18 *Ibidem*.
- 19 *Pravda*, November 8, 1974.
- 20 Ho Chi Minh, op. cit., p. 264.
- 21 *Ibid.*, pp. 51, 133-134.
- 22 *Daily Telegraph*, April 21, 1975, p. 4.
- 23 *The Times*, April 25, 1975, p. 9.
- 24 *United States News & World Report*, May 26, 1975, p. 25.
- 25 *Nhan Dan*, May 16, 1975.

Systems Analysis in Literature

MIKHAIL KHRAPCHENKO

The systems approach to social and natural phenomena continues to be a subject of great interest for scholars in various fields. Lively discussions are held on its nature and application, its theoretical principles are developed and extended and it serves as the foundation for concrete research. There are ardent partisans of the systems approach to the study of natural and social processes, as well as sceptics; and there are those who take a completely negative view of its methodological prerequisites and possibilities.

Some sociologists express the view that this new approach to social phenomena is used as a cover for a modification of structuralism, whose well-known methodological principles have not yielded any significant scientific results. According to these scholars, to "renovate" Marxist-Leninist methodology by using structuralist ideas is not only unjustified, but harmful as well.

There is, however, another school of thought regarding the systems analysis of social processes. Its essence is this: long before structuralism appeared as a definite trend in scientific philosophical thinking, Marx, Engels and Lenin thoroughly investigated the structure of various aspects and phenomena of social life and their systemic relationships. Therefore there are no grounds whatsoever for considering the systems approach an achievement of modern structuralism and its property.

The fundamental differences between systems analysis based on Marxist-Leninist methodology and "orthodox" structuralist analysis

M. Khrapchenko, Academician, Academic Secretary of the Division of Literature and Language, USSR Academy of Sciences. Author of the monographs: *The Works of N. V. Gogol, Leo Tolstoy as Artist, The Creative Individuality of the Writer and the Development of Literature and of many other works on Russian classical literature and the theory of literature.*

are quite obvious. What may be called the Marxist systems approach is not a new method, but a concretisation and further development of principles elaborated by the founders of Marxism-Leninism, taking into account the new processes and problems of present-day social reality.

We believe the second viewpoint to be nearer the truth. In estimating the various views on systems analysis we should bear in mind that the study of structure and of systemic connections is considered to be of great importance in the natural sciences. This brings out not only the interdependences that exist between social and natural sciences, but also certain general tendencies in their development, without blurring the peculiar features of either of these fields.

Literary criticism is marked by certain specific features in the formulation and elaboration of methodological problems, including those of systems analysis. For the past several years now persistent attempts have been made to extend the dominating influence of linguistic structuralism to the study of literary phenomena. Structuralist studies in literature have, from time to time, been subject to critical analysis in the Soviet Union and some other socialist countries, but these studies are sometimes lacking in substance and depth. At the same time systems analysis in literature is not infrequently identified with the structuralist approach. This partially explains why problems of Marxist systems analysis in literary criticism are virtually neglected. Literary critics actually keep aloof from the debate—sometimes quite heated—on new problems arising in other social sciences, in particular, philosophy, political economy, and sociology.

We believe, however, that this is not the sole reason. One of the most important features of systems analysis is that it brings out the internal connections within a certain aggregate of phenomena, relationships between separate components of various social processes, and examines their structural unity. But it is well known that the internal integrity of works of art has been the object of close study since the days of Aristotle. Nineteenth century aestheticians and literary critics considered this fact to be of prime importance. Schelling, Hegel, and Belinsky come immediately to mind. And that is not a matter of chance. Considering all man's works, art and literature have, perhaps, the greatest degree of unity and proportionality, and are most successful at integrating ideas and images.

But the representation of literary works and literary trends as definite systems or, to be more precise, as systems of systems, cannot be equated with observations and judgements concerning their inner creative unity. Our most important task now is to demonstrate the inner relationships in certain structural formations, the relationships between their constituent parts or components. And not just the interrelations between components, but also their *coordination*, their position and role with respect to the general function of a literary phenomenon.

However great the achievements of our literary critics, they have thus far shed little light on the deep relationships between the structure of a work of art and the way it actually functions, the correlations between the structure and ideological sources of creative works. This undoubtedly creates gaps in the analysis of literary phenomena and in addition gives rise to all sorts of theories, arbitrary in their essence.

Sometimes a certain component of a work of art is arbitrarily singled out and ascribed generalised significance, its actual relations to other elements being ignored, or, more frequently, the analysis of one or two components takes the place of the study of the work as a whole.

Most of us are familiar with E. Dobins's thesis: "The plot is a *conception of reality*". But the main question is left unanswered: how is it that the artist's world view is expressed in the plot and not in other components of the literary work? How can the priority of the plot in this particular respect be explained? The plot obviously reflects in some way or other a conception of reality, but the latter is much more fully and clearly embodied in the system of images and in the idea of a creative work.

At the same time the plot performs a specific and unique function: it reveals the ties and interrelationships between the personages, unfolds their life story, and defines their position with respect to each other. In fulfilling this function the plot is interrelated and coordinated with other components of the work. That is why we are not justified in singling it out as the exponent of the writer's general world view, and "burdening" it with "responsibilities" foreign to its nature.

Literary criticism continues to be concerned largely with so-called "concept-and-thematics" analysis (however condescendingly or ironically it might be treated), as well as one of its offshoots—"problem-and-thematics" analysis. Of all the vast complex of aesthetically significant values that make up a work of art or a writer's creative work, the literary critic using this approach singles out just those topics or problems which attracted the author's attention, the ideas which are expressed in his works. The critic assumes that he has selected and analysed the most essential features. We need hardly demonstrate that this analysis is purely illusory. The genuine richness of a major creative work is left outside the scope of such a study. Critical analysis is replaced by a comparatively elementary imitation thereof.

The interpretation of problems and ideas is often combined with a thorough analysis of the imagery and characters in a work of art. And this, no doubt, broadens the critic's scientific conception of individual literary works and the work of an author as a whole. But all too often the analytical study ends here. It is sometimes followed by a kind of supplement in the shape of cursory observations and reflections on the composition of the work and the author's language. Since these observations and reflections do not form an integral part of the preceding analysis, they add little to our understanding of literary phenomena.

I would like to stress that I have in mind "average" works, not those exceptional studies that have made a significant contribution to Soviet literary criticism. But even in some of these better studies critics seldom analyse the tonality of literary works, the highly developed system of emotional projections, inherent to them, their attitude towards life, their emotional-expressive accents and nuances, in short, that system which alone provides the framework for aesthetic assimilation of the world.

Analytical studies in the tonality of literary works can make our conception of their inner structure and content much broader and richer. They give us a deeper understanding of the character and dimensions of artistic generalisations. The discovery of the system of emotional projections and attitudes expressed in a major literary work enables one, apart from everything else, to see clearer its broad range of ties with reality. In close conjunction with this discovery one can determine the creative potential of important works of art.

Literary critics have devoted a fair number of studies to the language of poetry in its most general aspects and the word in the context of a literary composition. But achievements in this field cannot hide real defects and errors. In many studies the language of a literary work is examined primarily from the point of view of the simple correspondence between the work and the reality and characters it describes. Without much difficulty the scholar establishes the fact that the vocabulary of the work somehow reflects the characteristics of the personages and features of their social environment. It also becomes evident that there is a certain dynamic correlation between the author's vocabulary and that of the personages.

In addition the syntactic forms chosen by the writer are sometimes considered. It is established that the syntax of a work, like its vocabulary, corresponds to the content and reflects the peculiarities of the characters.

But the real function of language in a literary work is not to record passively certain aspects of life and man's psychology; it is rather to play an active role in creating artistic generalisations. The discovery of the essential attributes of men and their surroundings calls for a purposeful, efficient, and economical selection of linguistic means. Only a precisely chosen word or expressively constructed phrase, only poetic speech with its unique distinctive marks, can embody the characteristic elements of social reality and men's spiritual life. The word-concept, which has a certain universality, acquires a vivid individual colouring in a work of art, embodying that combination of the particular and the unique that contains a meaningful artistic image.

But this is just one of the aspects of the study of literary language. The poetic word is correlated with various fields of force of the artistic whole. It is the means of embodying a concrete image, and at the same time it takes an active part in forming the tonality of a given part of the work which differs in its emotional colouring from other parts, and in forming the tonality of isolated episodes. Moreover, it is

correlated with the general ideological and aesthetic trend of the literary work, its "supertask", and its genre peculiarities.

It is easy to distinguish the specific features of the verbal fabric in, say, a tragedy or novel of manners, a comedy or an epic. The poetic speech in works of different genres embodies a specific mode of aesthetic assimilation of reality, and artistic images of a peculiar structure. This seems rather clear in general terms. But it is evident that the more concrete and profound ties between genre and poetic language have not yet been sufficiently studied.

And although the impact of genre upon poetic speech is undoubtedly significant, just like the impact of speech upon the formation of genre, the totality of the specific features of the language of a certain literary work cannot be reduced to the specific features of genre formations. Of prime importance here are the specific features of reality that form the object of generalisation in a work of art, as well as the general idea and the creative conception of the literary work.

Neither of these act in isolation; they are a living unity, a kind of fusion. This unity determines the fundamental, characteristic features of the poetic language of a work, its general colour, superimposed upon all inner differentiations. All this forms the base for the "involvement" of the poetic word in the general goals—the "supertask"—of the work, for the primary role played by the word in influencing the reader. All these correlations between the word and other components of a literary composition require intensive study to reveal both their general typological features and the various peculiarities that distinguish the work of individual authors.

* * *

Aesthetic systems, like all other systems, are founded on certain basic principles and are characterised by their specific dominant. At the same time the various components of aesthetic systems possess a certain independence. The problem of dominant principles in individual works of art or the entire corpus of a single author was thoroughly investigated a long time ago. Of special importance in this respect is Belinsky's doctrine of the creative spirit.

In the critic's opinion, the creative spirit consists of the general idea of a work or a complex of ideas; these, however, appear not as abstract logical entities, but are interlaced with the artist's emotions and passions. The creative spirit is a combination of the author's general view of events and his attitude towards them. We find a similar conception of the creative spirit in Lermontov, who expressed it in splendid poetic form:

The thread of forceful thought

Binds fast the pearls of words.¹

Nowadays literary critics prefer such formulas as the creative conception of a work, a writer's artistic conception of the world. The

essentially valid notion of the "artistic concept" is sometimes used in an extremely vague sense. The connection and correlations between the "artistic concept" and the structure of a work, its component parts, and other works by the author are not outlined with the necessary clarity.

At times, the artistic concept is, for some obscure reason, ascribed the role of an omnipotent demiurge, an all-powerful ruler of many individual creative destinies. V. Borshchukov's comments on this subject are of some interest. In his *History of Literature and the Present* he writes: "The character of any literature is determined first and foremost by its underlying concept of the world and man.... The concept of the world and of man have acquired new features and properties at each successive historical phase. In the process of its development it has been enriched and, in turn, has engendered new ideas in literature in general and the work of each author in particular. The more original and striking its manifestations in the best works, the more varied and rich its content and the more powerful its impact."²

The artistic concept of the world and man is attributed here a significance so great, even universal, that it virtually conceals social realities that are the source of creative work and the determining principle of its growth. Moreover, the concept of the world seems to be developing spontaneously, primarily by virtue of its inner potential. At any rate, the type of arguments that the author uses suggests this particular interpretation of his views. It is obvious that this isolation of artistic concepts from the movement of social life is quite unjustified and, although it must be unintentional, fraught with negative consequences.

Furthermore, it seems that the creative concept of the world and man is not developed or elaborated by writers, but exists long before their works appear. This inexplicable concept independently engenders new ideas in the work of every author; the best literary works derive significance and value from it.

But we are well aware that a talented writer does not and cannot get his creative concept of reality and its interpretation from ready-made images. If that were the case, he would be merely an imitator, a literary tradesman, and not a creator of original artistic generalisations and significant aesthetic values. A great master's power does not lie in assimilating and applying existing concepts, but rather in his independent search for a profoundly truthful and vivid reflection of reality, revealing its new aspects and its development in an original manner.

In attributing great significance to the basic or dominant principles in aesthetic systems, one should by no means treat them as absolutes. The systems themselves should not be regarded as autonomous entities. This is not only because art and literature reflect social life and have their origins in definite social conditions. Of equal importance is the fact that they play an active (and many-sided) socio-aesthetic role.

Here one must consider another problem: the degree to which separate components of a work of art as well as other aesthetic

systems are internally bound and the relative independence of the most important of these components. So far the prevailing view is that any significant literary work is always a sort of ideal whole in which a maximal harmonious unity has been achieved.

But this view is at variance with many facts from the history of literature. Moreover, it conflicts, to a certain degree, with the nature of a creative work of art. There is no doubt that any true artist always strives to achieve profound unity in his work. These qualities determine the impact that his work will have upon the reader. At the same time the writer invariably faces an essentially different problem: he must convey the rich variety of phenomena and collisions which he draws from reality in bold relief. The unbroken current of life conflicts with the perfect unity of the work as such. His striving for inner harmony conflicts with the need to reflect life's antagonisms and complexities. The more acutely and broadly the author depicts these antagonisms, the more the ideal wholeness and complete harmony of structural relations become unattainable and unnecessary to the work.

Of course, this does not mean that the author in depicting profound conflicts of life must give up the idea of creating a work that is all of a piece, permeated with a single purpose and a single creative idea, well balanced and convincing in its inner development and its various parts. Far from it. The more the material resists, the greater the artist's efforts. At the same time, because literary works embody the diversity and conflicts of reality, their unity is dynamic and free from rigid canons and immutable "eternal" norms.

The relative independence of the most important components of a work of art is most clearly manifested when an author introduces parallel plots and secondary episodes, or when one character occupies the foreground. In *Anna Karenina* we find a parallel development of the life-stories of Anna and Konstantin Levin. This is vital to Tolstoy's conception of the novel. The author took pride in his ability to splice or blend together the narratives of the novel's different heroes—"the arches are joined in such a way that one doesn't see the keystone"³.

Nevertheless, the relative independence of the story of Anna Karenina from that of Levin is obvious. One is constantly aware of the counterpoint, but that does not interfere with the more or less isolated treatment of each of these characters, which has very much to do with the description of distinctly different processes of reality. It is therefore not at all surprising that Anna's story was dramatised as representative of the novel as a whole at the Moscow Art Theatre.

Parallel and at the same time integrated levels of narration are common in large-scale works of art. Not infrequently the various parts take on independent significance. *The Life of Klim Samgin*, for example, is a long, profound epic novel. Gorky includes many scenes and episodes which appear standing alone and, to a certain extent, acquire a significance of their own. One example is the description of the January 1905 non-violent demonstration. This is not an omission on the part of the writer, but the result of his conscious deliberation.

Sub-plots and episodes put even greater stress on the differences between various narrative levels and their distance. World literature abounds in examples of works constructed on this principle. These need not be limited to picaresque romances, like Fielding's *History of Tom Jones, a Foundling*; we might also include Voltaire's socio-philosophical satire *Candide* and other works of analogous structure, as well as Cervantes's *Don Quixote* and Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship* where sub-plots are important.

With this in mind, V. Shklovsky theorised that a novel is a collection of stories. While this reflects certain features of some forms of novels, it is not true of many of its other forms in various literatures of the world. It is true that from time to time modern novels appear that are collections of several novelettes, stories, and fragmentary sketches. But, as often as not, these works can not be cited as genuine creative achievements, in particular, in the novel genre.

Whenever centrifugal tendencies are manifested in a literary work, their main interest lies not so much in the relative independence of the various parts, as in the content of their imagery and their tonality. The inner richness of a work of art, the variety of tonalities embodied in it are of great significance for its social function.⁴ It should be emphasised here that the character of various components of an aesthetic system determines, to a considerable extent, the peculiarities of "transposition" which it undergoes in its historical existence.

It is not only in works of centrifugal structure that the various components or parts acquire relative independence, but also in cases where the narrative centres on one or several main characters.

Showing the inner logic of their character is of particular importance for the realisation of the "supertask" of the work, because these heroes are at the focal point of the action. These heroes are made prominent both semantically and structurally. In *Faust*, *David Copperfield*, *Eugene Onegin*, *The Hero of Our Time*, *Madame Bovary*, *Oblomov* and *Rudin*, for example, the image of the central character is emphasised, its semantic load set, as it were, in italics. Many other outstanding literary works could be mentioned in support of our contention.

Treating the dominant principles of a literary work as absolutes often leads us to misinterpretation of the most important inner structural connections and correlations involving more than the role of individual artistic generalisations in a unified aesthetic system. Many scholars are inclined to think, for example, that style and its components simply project or reflect a creative method. But this contention is refuted by the facts. The relationships between style and creative method are often mutable and indirect.⁵ And that is not at all surprising if one views a single literary composition, an author's entire works or a literary trend as a dynamic unity and interaction of many elements and components. The scholar who postulates that a literary phenomenon is derived from some nucleus capable of generating and transmitting energy to the enormous body formed by its components

oversimplifies. One tends here to overlook the fact that the most important components of a literary phenomenon are set in motion by impulses from reality itself. At the same time within an aesthetic system there are evident functional correlations. A literary phenomenon cannot exist without various levels of interaction among its components; but each also performs its own specific function.

One well-known theory, going back to German classical aesthetics, treats a literary work as a kind of organism. V. Kozhinov defends its basic principles: "A work of value is a kind of organism, i.e., something capable of independent existence and development. It is worth repeating that this is directly conditioned by the embodiment of vital necessity: having assimilated it, a work of art becomes a sort of small 'universe', for it carries within itself the 'law' of life, just like life itself (needless to say, this 'law' was drawn by the creator of the work from real life and 'transferred' to his work)".⁶

A related theory states that all outstanding literary works and characters (even a poet's rhymes) bear the stamp of spontaneous generation, of a superhuman force. "Thus, the smallest cell of poetry reveals the laws of artistic creation; this is true of *Eugene Onegin*, as well as of *Dead Souls* and *And Quiet Flows the Don*. Grigory Melekhov is the embodiment of a necessity, his non-existence is an impossibility, which also means that he gives one a powerful impression of spontaneity, he is life itself, born of life."⁷

One can hardly doubt that, for instance, Rabelais's *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, Voltaire's *Micromegas*, France's *Penguin Island*, Wells's *The Time Machine* and *The War of the Worlds* are valuable and even extremely valuable works. But at the same time one can hardly say that they are life itself. The relationships between reality and many outstanding literary and folklore pieces are fairly complicated; this does not detract from the value of their artistic generalisations. Proceeding from the "life-itself" principle, one can easily dismiss the marvelous creations of classicists and romanticists, not to mention ancient or mediaeval literature, and folk epics where the fantastic is a prominent feature.

The idea of alleged spontaneous generation of works of art and the alleged participation of superhuman forces has not proved productive. Such theories are contradicted by the facts: all great masters toiled prodigiously and unceasingly, searching for the right image of the hero and for better ways of implementing their creative schemes.

Leonid Leonov expressed an interesting view that won popular support: "A genuine work of art, a literary work in particular, always has an inventive form and revelatory content."⁸ Leonov is right to emphasise the significance of the artist's creative quest, of his efforts that are purposive but do not preclude profound self-doubt and intuition and result in a perfect work of art. Neither invention nor discovery emerge spontaneously. Leonov's characterisation of the essence and specificity of works of art and literature is also justified. Their socio-aesthetic function is to a considerable extent determined by the artistic discoveries which they convey and the craftsmanship which they reveal and which is a specific type of inventions.

It is precisely because a genuine work of art is a wondrous creation of human talent and intellect, that one should not ascribe organic properties to it. The very semantics of the word "creation" clearly indicates constructive work. The view of an artistic work as an organism does not just depreciate its underlying creative and transformative basis—it may obscure its ideological and aesthetic properties and the specificity of its impact. The functioning of a work and the life of an organism are essentially different phenomena, although metaphorically we do speak of the "life" of works of art. Whereas an organism lives according to natural laws, a work of art functions in accordance with the properties imparted to it by its creator, conforming to the laws of social development.

At times the integrality of a work of art and its organic properties are considered to be identical. This is not the case. Integrality is indeed an intrinsic quality of a work of art, usually interpreted as naturalness, profound veracity and the cogency of the prose narrative, lyrical utterance, or dramatic action. Naturalness and veracity are expressed not just in the delineation of individual images, but also in the description of their relationships and the whole sum of details and components that a literary artist uses. Equating an artistic creation with an organism has quite a different meaning. It means the recognition of spontaneity as the determining principle in the emergence of a work of art; it implies that its structure and all of its components, including such devices as rhyme, are not dependent upon the will and intention of the author.

* * *

Correlations between components are different for aesthetic systems of different levels. Some scholars believe that just as a component of a literary work cannot be evaluated in isolation, a separate piece cannot be understood correctly in isolation from the whole corpus of author's work, the literary context of the period and the context of national literature. This statement is justified, but only to a certain degree. There is no doubt that there are considerable advantages in analysing a literary work against the background of other works by the same author; the student has a clearer perspective of their common features and distinctive traits. But for the reader a literary work generally exists as an isolated, independent phenomenon. To appreciate the aesthetic wealth and the rich experiences of *War and Peace*, he does not have to turn to *Childhood*, *Boyhood and Youth* or *Resurrection*. When the author creates a literary work, he usually views its interpretation independent of his other works, with the exception of works in two volumes, trilogies, or cycles united by common heroes and plot.

The fact that literary works are received and interpreted as independent units stresses the essential differences between the bonds inherent to a writer's whole corpus and those inherent to the structure of each separate work.

Nevertheless, the work of a writer is a systemic unity. It is systemic, first and foremost, because every talented writer creates a specific set of themes, ideas, and images. This is also true when that set is very large and the author's creative searchings have universal implications. The work of a talented writer is also systemic because all his works bear the expressive stamp of his artistic individuality. However many contradictions in the evolution of a great master, they do not, as a rule, disrupt the unity and systemic quality of his creative work. Here such contradictions characterise a specific literary phenomenon as distinct from other artistic phenomena.

The history of literature has also witnessed considerable upheavals in the creative evolution of writers and extreme shifts in principles and forms of aesthetic assimilation of reality. This happens mostly at turning-points in social life, in periods of major changes in the development of literature. Such transitions are typical, for example, of the period when romanticism was superseded by realism. At the time the works of many outstanding writers, including Pushkin, Gogol, Lermontov, Shevchenko, Mickiewicz, had features of both trends; this, however, did not disrupt the inner unity of their creations. Rather, their works clearly express the necessity and inevitability of the transition from one trend to the other. Therefore the combination of heterogeneous artistic principles in the work of these authors does not result in eclecticism, but appears as an essentially organic phenomenon, constituting a most important phase in the development of a national literature.

Even greater creative upheavals occur in the period of the formation and development of socialist realism, as representatives of other trends come to accept its creative principles. For example, the works of A. Tolstoy in the late 1920s are completely different from his pre-revolutionary work. One is fully justified in speaking here of different aesthetic systems created by the author. But it would be quite wrong even in this case to stress the importance of the break. There are inner connections here too. For the prerequisites for the formation of a new creative trend ripened within the framework of the older one. It is well known that not all the representatives of critical realism, not even the major ones, realised the inevitability of the new social relations and ideas that marked the process of the renovation of society. A. Tolstoy was one of those talented masters who had an acute realisation of the crisis of the "old" social order and, in spite of fluctuations and errors, persistently searched out new ideological and creative paths.

The work of a talented author, as an aesthetic system, is characterised by the figurative revelation of either images of processes in life and man's spiritual world hitherto unexplored artistically, or of new aspects of phenomena previously dealt with in artistic generalisations. The significance and the value of a master's new creation is therefore determined not by its propinquity to his previous works, but rather by the degree of their dissimilarity, in other words, by the measure of the new and the universally significant information expressed in them. And all this is by no means an obstacle

to the existence of an integral whole, but, on the contrary, its necessary base.

The few works on systemic relations in literature and art manifest various tendencies. D. Lashmanov, for example, expresses the view that the literary and artistic works should be excluded from the sphere of systems analysis at any rate, at the present stage of scientific research. He writes: "In all probability, a concrete work of art in all the diversity and richness of detail cannot be the prerogative of a philosophical-aesthetic investigation. We also believe that it would be premature to perfect the specificity of systems and aesthetic analysis of such objects as, let us say, 'types' or 'kinds' of art."⁹

In D. Lashmanov's view, "for determining the systemic characteristics of a work of art as a construct it is useful to consider certain aggregates of works as definite sets for which some 'system-forming relation (or property)' uniting these works is realised." Research principles can also act as such properties (relations), e.g.,: 'the image of the author', 'the artist's point of view', 'the stylistic type of work', etc."¹⁰

It is necessary to point out, however, that aesthetic systems are not arbitrarily constructed models; they actually exist. A great number of "research principles" may appear to be useful for the classification of literary or artistic facts. But it is a rare speculative construct that can provide an adequate model of actually functioning aesthetic systems which play a definite role in the history of artistic culture. From this perspective, for instance, "the image of the author" can by no means function as a "system-forming" factor. Even if we leave aside the debatable character of the concept itself, the fact remains that "the image of the author" is manifested in the works of completely different literary artists, in entirely dissimilar aesthetic systems. For this reason a model that is based on "the image of the author" will be unsuitable for determining systemic relations in art and literature. This is equally true of such categories, as "the artist's point of view", etc.

The view is sometimes expressed that a broad aesthetic system is an integral unity of the process of creation of a work of art, its scheme, the finished work of art itself and, finally, its reception by the reader. Although obviously attractive, this idea gives rise to doubts and objections. First, the scheme of the work, as well as the various stages of its realisation, are not yet an aesthetic phenomenon in the proper sense of the word. Second, the reader, especially considering the prolonged temporal function of a literary work, is a highly variable quantity. A system, on the contrary, is made up of parts or components possessing some constant "parameters", which does not preclude the development of the system as a whole or of its parts. Therefore, the creative scheme, the work, and the reader — in spite of the dynamic interactions between them — can hardly be defined as an aesthetic system.

It is essential to emphasise here the difference between systemic connections and typological correspondences. Whereas systemic connections presuppose a common genesis for literary-artistic

phenomena and their functions, typological correspondences entail properties common to artistic phenomena, irrespective of their genesis or the peculiarities of their function. The same phenomena can be studied both from the point of view of their typological kinship and their systemic relations.

In studying the typological aspects of literary trends, we characterise their types and subtypes either within the framework of a national literature, or that of world literature. The actual historical context of their development has no essential significance in this study. The primary objective here is to determine types of artistic thinking, the paths and forms of figurative creations.

Of prime importance in the systems approach is the treatment of a literary trend as a definite aesthetic unity which emerges and functions in concrete historical conditions. Not infrequently literary movements, including romanticism and realism, are interpreted only on the basis of an analysis of their general content. There is no attempt to discuss the socio-aesthetic impetus for a given literary trend, its constituent parts and components, and the aesthetic system as a whole. If these points are not elucidated, however, the specific features of a literary trend cannot, in fact, be characterised.

Thus, if one were to speak of the social impetus for romanticism, one should, in my opinion, point out the widespread inner resistance to new bourgeois relations between people, an opposition that existed in various strata of society in the initial stages of capitalism. At the same time it is important to characterise the noble and lofty ideals and hopes for the renovation of humanity concurrent with great social changes. Both the resistance and the hopes were not homogeneous. Hence the heterogeneity of romanticism itself that continually amazes scholars and at times baffles them.

It follows that there are contradictions within romanticism and, on the other hand, there are connections between its various trends which permit to define it as a definite aesthetic system. These are not mutually exclusive. In considering romanticism as an aesthetic system one takes into account first of all the artist's concentration upon the individual and the complicated collisions within the individual, the individual's private and social aspirations; the artist "liberates" man from a temporal, concrete historical context to better reveal his constant, "eternal" features. As for the internal differentiating features of romanticism, on the one hand, the romantics manifest an active sense of the world's contradictions, for romanticism was closely allied with the growth of natural self-consciousness, on the other hand, some romanticists are inclined to describe the "supernatural", the unreal. While there are other types of romantic art, all of them have common social sources and are typologically related.

Systems analysis of literary movements is difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish from historical research into these movements. The analysis of systemic connections, one would suppose, must form a part of the general characterisation of the genesis and development of literary-artistic phenomena. In the real process of literary development the components are not amorphous, chaotic

nebulae, but creations manifesting a sufficiently high (and sometimes remarkably high) degree of systemic organisation which dynamically interact with each other and with earlier literary-artistic phenomena. Of particular importance is the study of the structure and formative processes of established aesthetic systems.

At the present stage of development of our science one cannot simply state that an author's creative work and literary trends or movements are dependent upon the specific features of the historical period. It is necessary to reveal the origin and development of aesthetic systems, their interaction and at the same time their contradictions and conflicts.

Systems analysis as applied to literary history and criticism will help to raise literary research to a new level.

Here we have dealt with only a few aspects of the systems approach. Many problems remain. It would be quite interesting to examine systemic relations among genres, within a national literature, and in the development of world literature *per se*. Even those problems discussed above demand more thorough treatment. The main point is that the systems approach has great potential as a tool for literary criticism and concrete analytical studies of literary phenomena.

NOTES

- ¹ M. Lermontov, *Complete Works*, Vol. 1, Moscow-Leningrad, 1974, p. 55 (in Russian).
- ² V. Borshchukov, *History of Literature and the Present*, Moscow, 1972, p. 229 (in Russian).
- ³ L. Tolstoy, *Complete Works*, Vol. 62, Moscow, p. 377 (in Russian).
- ⁴ See my article "Life Through the Ages. Inner Properties and Function of Literary Works", *Znamya*, 1974, No. 1.
- ⁵ The subject is treated in greater detail in my book, *The Author's Creative Individuality and the Development of Literature*, Moscow, 1972, Chapter 3 (in Russian).
- ⁶ V. Kozhinov, "Why Should One Study a Literary Work?", *Context-1973*, Moscow, 1974, p. 189 (in Russian).
- ⁷ *Ibidem*.
- ⁸ *Literature and the Times*, Moscow, 1967, p. 282 (in Russian).
- ⁹ D. Lashmanov, "The Systems Approach in the Study of Art", *Art and Scientific and Technological Progress*, Moscow, 1973, p. 351 (in Russian).
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 352.

Soviet Ethnography Today

YULIAN BROMLEY

Communication between nations is expanding on an unparalleled scale in the present epoch, which witnesses the consolidation of the forces of peace and socialism, increasingly higher rates of social progress, and the unfolding of the scientific and technological revolution. This manifests itself in the intensification of contacts between industrialised countries and in the ever deeper involvement of the peoples of the developing states in worldwide relations. This expansion of international relations requires a profound study of the culture of every nation. In the world today there are nearly 2,000 peoples, big and small, ancient and relatively new. Each people has its own culture and makes its own contribution to the treasure-store of world culture.

In order to ensure sincere and businesslike cooperation, Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said at the World Congress of Peace Forces, the peoples must know each other well. Ethnography (ethnology), the science that has long been giving attention mainly to studying the general and the specific in the culture of nations, is called upon to make a large contribution towards strengthening trust and friendship between peoples.

To this day a fairly widespread view among Western ethnographers and social anthropologists is that the object of ethnography is chiefly the peoples who have no written language and are

Y. Bromley, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Director of the Miklukho-Maklai Institute of Ethnography, USSR Academy of Sciences. Engaged in research in ethnic processes in the USSR and in general theoretical problems of ethnography. His latest work on the subject is *Ethnos and Ethnography. Specialist in the mediaeval history of Yugoslavia. Author of the books, The Formation of Feudalism in Croatia and The Peasant Uprising in Croatia in 1573.*

backward in their development, and that its object of study is mainly archaic phenomena. The reason for this is that having taken shape as a science in the epoch of bourgeois Europe's colonial expansion, ethnography initially gave attention to studying the peoples inhabiting non-European territory, many of whom had no written language. Moreover, ethnography was sharply counterposed to history. The latter was regarded as a science based on written records and studying "historical" peoples: ethnography was accorded the role of a science of so-called "non-historical" peoples.

Marxist ethnographers consider these views hopelessly obsolete. The untenability of dividing peoples into "historical" and "non-historical" has long since become evident to progressive scholars. The Marxist teaching that the replacement of socio-economic formations is natural has finally asserted the view that peoples who have no written language are at early stages of social development.

The historical materialism of Marx and Engels has become the theoretical basis for promoting a genuine science of the study of peoples. Moreover, the founders of Marxism have made a major contribution to the direct elaboration of the problems dealt with by ethnography. For instance, in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* Engels enlarged on the basic methodological propositions of the Marxist concept of the primitive stage of peoples and the rise of class society. This was of inestimable significance to ethnography. In the USSR, which is a multinational country, ethnography asserted itself, during the very first decades of Soviet power, as an historical science founded on Marxist methodology. This process was accompanied by the intensive study of the theoretical legacy of Marx, Engels and Lenin by Soviet ethnographers. Lenin's works on the theory of the national question, his teaching on the social structures and his propositions on the equality of nations and languages, on national culture and its class content comprised the theoretical basis for research by Soviet ethnographers.¹

Historical materialism is firmly consolidating its position in ethnography in the socialist countries, and the number of Marxist ethnographers is growing in the capitalist and, particularly, the developing countries. Although anti-historicism is strongly entrenched in such widespread Western ethnographic schools as functionalism, cultural relativism and structuralism, the historical approach to the study of peoples, including peoples who have no written language, is winning an ever larger number of adherents in ethnography abroad.

Scholars in the Soviet Union and other countries are now increasingly seeing in ethnography a science of peoples at all stages of their development. This means that by spatially embracing the entire territory of the world inhabited by man, ethnography chronologically studies man from ancient times to our day. Its field of vision covers existing peoples and peoples that had once existed. This new approach to ethnography as a science of all peoples at all stages of their development has raised before it the immediate task of deepening and specifying the notions about such a highly complex and

many-faceted phenomenon as a people. In Russian and in other languages the word "people" has many meanings, which include the working masses, national groups or simply a multitude of people. For that reason in cases where the word "people" implies historical communities such as tribes, nationalities and nations, ethnography usually uses the generalising term "ethnos". Soviet ethnography studies, in particular, such key aspects of the theory of the ethnos as the determination of its place among human communities, the narrow and broad understanding of ethnical communities, their typologisation, ethnic features of culture and the way of thinking, varieties of ethnical processes, and so forth.

Moreover, the elaboration of the theory of the ethnos has made it possible to specify the object of ethnography. This is especially important because alongside the restriction of its task to the study of the archaic world there is another extreme—the trend to represent ethnography as a super-discipline claiming to study almost all the components of society. These views are typical of many Western ethnographers, ethnologists and social anthropologists. In this case it is obviously extremely difficult to draw a line of distinction between ethnography and contiguous disciplines. What are the criteria for such a demarcation? Since in the case we are dealing with, the object of study is the people-ethnos, the criteria for determining the object of ethnography must be sought among its specific properties. These are the properties that distinguish the ethnos from other social communities (such as class, caste, community, and so on). As an analysis of ethnical formations shows, properties of this kind, along with language, are possessed mainly by traditional, day-to-day components of culture—customs, rites, folk art, oral literature, and so on. These cultural elements are studied also by many other scientific disciplines. But they interest ethnographers mainly because they form the specifics of the studied ethnos. Here it must be noted that one of the tasks of ethnographic investigations is to study not only the particular in the way of life, culture and psychology of one people or another but also what it has in common with other peoples, what determines their affiliation to one and the same socio-economic system, to one and the same economic and cultural type, historico-ethnographic region, and so on. This fundamental, methodological requirement of the Marxist theory of the ethnos is opposed to the hypertrophy of the ethnic particular, which, in its turn, is closely linked with understanding the ethnos as an extra-historical, eternal category.

Ethnography thus studies mainly the similarities and distinctions between peoples-ethnoses, and also the modifications of their specifics in time, in other words, ethnical processes. It must be borne in mind that the ethnographer's object of study does not remain immutable at all stages of man's ethnical history. At the early stages of the socio-economic development of peoples-ethnoses, society's life was founded on unrecorded traditions and was permeated to a large extent by the ethnical specifics. For that reason ethnography studies all aspects of the life of such peoples. With the transition to class societies, a transition in which prominence is gained by

professional culture, the ethnical specifics are concentrated in the relatively shranked traditional, day-to-day sphere. This is strikingly seen among the peoples of industrialised countries. Today, as a result of the scientific and technological revolution, that has led to the spread of mass industrial output, the ethnic specifics of these peoples are increasingly shifting from the sphere of material culture to that of spiritual life. Accordingly, a certain change is taking place in the area studied by ethnography. The weakening of the ethnic specifics in the areas traditionally studied by ethnography is sometimes regarded as the gradual disappearance of its object generally. However, the concept of ethnography as a science of ethnos leaves no room for such views about its prospects. As long as peoples-ethnoses exist ethnography will have its object of study, and this object will be not only the historical past but also living reality. The only change will occur in the significance of the various areas of ethnographic study, in accordance with the shift of the ethnic specifics in these areas.

A comprehensive characteristic of the ethnos can only be given on the basis of a special study of its individual components, primarily of the traditional forms of culture. The study of these components is all the more important because today many forms of traditional, day-to-day culture are rapidly disappearing from day-to-day life. One of the cardinal ways of recording the traditional components of culture is historico-ethnographic atlas. Moreover, an essential part in studying traditional culture is played by ethnographic museums, the large network of history and local studies museums, most of which have ethnographic displays. The close attention given to traditional, day-to-day culture is due to the wide employment in ethnography of the method of direct observation by expeditions. By concentrating its attention chiefly on traditional, day-to-day culture, ethnography thereby facilitates the elaboration of a vital aspect of man's entire cultural history, which is by no means reduced to the development of solely professional forms of culture. A notable role is played by ethnographic research in reconstructing the history of culture at early stages of social development, for in this case it embraces the entire range of culture. By and large, ethnographic historico-cultural studies convincingly show that all peoples are equally capable of achieving cultural progress. Although in the sphere of culture the development of mankind is uneven, the essential distinctions are due not to the inner properties of the ethnos but to local features of the world-historical process, chiefly to the socio-economic development level of individual peoples and to the relations between them. As was noted by Marx and Engels, "not only the relation of one nation to others, but also the whole internal structure of the nation itself depends on the stage of development reached by its production and its internal and external intercourse".²

The study of peoples at all stages of the world-historical process confronts ethnography with many problems.

In particular, ethnography has long been playing a major role in the elaboration of problems relating to the history of primitive society. As we have already noted, a study of peoples who have

lagged behind in their development brings their entire life into focus: their economy, their socio-economic system and their culture. This enables ethnographers to make wide use of the data of their science to reconstruct the history of the primitive communal system. During the past decades Soviet ethnographers have amassed and analysed a vast range of factual material testifying to the universality of the communal-clan system. Progress has also been made in studying the late forms of the primitive communal system, the complex structure of the patriarchal clan has been elucidated, the stages of the development of the large family have been brought to light and extensive material concerning its later extant forms has been generalised. Much has also been done in the study of archaic forms of social life persisting in class and, chiefly, early class societies.

A study of these problems yields extremely valuable factual material in favour of the materialistic concept of the historical process, confirming that phenomena such as classes, private ownership, the state and the exploitation of man by man are transient, that they are by no means eternal. The topicality of these problems, which seem to be far removed from our day, is exceptionally great. Small wonder that primitive history was given considerable attention by the founders of scientific communism a century ago. They proved that a classless society, dominated by primitive collectivism springing from the undeveloped state of the productive forces existed at an early stage of the historical process. Production, Engels wrote, "was essentially collective and, likewise, consumption took place by the direct distribution of the products in larger or smaller communistic communities. This production in common was carried on within the narrowest limits".³ The researches by Soviet scholars are producing more and more evidence that the labour theory of sociogenesis evolved by the founders of scientific communism and their concepts of primitive communal-clan collectivism are unshakeable. Of the latest Soviet works on this subject, which is important from the philosophical standpoint, we shall mention as an example the volume, *Problems of Ethnography and Anthropology in the Light of Engels's Scientific Legacy*, that was published in 1972.

Moreover, the study of problems as the formation of consciousness and religion are of great importance to ethnography. Ethnographical material has allowed Soviet scientists to corroborate and concretise Engels's proposition that the emergence and development of thinking and the accompanying development of speech took place in the course of people's labour activity in proportion to the development of production and the improvement of the implements of labour.

A clear orientation in the study of the problems of the genesis and essence of primitive religion is given by Lenin's words that the "impotence of the savage in his battle with nature gives rise to belief in gods, devils, miracles, and the like".⁴ A study of the religious beliefs and rites of peoples who are backward in their socio-economic and cultural development provides convincing evidence of the fact that much in the teachings and in the cult of so-called world religions

directly stems from the same primitive superstitions, from which the present-day apologists of religion assiduously dissociate themselves. More often these researches have completely shattered the constructions of clerical ethnographers, who endeavour to prove that belief in a single god was inherent in mankind from the very beginning.

Some of Lenin's propositions are of fundamental importance to an ethnographic study of the history of primitive society. One of the most essential of these propositions concerns the role of the "primitie herd", the "primitive commune" in the formation of human society.³ "Our age," Lenin wrote, "was not preceded by a Golden Age; and primitive man was absolutely crushed by the burden of existence, by the difficulties of the struggle against nature."⁶

A study of the archaic forms of social organisation is of ideological and direct practical significance, for the downfall of the colonial system has dramatically aggravated the question of the choice of ways of development for many peoples, who are today at various stages of the disintegration of the primitive-communal system or have many survivals of that system. Further, in this connection mention must be made of the transition to a settled way of life and the changes that have taken place under socialism in the way of life of former nomads. The experience of these changes is of no little practical significance to many developing countries.

Ethnographic material is one of the prime sources for a study of the problem of the origin of peoples, of their ethnogenesis. The enormous interest shown in this problem is in many ways due to the natural desire of each people to have a clear idea of its origin. The need for its thorough study is also dictated by the fact that the commonplace consciousness is frequently inclined to give it a simplified interpretation. However, because of their complexity ethnographical problems have to be considered in their totality: for many decades this study has been conducted by Soviet ethnographers jointly with anthropologists, archaeologists and linguists. The present notions about the origin of many peoples of the USSR are unquestionably closer to historical reality than the notions of two or three decades ago. It is vital that these investigations should not be reduced to a study of the origin of some one people but that they should embrace the ethnical history of all peoples of one or another large region, because their origin in such regions is usually closely interwoven. Much interest is centred on a study of the ethnogenesis of the peoples of Asia and Africa, for this is of particular importance in view of the emergence of new sovereign states. The range of ethnogenetical problems that has been elaborated bears testimony to the fact that human history has always been a history of contacts and replacements of various anthropological, lingual and cultural affiliations of groups, that no "pure" people that has not absorbed innumerable foreign elements exists in the world.

The importance of making a comprehensive study of ethnoses as integral dynamic systems has determined the fact that such a form of research as the historico-ethnographical monograph devoted to a composite characteristic of an individual people, is widespread in

Soviet science. A special place among works of this kind is occupied by monographs on numerically small peoples that do not have a long-established written tradition. The history of such peoples can be reconstructed retrospectively (needless to say, with the use of all sources, including archaeological data) only by the ethnographer who has the data of direct expedition observations at his disposal. Many peoples of the USSR who had no written language in the past, particularly the numerically small peoples in the north of the European part of the USSR and Siberia, now know their history as a result of the painstaking work of ethnographers.

A comprehensive ethnographic study of each people inevitably entails, as we have already pointed out, the elucidation not only of the specifics of its culture but also of the features that it has in common with other peoples. Moreover, it is important to study the common features of peoples because the commonplace consciousness is inclined to absolutise the correlation between the ethnos and the individual components of culture, creating the illusion that the spread of these components is limited to the confines of that culture. However, the specific character of almost all such components of culture is not absolute but relative: in addition to the people for which they are most typical, these components are to be observed to one extent or another among some other peoples. In this connection it is extremely important to study so-called ethnolinguistic communities — broad formations that embrace all kindred peoples. A task of this kind, for instance, the elucidation of the unity and specifics in the culture of all the Slav peoples, is assigned to the three-volume work on the ethnography of the Slavs that is being compiled jointly by ethnographers of European socialist countries.

The concept of ethnography as a science studying all peoples-ethnoses at all stages of their historical development makes that science responsible for working out a common ethnographic characteristic of all the peoples of the world. In postwar years Soviet scholars have produced a 13-volume publication under the title *Peoples of the World*. At present, work is in progress on an ethnogeographical 20-volume series, *Countries and Peoples*, for the mass reader. In addition to a description of nature and the economy, this series will give a characteristic of the culture and customs of all peoples.

The fact that Soviet ethnography regards modern peoples as a living reality, places it alongside the social sciences that participate directly in resolving the practical tasks of the building of socialism and communism, in short, sciences that not only reconstruct the past of peoples but also serve them today and in future.

The fact that today the peoples of the USSR have a socialist culture that is common to all of them in content does not lead to the disappearance of the national forms of this culture. On the contrary, this culture harmoniously combines with national cultures, with progressive national traditions that have been further developed under the conditions of Soviet reality and are gradually becoming attributes of all the Soviet peoples. In one way or another this process

embraces all forms and levels of culture in the broad sense of the word: material and spiritual life, social and family traditions, everyday and professional culture. This is, naturally, an extremely complex process, and special ethnographic research is required to analyse its mechanism and, especially, to forecast its various aspects.

Lenin's proposition on cultural continuity is fundamental to the ethnographic study of the culture of Soviet society. Lenin regarded the utilisation of the entire cultural wealth accumulated by man as an indispensable condition for the formation of the new, socialist culture. "Proletarian culture," he said, "must be the logical development of the store of knowledge mankind has accumulated under the yoke of capitalist, landowner and bureaucratic society."⁷ Further, Lenin's proposition that in antagonistic society there are two cultures in each national culture requires a partisan approach to the cultural legacy of each people and an ability to distinguish what is advanced and progressive in this legacy, ruling out the idealisation or, much less, the fetishisation of extant forms.

One should not get the impression that the study of contemporaneity has become one of the cardinal tasks of Soviet ethnography only in recent times. Work in this direction, springing directly from the practical requirements of reorganising the country's former outlying regions, began immediately after the October Revolution. True, by the beginning of the 1930s the study of the remote past had become the main object of study, but on the eve of the Second World War the ethnographic study of modern culture and customs of the peoples of the USSR was continued. The first publications resulting from this work were mainly of a descriptive character, but by the beginning of the 1960s this stage had been passed. A deeper and more comprehensive study of the modern stage of culture and customs commenced, and scholars began the monographic investigation of the life of the collective-farm peasants and initiated research into the life of the workers, and then of the entire urban population.

The accumulated experience has shown, in particular, that the study of the material culture of the peoples of the USSR can also help to create such standard designs of houses and towns that would take the rational features of local folk architecture more fully into account, to remodel popular clothes adapted to local conditions, and plan the production of household utensils, food and so on. A study of spiritual culture is of even greater significance, for with the shift of the ethnical specifics from the sphere of material culture to that of consciousness, spiritual culture gradually becomes the basic indicator of the ethnic specifics. Here ethnographic study can help, for instance, to specify the lingual aspects of the work of educational bodies and publishing houses, and popularise and integrate into Soviet culture the finest works of the oral, musical and folk fine art of all of the peoples inhabiting the Soviet Union. Further, ethnographic studies of the family and of family life can help to improve cultural development.

Analysis of present-day ethnocultural traditions is an essential aspect of the ethnographic study of Soviet society. Traditions play a key role in sustaining the cultural link between generations and in

ensuring cultural continuity. Traditions are a historical category: with the development of society some traditions constantly become obsolete and are replaced by innovations that with time themselves become traditions. At the same time, due to their relative stability many obsolete traditions are preserved as survivals. For that reason each ethnocultural complex always has progressive and outworn, negative traditions, many of the latter being linked with religious ideas. The commonplace consciousness frequently regards all traditional forms of activity without exception as national values and, consequently, as inalienable features of a given people. This confronts ethnography with the task, on the one hand, of ascertaining positive ethnocultural traditions and thereby facilitating their further development and, on the other, of showing that if negative traditions are not idealised they can be quickly overcome. It was this kind of extant phenomena that Lenin had in mind when he wrote of "the remoulding of the most deep-rooted, inveterate, hidebound and rigid 'order'".⁸

A study of the ethnic aspects of national processes comprises another extremely important area of the practical tasks of ethnography. It would be hard to overestimate the significance of these aspects to a multinational state like the USSR. Within a period of a little over half a century the socialist nations and nationalities of the USSR have achieved an unprecedented level of development and drawn close to each other to form a new historical community, the Soviet people. The relations between the peoples of the USSR provide a model of cooperation and friendship between nations. However, it should not be forgotten that these relations took shape not spontaneously but as a result of the CPSU's Leninist nationalities policy, that guided by the objective laws of social development the CPSU continues to create ever more favourable conditions for the burgeoning and drawing together of the peoples of the USSR. This, in turn, gives rise to the need for a profound study of the various types of modern ethnic processes in the USSR, their trends and prospects, their specifics and rates, and the factors that influence the development and drawing together of the socialist nations.

In an ethnographic study of present-day national processes it is particularly important to bring to light the relationship between ethnic proper and socio-economic aspects. This sets a dual task: to study the specifics of ethnic changes in various social groups and to ascertain the features of the social changes in various ethnic surroundings, among concrete peoples. In recent years in the USSR these investigations have given rise to a scientific discipline on the borderline between ethnography and concrete sociology. This discipline is ethnosociology. Parallel with an analysis of the general indicators of the economic, socio-class and cultural development of the Union and autonomous republics and of the relations between them, a study of this kind presupposes ascertaining the course of ethnic processes in the different social and national groups in individual republics; in particular, the task is set of finding out how various ethnic phenomena are refracted in the consciousness of these

groups. Mass enquiries with the aid of questionnaires and with the data subsequently processed by computers have been conducted for this purpose. The results of the first enquiries of this kind organised in the Tatar Autonomous Republic were recently generalised in a collective monograph published by the Institute of Ethnography of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Similar studies are being conducted today in Moldavia, Georgia, Estonia, and Uzbekistan.

Important tasks face Soviet ethnographers also in the study of the ethnic aspects of present-day national processes in foreign countries. Collective monographs on Europe, a number of Asian countries, Canada and the USA have been published. Work is under way on a three-volume comprehensive monograph on Latin America. Researches of this kind give us a better knowledge of the modern world's national problems, of establishing the link between their ethnic aspects and the specifics of the socio-political development of nations. A study of the ethnocultural situation in the industrialised capitalist countries lays bare the national, lingual, religious and racial discrimination against large groups of the population in many of these countries.

Africa, Asia, Latin America and Oceania, which have taken the road of independent development, are of special interest to ethnographers. The unity of the anti-imperialist forces, the attainment of political independence and the upsurge of economic and cultural life have led to an unparalleled activation of ethnical processes in these countries. A study of these processes is not only of theoretical but also of practical importance. By studying the course and prospects of such processes, Marxist ethnographers help the progressive forces in the developing countries in their struggle to put an end to clan-tribal and feudal-regional disunity. Of no less importance in this context is the study of the course of the revival of the original culture of the non-European peoples, 'whose development had been slowed down by colonial oppression in the course of scores and hundreds of years.

Ethnical communities differ from each other not only in various features but also in scale, i.e., quantitative indicators. For that reason the corresponding demographic indicators (chiefly numerical strength) and their dynamics are of considerable importance for a characteristic of such communities. A study of these indicators is an object of ethnic demography. This borderline discipline investigates factors that determine changes in the numerical strength of peoples, such as the birth-rate, the death-rate, the sex and age composition of the population, and data provided by medical geography, which studies the regional and ethnical incidence of diseases. As one of its tasks, ethnodemography determines the link between the dynamics of the numerical strength of peoples and ethnical factors. In particular, in order to understand the distinctions in the indicators of the birth-rate of the peoples of the world it is important to take into account the traditions of each ethnic community, such as the marriage age, the attitude to large families, and so on. Assimilatory and consolidational processes directly affect the numerical strength of peoples. Migration, too, influences the numerical strength of ethnic

communities. For prognostication in the sphere of ethnodemography it is very important to take all these factors into account.

In addition to data showing the internal structure of ethnic communities, a characteristic of these communities must contain indicators relating to the territories inhabited by them and also to their interaction with the natural environment. This explains the long-standing contacts between ethnography and geography dating from remote antiquity, when it was inconceivable to describe the specifics of the life of peoples without describing the elements of the natural environment. The demarcation of ethnography and geography as separate sciences began in the mid-19th century. But a noteworthy turn in this respect took place in the USSR only in the late 1920s and the early 1930s, when, as we have already noted, ethnography came to be regarded as a historical discipline. We feel that it is extremely important to stress the fundamental error of isolating ethnography from geography. Ethnic maps, for example, are a major source for shedding light on questions related to national-territorial transformations and give us a better understanding of the essence of relations between nations. Soon after Soviet power was established, Lenin noted the need, in connection with the preparations for the national-demarcation of Central Asia, for, among other things, a special ethnographic map of "Turkestan with a subdivision into Uzbekia, Kirghizia and Turkmenia".⁹ In the 1920s, Soviet ethnographers completed a number of ethnographic maps of multinational regions of the USSR and later they began preparing ethnic maps of all parts of the globe. Soviet ethnogeographers and ethnodemographers are now jointly compiling an *Atlas of the Population of the World*, the numerous maps of which will spatially record the basic ethnic and demographic indicators of all the peoples of our planet.

Special mention must be made of the tasks in the sphere of the struggle against the man-hating concepts of racism and chauvinism. Although overt racist ideology had discredited itself during the years of the Third Reich, in the West not only political and day-to-day but also "theoretical" racism has not been uprooted to this day. Concepts about élite, chosen and exclusive nations and races are still widespread in reactionary science. Employing strictly scientific methods and operating with extensive data on cultural values, the way of life, way of thinking and other ethnic data about various groups of mankind, Marxist ethnography proves that all peoples are equally capable of historical progress and, at the same time, teaches us that an attentive attitude must be adopted to their ethnic specific features.

A vital task of Soviet ethnographers is to make a critical study of foreign literature, including works not only on ethnography but also those that on many points coincide with it, for instance, cultural and social anthropology. In particular, mention may be made of a recently published book, *Ethnological Studies Abroad*, in which a critical analysis is made of the theories of Western ethnographers on questions relating to pre-capitalist societies. As was shown at the 9th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnographic Sciences (Chicago, September 1973), a critical analysis must be made of such

concepts as evolutionism in social anthropology and of the idealistic constructions in ethnocultural research.

Further, the same international congress convincingly stated that many progressive scientists are keenly interested in Marxism-Leninism, seeing in Marxist methodology the key to the solution of the problems studied by them. This interest in Marxism is one of the most characteristic features of present-day ethnography. And this, judging by everything, is to some extent promoting familiarisation with the achievements of Soviet ethnography.

This science, which is based on Marxist-Leninist methodology and performs not only cognitive but also ideological functions, is opposed to objectivism and indifference to politics. That is why despite the breadth of their studies, Soviet ethnographers ultimately always set their sights on the solution of pressing and important philosophical and practical problems. Thereby, together with other Marxist social sciences, Soviet ethnography makes its contribution to the struggle for lasting peace and social progress.

NOTES

¹ This work is reviewed in Y. Bromley's essays "Ethnographical Studies in the USSR", *Social Sciences*, No. 2(12), 1973; "Ethnographical Works", *Social Sciences*, No. 2(20), 1975.— Ed.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, Moscow, 1968, p. 32.

³ F. Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*; K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, p. 330.

⁴ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 83.

⁵ See V. I. Lenin, *Complete Works*, Vol. 48, p. 238 (in Russian).

⁶ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 111.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 287.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Vol. 32, p. 162.

⁹ V. I. Lenin, *Complete Works*, Vol. 41, p. 436 (in Russian).

Ethology and Ethics

ALEXANDER SHISHKIN

For centuries philosophical ethics claimed that human behaviour and morality were based on human nature that never changed. That was a challenge to the notions that morality was of supernatural origin, and in some conditions a challenge to the social order which tended to distort man's "natural nature". However, the view that man's nature was given once and for all allowed a wide range of moral characteristics of that nature, which could be regarded as being wild, amoral, and irrational, or as rational and kind. The numerous eudaemonistic theories saw human nature as containing the urge for happiness or pleasure inherent in all living beings.

Following the appearance of Darwin's theory, some claimed on the strength of the "struggle for existence" (seen as a struggle for individual survival) that human nature was chiefly predatory and bestial. Others emphasised mutual assistance as the main factor in organic evolution and discerned in man deeply embedded moral principles which were to triumph over egoistic urges also inherited from his animal ancestors.

Leaving aside for the moment the question of the role of man's natural nature in the shaping of his behaviour and morality, let us note that a century ago Engels said in a letter to Lavrov that both conceptions ("struggle for existence" and "cooperation") were "justified within certain limits, but the one is as one-sided and narrow-minded as the other. The interaction of bodies in nature... includes both harmony and collision, struggle and cooperation".¹

A Shishkin, D. Sc. (Philos.), Professor, Head of the Chair of Philosophy, Moscow State Institute of International Relations, member of the Voprosy filosofii Editorial Board. Author of the books: *From the History of Ethic Theories, Fundamentals of Marxist Ethics, The 20th Century and Moral Values of Humanity (in co-authorship), and many other studies on problems of ethics.*

This interaction of "struggle" and "cooperation" is now accepted by many naturalists, believing that it is wrong to contrast these forms of relations between animals in straightforward terms, and that the struggle for existence is expressed not only in direct clashes but also includes "other forms of relations, the chief of which is the formation of friendly communities", which is a "powerful instrument of collective defence", and one of the "main conditions for group selection".²

With the development of genetics the question of human nature and ethics acquired another aspect, becoming a question of the role of heredity and environment in the shaping of man, a question which had been considered earlier as well but which could not be solved by science with its then limited possibilities. What is more, many 17th and 18th century philosophers were convinced that men with a normal physical organisation did not differ from each other in their endowments, that at birth the human soul was a *tabula rasa*, and that experience and education made it possible for everyone to be shaped in accordance with the desires of educators. Let us note that a peculiar duplicate of the basic idea of this revolutionary theory (the French Enlighteners who adopted it put the blame for human vices on vicious society and called for its transformation) will now be found in the notion of man as a product of external conditions governed automatically and mechanically within the framework of the behaviourist pattern of stimulus-reaction. One scientist wittily called this notion the "ratomorphous view of man", for here the same laws of behaviour are applied to man as will be discovered in laboratory experiments with rats.

Meanwhile, the growth of knowledge about heredity, which has carried genetics to the forefront of biological science, was initially accompanied by erroneous notions about the fatal role of heredity in man's life, in the shaping of his bodily and spiritual qualities, by assertions about his predatory nature inherited from animals, about his innate urge for aggression, murder, aggrandisement, and so on.

These views became popular, in particular, in connection with the advances of comparative ethology, a young branch of biological science dealing mainly with the genetic basis of behaviour in philogenesis and the experience gained by animals on that basis in the course of their life.³ At the same time, fresh attempts have been made to explain some social, including ethical, phenomena in the light of biological science.

* * *

There is no doubt, in general, that man does inherit certain qualities and traits of behaviour from his animal ancestors. This view was expressed with adequate conviction by Charles Darwin, and was also accepted by Engels, who wrote: "It is ... inherent in the descent of man from the animal world that he can never entirely rid himself of the beast, so that it can always be only a question of more or less, of a difference in the degree of bestiality or of humanity."⁴

Modern ethology has accumulated many observations and experimental data bearing out this view. They show that the transformation of man's animal nature does not at all imply any solid wall between man and the animal even in a sphere which appears to be most human, that is, the sphere of mental capabilities. There is a growing body of research showing that animals are not confined to stereotyped instinctive behaviour but are also capable of deliberate action aimed to achieve definite goals, and that in the adaptation to the environment a great part belongs to training, imitation and initiative, and that reasoning activity among animals deserves the closest attention, etc. The advances in ethology show that it is an important element of the whole complex of the sciences of man.

However, many ethologists have expressed views which totally ignore the achievements of social science, what it says about the substance of man, about social relations, and the institutions and forms of consciousness in which men reflect reality. There is, for instance, the claim that ethology is capable of tackling ethical problems of its own. One British scientist says that "ethology sheds a great deal of light on the question of what kind of behaviour in what circumstances contributes to human happiness and fulfilment, and therefore... on what actions in what circumstances are good, and what bad."⁵

We think that this is a big mistake. Ethical questions, the questions of good and evil in human life cannot be decided only by means of the data available to ethology (just as there is no similar solution for problems in art, religion, philosophy, politics, etc.). What is more, when it comes to similarities in the behaviour of animals and man, all comparisons must take account of the fact that the same models of behaviour have, as a rule, a profoundly different content. This applies, for instance, to the conception of aggression, which many naturalists claim is a common trait in the behaviour of animals and man.

Let us take a closer look at this question. Meynell refers to a book by the well-known ethologist Konrad Lorenz, *On Aggression*. Here is how he sums up one of the key ideas of this book: "Aggression between man and man is to a large extent an innate, rather than a socially imposed characteristic, and is hence hardly to be removed, though it may indeed be ameliorated, by changes in education and social structure."⁶ Below we shall deal in greater detail with these ideas of Lorenz's, which he has elaborated in a number of recent works. But before doing so we want to quote another extract from Lorenz to show how little ethology can help to understand human ethics.

"Living in the natural environment which has influenced its gradual development throughout the earth's history, the wild animal enjoys in a certain sense the paradise that man has lost. Every single urge which wells up in a wild animal is 'good', that is, all instinctive impulses from an inner source are such that they must finally contribute to the good of the particular animal and of its whole species. For a wild animal in its natural state there is no conflict

between natural inclinations and what they 'ought' to do, and this is the paradise which man has lost. The fruits of man's higher mental capacities are his cultural development, and above all the power of speech and of conceptual thought, and the accumulation and traditional passing on of common knowledge. All this has resulted in man's historical evolution at a rate which is many hundreds of times more rapid than the purely organic genealogical development of all other living beings. But the instincts, the innate actions and reactions of man, remain tied to the much slower rate of organic development and are unable to keep pace with his cultural development.

"Natural inclinations' no longer quite fit in with conditions of human culture, where they have been largely superseded by human intellect. Man is not 'bad' from birth onwards, but he is not good enough for the demands of cultivated society which he has imposed upon himself. In contrast to the wild animal, the cultivated human being—and in this sense every human being is cultivated—can no longer rely blindly on his instincts: many of these are so obviously opposed to the demands made by society on the individual that even the most naive person must realise that they are anti-cultural and anti-social."⁷

These views of a most prominent authority in the study of animal behaviour suggest that it is only with great reservations that we can speak of the ethical content of animal behaviour. Lorenz shows this on many examples. He gives due credit for the diverse expressions of emotions and intellect among animals, even discovering some aspects of "ethical" behaviour, for instance, among dogs (conscience, responsibility, a chivalrous attitude to females and pups, etc.), but shows that one must discern a qualitative distinction between man and the animal. Neither conscience, nor loyalty among dogs has anything in common with the groping along "the labyrinth of moral obligations" which frequently accompanies human behaviour. The dog "only knows in minute measure the conflict between inclination and obligation.... Seen from the viewpoint of human responsibilities, even the most faithful dog is to a large extent amoral."⁸

In another book, Lorenz gives the example of "chivalrous" behaviour on the part of a wolf when he spares a weaker adversary who is tired of the fight and admits his defeat (by offering his unprotected neck, the most vulnerable place where a bite would be fatal), and says that some animals have innate restraining mechanisms fixed by heredity. In his book *King Solomon's Ring* he says that this kind of mechanism is no more than an outward analogue and at best a remote predecessor of man's social ethics. Hence the need to be extremely wary of any attempts to extrapolate ethical criteria to relations among animals. Lorenz opposes any attempts to anthropomorphise animal behaviour, that is, to ascribe to animals everything that is characteristic of relations between men. "The essence of creative organic evolution is that it produces completely new and higher characters which were in no way indicated or even implicit in the preceding stage from which they took their origin. Of course, even today, the animal is still present in man, but never man in

the animal. Our genealogical examination methods which necessarily proceed from the lowest step, from the animal, enable us to see in clear relief the essentially human, the high achievements of human reason and ethics which have never existed in the animal world."⁹

However, Lorenz's correct ideas are somewhat debased by his urge (which will be discerned in the works we have quoted here) to put human and animal behaviour on the same footing. In his book *On Aggression* and in various other writings, he claims, for instance, that aggressiveness has been inherited by man from animals. He says that intraspecific aggression is an instinct which is common to man and other higher vertebrate animals. Whenever aggressiveness cannot be contained it tends to spill over both among animals and among men. But while many animals have a special mechanism inhibiting aggressive action with respect to their like (as, for instance, the above-mentioned submissiveness of the vanquished wolf arouses the victor's clemency), among men, with the development of weapons and new methods of killing their kind the instinct of aggressiveness meets less resistance in the innate taboo of fratricide. There remains only one hope—human reason and ethics, awareness of moral responsibility, etc. In this way Lorenz appears to enhance the importance of the "moral factor" in the life of society. He stresses the need to develop contacts (especially personal contacts) between men, education designed to strengthen the internal taboos to destroy other men, education against nationalism and racism, etc.

But while emphasising the role of moral motivations in behaviour, Lorenz still says that the instinct of aggressiveness is the basic factor of behaviour, and so suggests that in this respect man has not made any headway at all in the matter of self-possession.

We believe that these are obvious overstatements. Although Lorenz does pin some hope on the education and growing moral responsibility of men for their future, he appears to take a dim view of that future. Indeed, what can one expect of man who has not made any headway in self-control, despite the age-old moral prescriptions and taboos? After all, he is burdened with hereditary aggressiveness, that is, an urge to kill his kind, while increasingly losing the innate restraints. Nor is man able, for the time being, to exercise any control over his social relations. Lorenz says: "If... we are powerless against the pathological disintegration of our social structure, and if, armed with atomic weapons, we cannot control our aggressive behaviour any more sensibly than any animal species, this deplorable situation is largely due to our arrogant refusal to regard our own behaviour as subject to the laws of nature and as accessible to causal analysis."¹⁰

But what can one obtain from an analysis of human behaviour subject to the laws of nature for control of social structure and human acts? After reading his book, one is left with the impression that the author tends to ignore the accomplishments of social science. He does express some encouraging views about man and his development and also of the possibility of human reason and ethics controlling animal heredity, but instead of being well-grounded propositions they are more in the nature of pious hopes and wishes.

We think that the fundamental flaw in these views is that the problem of control over "aggressive behaviour" is not presented as a social problem, that is, in the light of historical development and its tendencies, the struggle of advanced social forces in present-day society against reaction, and the effort to do away with exploitation and war. If anything, Lorenz's advice concerning the danger of aggression and the need to avert it fails to go to the heart of the matter. He suggests self-knowledge as a means of combating this danger (that is, a study of the causal nexus governing human behaviour), including both ethological research and psychoanalysis of so-called sublimation, that is, the orientation of man's instinctive activity to the higher realms (poetry, music, painting and science), which helps to foster men in a spirit of respect for human values and ideals. Furthermore, he urges the establishment of human contacts or friendship between individuals representing different ideologies and nations, the need duly to rechannel bellicose enthusiasm, develop sport, etc. We have no reason to doubt the sincerity of all these intentions to check aggressiveness, even if the author fails to see its sources. But that is not what has been generally brought out in his book. The bourgeois press has advertised it as an epoch-making worldwide bestseller, with special emphasis on the "killer instinct" which is allegedly common to man and the animals, an instinct which is less subject to control among men than it is among most wild animals. Indeed, whether the author likes it or not, these assertions are akin to the cynical statements of Robert Ardrey, which have been widely popularised: "We know above all that man is a portion of the natural world... We are Cain's children."¹¹

Actually, we have no authentic data about any innate sources of man's aggressiveness. Scientists who regard man as a predator seeing others as his prey or as a means to attain his ends, are apparently aware only of the relationships between men which are characteristic of the society based on the principle of money-making. But these relationships have not been created by nature, and men who act as predators and aggressors are not such by nature. In such a society (as in any other exploitative society) there are also men and women fighting for freedom, progress and enlightenment of the masses, men and women prepared to make sacrifices for that end. Indeed, are they moved by any aggressive purposes? Is it also right to say that the masses of men involved in the aggressive wars waged in the interests of capital do so out of innate aggressiveness? One need only pose these questions to realise the groundlessness of the conception of man's innate aggressiveness. We say nothing about the very different interpretation given by men in various periods to the conception of aggression, the difficulties involved in its legal definition, etc.

In the animal context, the term "aggression" is used to denote the more ferocious forms of competition or struggle for survival, but many naturalists assure us that these forms are not as widespread as one would think. According to the well-known US scientist Ernst Mayr, "in most cases ... dramatic competition occurs only where two species come newly into contact or where a radical change of the

environment upsets the previously existing dynamic balance". The author refers to other scientists who claim that "such an acute phase of competition is often 'a relatively evanescent stage in the relationship of animal species' and will be replaced by a new balance in which severe competition is avoided."¹² Competition both between and within species is a biological relationship, reference to which does not in any way help to understand the nature of social relations.

We think that the most substantial objection to Lorenz's approach is that it is not right to equate ethological "aggression" and political aggression. In general, the use of conceptions like aggression, competition, parasitism, etc., in the same meaning when applied to animals and men cannot help to gain a correct understanding of biological or of social phenomena.¹³ This has been repeatedly brought out by the founders of Marxist-Leninist theory. Any analogies between animals and men need to be very carefully weighed. Observations of animals are frequently tainted with anthropomorphism or sociomorphism, which now and again springs from the observer's own limited experience.

The American scientists V. Dethier and E. Stellar say that references to instincts in general need to take account of the fact that "in many cases instinctive behaviour is not an infallibly accurate 'fixed pattern' of response, since there is too much variability in the behaviour of even simple organisms, and the behaviour of the higher organisms is constantly being modified and shaped by individual experience and learning." In virtue of these and other considerations, the two scientists object to any free-wheeling use of the conception of instincts in application to animals, to say nothing of man. They regard the claim that "man fought because he had a fighting instinct" with unconcealed irony.¹⁴ One can, of course, distinguish more and less "aggressive" characters among men (just as one can distinguish different degrees of aggressiveness among animals), but that does not give any ground at all for saying that wars among states are due to the prevalence of "aggressive" over "peaceable" characters among the citizens of these states.

Attempts have also been made to deduce from organic evolution such traits of human behaviour like altruism and egoism, love and jealousy, and to apply these terms as completely similar characteristics for the behaviour of animals and men. Here is Lorenz once again: "If, in the Greylag Goose and in man, highly complex norms of behaviour, such as falling in love, strife for ranking order, jealousy, grieving, etc., are not only similar but down to the most absurd details the same, we can be sure that everyone of these instincts has a very special survival value, in each case almost or quite the same in the Greylag and in man."¹⁵

One must object most seriously to such comparisons, above all because of the anthropomorphic characteristic of animal behaviour which is completely identified with human behaviour.

The conception of value which is very often used by naturalists to designate both "evolutionary value" and "ethical value" cannot, we believe, lead to anything except confusion in studying the behaviour

of animals and men. Take as an example the conception of altruism. A study of animal behaviour shows that in the course of evolution many of them have developed a capability for self-sacrifice, which helps the group to survive.¹⁶ But there is hardly any doubt that this capability has no ethical value, because it does not involve any free choice or moral purpose, but merely indicates a biological adaptation. That is why naturalists themselves take a sceptical view of the use of the conception of "altruism" in application both to animals and man. "Though in bird behaviour we may find models which demonstrate the selective advantage of 'altruism', we must be careful about regarding this as an ethical phenomenon. It is true that birds do learn; song is handed down from generation to generation by imitation and local dialects can develop, and the geographical spread by learning of other behavioural traits has been recorded. But bird behaviour is largely genetically programmed. Similarly, we must agree... that the 'bravery' of soldier ants is not an action calling for moral assessment of any kind."¹⁷

The same applies to egoism as a "norm" of individual behaviour. Among animals this "norm" does not require any moral assessment, encouragement or condemnation. In *The German Ideology*, Marx and Engels said that "no dog has ever made phosphorus... out of a bone, any more than it has ever 'got into its head' anything about its 'right' to a bone". But some men will claim that a dog-fight has the purpose of establishing the right of ownership, to provide a moral sanction, and prescribe the force of a natural law, an approach which does not, of course, do anything to help one gain a better understanding either of law or of morality.

* * *

The comparison of human and animal behaviour has its limits, as we have suggested above. The dividing line runs where man is regarded only as an aggregation of physical and spiritual forces of the living organism taken outside the context of the given social structure. That is the sense in which Marx has used the term "the human organism". In real terms this always has the specific features which characterise it at the given time and in the given historical conditions, depending on the development of production and social relations. When abstracting ourselves from these conditions, we can speak about man in general as a social animal and compare his behaviour with that of his animal ancestors, immediate and more distant ones.¹⁸ We can compare human labour taken in general with animal forms of "labour" and establish the specific nature of human labour as distinct from the "labour" of animals, together with the specifics of other expressions of human activity as compared with animal activity. However considerable the gap between man and animals, it is not absolute.

But the natural-historical connection between man and the animal world, the connection between human labour and animal operations,

etc., does not give any ground at all for trying to find in the animal world even in embryonic form what Marxist political economy designates, for instance, as simple and complex labour, as abstract and concrete labour, as necessary and surplus labour, to try to find the beginnings of commodity production, exchange, exchange value, etc. Neither social science, nor the science of animal behaviour can seek such analogies in nature. According to the outstanding French ethologist, Rémy Chauvin, the basic task of ethology is to seek and study "the principal and characteristic line of activity" of definite species of animals, the line which is "pivotal for the whole behaviour, to study the behaviour of the organism as a function of that activity and the details in the context of the whole."¹⁹

Chauvin adds that human activity and the activity of any of man's most developed ancestors are quite different. "Through speech we have moved so far away from the animals that no comparison is possible in the intellectual sphere."²⁰ As for the emotional sphere, he says that here the comparison between man and animals is undoubtedly most important. He writes: "In terms of emotion, as in pathology, Man is far from being a Rat or a Monkey, but deprive the doctors of their animals and you will inexorably hurl their science back two centuries. It is in this sense that 'our minor brothers' can serve psychology as they have already served human biology."²¹

Animals used in experiments or under observation can advance man's biological or psychological knowledge (both his intellectual and his emotional side) but we do not think they can help advance our understanding of human ethics, unless ethics and behaviour (something we have dealt with above) and ethics and mental processes are equated. The natural foundation of mental activity is the subject-matter of the natural sciences on which psychology relies. But man's mental activity is of social origin, and psychology, which makes a study of the specifics of this activity, must necessarily rely also on the social sciences, especially the sciences formulating the general laws governing the historical development of society and the laws governing the development of definite social formations. When making a study of the mental processes shaped by social conditions, psychology does not substitute either for ethics or ethical theory. It does not deal with the origins of ethical norms, the moral criteria in the choice of acts, their moral assessments, etc. At the same time, psychology is of vast importance for ethics and a scientific analysis of morality, because no study of moral behaviour, moral choice, assessment, etc., can afford to ignore mental activity, its structure, the types and expressions of the human character, temperament, thinking activity, motivations, will, emotions, etc. A very common flaw in ethical writings is the confusion of man's mental and moral qualities, so that now and again you will find volitional qualities being regarded as moral, without any reference to moral purposes. We agree with the view that it would be useful to have a special branch of psychology, *the psychology of morality*.

Because individual morality falls within the sphere of individual mental activity, its natural premises, as we have said, do not

constitute anything different as compared with the natural premises of man's mental activity. But because man's mental activity is inseparable from the historical process which shapes it, we are justified in speaking of the natural premises of morality in the same sense as the premises of history in general. Marx and Engels believed that these initial premises of history lay in the bodily organisation of individuals, in their relationship with the rest of nature and also in the natural conditions to which the individuals of every new generation succeed and which they modify. The natural and subsequently ever more historical conditions created by men themselves are the *premises* of their further activity, with the new forms of social life and activity springing from earlier ones and replacing them. Thus, with respect to bourgeois society "the pre-bourgeois phases are *merely historical*, that is, already eliminated premises". Accordingly, the conditions of the bourgeois mode of production "appear as conditions which *eliminate themselves*, and for that reason as conditions of production which lay the *historical premises* for a new social system."²² The higher structure of society makes it possible to gain an insight into the structure and relations of production of all the forms of society which have gone and from whose elements and fragments it has been built. "What in the earlier forms of society was contained only as a hint, has been developed here [in bourgeois society — A. Sh.] to full significance, etc. The human anatomy is the key to the anatomy of the monkey, but the hints of a higher order among the lower species of animals can be understood only where that higher order is already known."²³

What Marx says about the premises of transition from one form of society to another and from one species of animals to another should not be taken to mean that the lower stage of development contains in embryo everything we find at the higher stage. Marxism does not share such preformist conceptions. When speaking about "hints of a higher order", Marx did not have in mind that everything that is of a higher order must have its "hints" among the lower orders of animals, especially in view of the fact that the "hints" can be discovered and understood only when the higher stage is there, and not the other way round. This means that the formula according to which "man has the same or nearly the same features that the animals have, but only in a more mature form" cannot be applied to man without important reservations.

We often hear it said that human nature is immutable, but in such instances we are never told what is meant by nature. If it is man's physical structure, the biological mechanism of his behaviour, the hereditary properties going all the way back to the formation of man, this statement is relatively true. According to the well-known Soviet anthropologist Y. Roginsky, "modern mankind does not reveal any trace of a morphological progress that could lead in the course of the millenia to the emergence of a new species as distinct from us as we are from *Sinanthropus* and *Palaeanthropus*."²⁴ The structure of the human body, the cortex and the mental peculiarities of men connected

with the activity of the brain do not differ in modern man from those of our most ancient representatives.

But what is specific about man is his social nature, his social relations. The principle that the "individual is a product of heredity and the environment" can no longer be applied to man without important additional commentaries because in contrast to the animal, man creates his own "environment" and gains experience which is much vaster than the animal's acquired habits of behaviour. The history of human society is not a history of human populations and genetic changes in these populations, but a history of its culture, its civilisation, which are unknown to the animal world.

Even primitive human society differs radically from any community of animals, because there human behaviour is already "governed by a culture transmitted from generation to generation in the form of language, knowledge, rules, systems of social grouping, beliefs and material objects. The members of such [primitive — A. Sh.] communities feel a sense of common identity based on a transmitted memory of the past; they are governed by a system of values and they have a power of conceptualising social relationships".²⁵

Marx agreed with Adam Smith who saw clearly that "the difference of natural talents in different men is, in reality, much less than we are aware of; and the very different genius which appears to distinguish men of different professions, when grown up to maturity, is not so much the *cause* as the *effect* of the *division* of labour."²⁶

Marx, Engels and Lenin showed that in human society even natural processes (for instance, the reproduction of men) "are *natural laws*, but these are the natural laws of man only at a definite stage of historical development with a definite development of the productive forces determined by man's historical process proper."²⁷ In other words, natural laws are taken in the context of historical development, that is, the development of production, social relations, etc. That is the basis, in particular, of the Marxist-Leninist critique of the Malthusian law of population, the law of diminishing returns, etc.

The biological approach to ethics frequently amounts to the claim that man "as he is" has definite natural requirements (in food, housing, people of the opposite sex, etc.), that he yearns for pleasure and avoids suffering, and that these are the requirements and urges in which one should seek the basic (natural) motivations for his behaviour. Indeed, morality has to be adapted to these requirements. We shall not analyse in detail such ethical theories. Their rational content consists in the conclusion that the satisfaction of material requirements is an essential condition for man's spiritual development, that preaching aimed at suppressing natural requirements (like the preaching of asceticism, the mortification of the flesh, etc.) is hostile to man and that nature has a tendency to "revenge itself" for such suppression. But "nature" cannot explain why and under which social conditions such ideas can be advocated. What is the meaning of the advocacy of asceticism in Christianity and at the initial stages of the working-class movement? Why is it that in some conditions men do not avoid suffering but deliberately accept sacrifice for a definite

goal and even set up a cult of suffering, arguing its ethical value, etc.? Human morality cannot, quite obviously, be based simply on the demands for the satisfaction of man's natural requirements, because these requirements themselves, being genetically connected with the animal world and differing with natural conditions, are a product of history in their proportions and mode of satisfaction. Apart from natural requirements, man develops, on the basis of his activity and his social relations, a rich world of social requirements, including moral requirements engendered by historical development.

Nature has not produced a single capitalist or worker, nor, accordingly, class mentality and ideology, moral rules and theories. All these are a product of history. Whenever reference is made to such "eternal sources of truth and morality" like the Old and the New Testament, their very different interpretations at various periods of history are forgotten. In the early stages, Christianity was the ideological banner of the deprived masses, and then the banner of Kings and Popes, Crusaders and Inquisitors, heretical sects and rebels, etc. It is impossible here to refer to man's everlasting nature even if only because (as the well-known turn-of-the-century Russian Marxist, Plekhanov, showed) immutable nature cannot explain the changing ideas, principles and rules and their diverse interpretation. The same applies to references to heredity in explaining social phenomena. Without the framework of the overall characteristics of the genetic basis of behaviour in the organic world it is possible to draw comparisons between man and animals, but these are unacceptable whenever the laws of organic evolution are extrapolated to social life, and vice versa. Consequently, it is wrong to reduce morality and ethics to conclusions from ethology, just as it is wrong to convert ethics into a part of ethology, and vice versa.

"All history," wrote Marx, "is nothing but a continuous transformation of human nature."²⁸ Throughout the history of class society, the shaping of man has been inevitably limited, and this limitation consisted "not only in the exclusion of one class from development, but also in the narrow-mindedness of the excluding class."²⁹ What was uppermost in Marx's mind here is capitalist society, in which man's physical and spiritual properties are reduced to utilitarian needs by capital, instead of being regarded as "something that is of a higher order per se, as legitimate per se."³⁰ He saw that the whole course of historical development was paving the way for transition to a communist-social system in which the development of man would be regarded as an end in itself, that is, precisely, as something of a higher order "per se". That is the principle the fighters for a new society seek to implement. This principle is not realised in the restricted form of bourgeois wealth, or in the subordination to it of all human relations, but in man's growing mastery of the forces of nature and the forces of his own nature, that is, the sphere of social relations. In contrast to all its earlier restricted forms, this wealth is "an absolute expression of man's creative endowments, without any other premises but preceding historical development, which makes this coherent development an end in itself."³¹

This coherence is, in fact, the fullest development of man's social nature, which is possible only in a society in which men's relations are most developed, and social inequality, competition and the *bellum omnium contra omnes* eliminated, that is, the very things that now and again give rise to definite associations with predatory behaviour in the animal world. Engels showed that with socialism is connected the final transition of society from "bestial" conditions to truly human conditions of existence. The moral aspect of man's coherent development is the development of human solidarity and cooperation, fraternal relations between men and nations, the fostering of every member of society in a spirit of joint struggle against the forces and traditions of the old society, and for mankind's better future and its cohesion in one fraternal family.

NOTES

- ¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1970, Vol. 3, p. 477.
- ² L. Krushinsky, "The Role of Elementary Reasoning Activity in the Evolution of Group Relations Among Animals", *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 11, 1973. See also B. Mednikov, *20th Century Darwinism*, Moscow, 1973 (in Russian). Similar views were expressed by participants in a symposium on biology and ethics, held in London in 1969 (*Biology and Ethics*, Ed. by F. J. Ebling. London-New York, 1969).
- ³ For details, see Y. Panov, "The Organisation and Evolution of Population Systems", *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 11, 1973.
- ⁴ F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 121.
- ⁵ H. Meynell, "Ethology and Ethics", *Philosophy*, London, 1970, Vol. XLV, No. 174, p. 291.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 297.
- ⁷ K. Lorenz, *Man Meets Dog*, Harmondsworth, 1971, pp. 182-183.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 67.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 68.
- ¹⁰ K. Lorenz, *On Aggression*, New York, 1967, pp. 215-216.
- ¹¹ R. Ardrey, *African Genesis*, New York, 1961, p. 315.
- ¹² E. Mayr, *Populations, Species, and Evolution*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1970, p. 43.
- ¹³ Ivor Montagu is quite right in pointing to the very different content of the conception of "aggression" in the ethological and political sense (I. Montagu, "Of Men and Not-Men", *Marxism Today*, 1968, Vol. 12, No. 4).
- ¹⁴ V. G. Dethier, E. Stellar, *Animal Behaviour*, New Jersey, 1970, pp. 97, 98.
- ¹⁵ K. Lorenz, *On Aggression*, p. 210.
- ¹⁶ Lorenz says that "our prehuman ancestor was indubitably as true a friend to his friend... as tender and solicitous to the young of his community and as self-sacrificing in its defence, aeons before he developed conceptual thought and became aware of the consequences of his actions" (see *On Aggression*, p. 238). He adds that the deepest strata of the human personality are the source of love and friendship, of all warmth of feeling, of appreciation of beauty, of the urge to artistic creativeness and the striving for scientific enlightenment. "These deepest strata of the human personality are, in their dynamics, not essentially different from the instincts of animals, but on their basis human culture has erected all the enormous superstructure of social norms and rites whose function is so closely analogous to that of phylogenetic ritualisation" (*ibid.*, p. 240). The suggestion is, therefore, that the whole of culture is based on animal instincts.
- ¹⁷ *Biology and Ethics*, Ed. by F. J. Ebling, London-New York, 1969, Introduction, p. XVI.

- ¹⁸ Behaviour in the biological sense is taken to mean a way of adaptation to different external conditions and to their change. Definite changes in the environment (for instance, in physical factors like light, temperature, humidity, etc., changes in the biological environment), and also in the internal medium of the organism cause various behavioural responses. The growing complexity in the nervous system in the course of evolution has led to ever greater change and complexity in behaviour, "from the simple, brief, stereotyped act to the highly intricate and highly variable long sequence of acts" (see C. Villee, V. Dethier, *Biological Principles and Processes*, 1971, and also V. G. Dethier, E. Stellar, *Animal Behaviour*, op. cit., p. 90).
- ¹⁹ R. Chauvin, *Psychophysiologie. II. Le Confortement animal*, Paris, 1969, p. 4.
- ²⁰ Ibid., p. 5.
- ²¹ Ibid., p. 6.
- ²² K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. 46, p. 449 (in Russian).
- ²³ Ibid., p. 42.
- ²⁴ Y. Roginsky, *Problems of Anthropogenesis*, Moscow, 1968, p. 184 (in Russian).
- ²⁵ A. I. Richards, "Characteristics of Ethical Systems in Primitive Human Society", *Biology and Ethics*, p. 24.
- ²⁶ K. Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Moscow, p. 144.
- ²⁷ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. 46, Part II, p. 104 (in Russian).
- ²⁸ K. Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, p. 165.
- ²⁹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, Moscow, 1964, p. 475.
- ³⁰ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. 46, Part I, p. 367 (in Russian).
- ³¹ Ibid., p. 476.

Developing Countries: New Researches

Scientific and Technological Progress and Social Orientation

GEORGY SKOROV

Since 1974 the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, in conjunction with the Mysl Publishers, has been producing a series of joint monographs entitled "The Economies and Policies of Developing Countries". We have already acquainted our readers with the first book in the series—*Developing Countries: Regularities, Trends and Prospects*—when we published a chapter from this work in our journal No. 4, 1975 and a review of the book in this issue. The current issue of our quarterly carries, in an abridged form, the concluding chapter of the second book of the series—*Developing Countries: Science, Technology and Economic Growth*.

The Editors

The specific nature of the scientific and technological revolution as a worldwide process consists in the fact that, in the main, its active development takes place in industrially developed socialist and capitalist countries, with all the differences inherent in these two opposing social systems. As for the developing countries it is introduced into them from outside. As a consequence of economic backwardness, a shortage of scientific, engineering and technical personnel and the underdeveloped nature of the scientific infrastructure and industrial base, these countries, with a few exceptions, are at present only consumers of technical innovations developed in other countries. Shifts in the scientific and technical base of the Third World take place mainly as a result of external rather than internal stimuli and represent a complex interweaving of two different processes—the industrial revolution, at least 150 to 200 years late in arriving in these countries, for which capitalism is to blame, and the

G. Skorov, D. Sc. (Econ.), Professor, Head of the scientific and technological progress sector of the Department of the Economies and Policies of the Developing Countries, Institute of the World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences. Author of the monographs: *French Imperialism in West Africa*; *Who Needs Euroafrica?*; *Integration of Education and Economic Planning in Tanzania and others*.

scientific and technological revolution. It is practically impossible to distinguish between these processes in developing countries.

For many of them the techniques and technology developed at the end of the last or the beginning of this century (the electric motor, conveyor, tractor, radio and chemical fertilisers) are fundamentally new productive forces (in comparison with those in current use), and their use means a true revolution in productive forces. There is no need to say that the use of computers, nuclear reactors, polymers, laser technology and satellite communications—all the innumerable innovations brought about by the scientific and technological revolution exert an ever greater influence on the former colonial periphery. At the moment, however, one can only talk of individual, isolated “break-throughs” of the scientific and technological revolution into the Third World.¹

TRENDS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

As the national scientific and technical potential of newly-free states grows and gains in strength, the situation will change. The geographical limits on the active development of the scientific and technological revolution will expand. The last decades of the 20th century might be a period during which the developing countries will intensively participate in world technological progress in particular forms reflecting the socio-economic conditions within these countries, real progress in their science and the impact of world scientific and technical achievements. Along with India, which, during the 1960s, was responsible for one out of every forty discoveries made in the world, by the end of the present decade and particularly in the 1980s, Mexico, Brazil, Egypt and a number of other Third World countries will probably be in a position to make an independent contribution to the development of science and technology.

In the coming years, scientific and technological progress in these countries will be the result of interaction between many diverse factors—economic and political, scientific and technical—which will either assist or hinder, accelerate or slow down its rate of development. These factors may be divided into two groups. The first includes internal conditions: the nature and extent of socio-economic transformations, the establishment of an economic mechanism ensuring constant renewal of the production base, the development of internal scientific and technical potential. The second group consists of external conditions: the competition and struggle between the two opposing social systems, expansion of comprehensive links between developing countries and the socialist community, a new balance of power between the Third World and the developed capitalist states and strengthening of economic and political ties between the developing countries themselves.

Current trends in the development of productive forces in the capitalist world permit the assumption that, in the near future, further shifts will take place in the distribution of world production. Highly science-intensive branches of industry, requiring modern technology and a qualified labour force, will become increasingly concentrated in the developed countries, while industries requiring large amounts of labour and materials, such as conveyor production, metallurgy and metal-working, the manufacture of large-size units and assemblies, the production and assembly of transistors and TV sets, the manufacture of the simplest electronic equipment, and also industries which pollute the environment, will evidently be transferred increasingly to the developing countries. The intensifying ecological and energy crises in the West will help this process along. A number of chemical enterprises requiring expensive purification plant are already “emigrating” from the developed capitalist states to developing countries, where pollution of the environment is not yet as significant and where, in the majority of cases, there is no corresponding nature-preservation legislation.

This transfer cannot but result in a certain increase in employment, industrialisation and inflow of new techniques and technology into developing countries. At the same time, however, it entails an increase in the amount of profit exported from these countries and a strengthening of their technical and financial-economic dependence on the main capitalist centres (to say nothing of the unfavourable ecological consequences).

In the coming quarter-century, the following qualitative changes will take place in the development of the productive forces of Third World countries: increasing use of mechanised instruments of labour and transition to machine production in the leading branches of the economy. At the same time, in a number of branches, such as agriculture, construction, handicraft production and partially in the services sphere, manual labour will be retained to a considerable extent. The coexistence in the economy of the most advanced and the most backward labour methods will naturally hinder any increase in the level of mechanisation on the scale of the whole economy in developing countries. As far as automation is concerned, it will evidently develop only in individual enterprises, the largest and most advanced, primarily those in the public sector or connected with foreign capital.

On the whole, the introduction of new techniques and technology will, as before, be held back by the enormous and ever increasing number of unemployed and semi-employed. However, at least two factors might be mentioned which operate in the opposite direction—the limited possibilities for using low-skilled labour in many branches of modern industry and the increase in the rate of accumulation which accompanies a rise in the organic composition of capital. For this reason (in spite of statements made by public figures in a number of developing countries on the necessity for restraining the rate of mechanisation or for its selective application) the technical

equipment of labour in developing countries will continue to grow under the direct influence of the needs of production.

The vulnerability of scientific and technological progress in developing countries is connected with the fact that its motive force remains outside the bounds of the Third World. This has two-fold consequences for the newly-independent states. To the extent that, in the coming years, technology, patents and licences will be imported from the capitalist world, a certain increase in the dependence of the developing countries on the main capitalist centres is inevitable. On the other hand, however efficient it may be to borrow foreign technical achievements, the results cannot be compared with those of self-generating technological progress, based on a domestic scientific and technical base.

With the ever increasing development of world science and technology, the technological rift between the advanced and the technically backward countries will become ever deeper. While developing countries are mastering technology which, for them, is new, the industrialised countries will forge ahead. The backward countries will remain backward as long as their scientific and technical base lags behind the level of technically advanced countries. In any case, the uneven nature of scientific and technological progress and the way it is located at isolated points will further increase the division of the Third World into separate groups of countries which became distinct at the turn of the 1970s.

In the coming years, scientific and technological progress in developing countries will apparently cover three different, though interconnected, processes:

1) the use of scientific and technical achievements which are already widespread or becoming widespread in industrially developed countries (for example, the construction of nuclear power stations, the use of computers, of radioactive isotopes in geology, biology, medicine and other branches of science);

2) the use of fundamentally new scientific discoveries which may be made in the near future in industrially developed countries towards solving the actual problems facing developing countries (for example, the problems of food supply, the fight against tropical diseases, effective family planning and so on);

3) the development and introduction of original technical innovations by the scientists of developing countries or in conjunction with scientists from developed states (for example, the creation of an "intermediate" technology which could raise labour productivity in small-scale production and ensure more efficient use of scattered resources).

The rate of scientific and technological progress in developing countries will depend primarily on the growth of their national scientific potential, but also to no small extent on the degree to which states which have a developed scientific research and production base show their willingness to devote their efforts to solving the problems specific to developing countries. For example, research carried out with the help of scientists from developed countries in the field of

plant genetics has shown that such help can prove extremely effective and significantly speed up the solution of a number of the economic problems of developing countries.

The participation of highly developed states in working out scientific and technical problems of direct interest to developing countries is closely connected with international détente and reduction in the arms race. Expenditure on armaments is an enormous reserve for increasing economic, scientific and technical aid to countries in need of it. This reserve includes arms industry capacity, raw and other materials and labour power. The transfer of even a part of this capacity and resources to peaceful development could produce a tremendous economic effect. According to certain estimates, the use of only 10 per cent of the world's annual military expenditure for capital investment in civil production would allow an increase of one-third in the accumulation fund of developing countries.² From this point of view, the recent suggestions made by the Soviet Union to cutback on the military budgets of the member countries of the UN Security Council by 10 per cent and to use part of the resources thus saved for aid to developing countries, as well as to forbid influence on the environment and climate to military and other ends incompatible with international security and the welfare and health of people, are directly related to the prospects of scientific and technological progress in the Third World. Each real step towards disarmament will bear tangible fruit for all mankind, including the peoples of developing countries.

The main trends of scientific and technological progress in developing countries in the remaining 25 years of this century will evidently correspond to those in the development of world science and technology. These include:

— the development of power engineering, primarily through the use of nuclear power and other "non-traditional" sources of energy—solar, wind, geothermal, tidal and others, which are acquiring increasing significance as a result of the current energy crisis;

— the discovery of new, highly productive food crops and breeds of cattle and fowl, and also the industrial production of protein;

— comprehensive use of the resources of the world's ocean, including the mining of minerals, artificial fish breeding and the development of economic methods of purifying sea-water;

— the prospecting for and exploitation of natural resources;

— the creation of a wide range of synthetic materials on the basis of the chemical industry;

— the development of soft and low-waste technology with a view to the multiple use of scarce and irreplaceable resources and reduction of environmental pollution;

— a further extension of the use of computers, laser technology and artificial multipurpose earth satellites (long-distance telecommunications, weather forecasting, the elimination of illiteracy, geological prospecting, etc.);

— the creation of fundamentally new and improvement of existing means of transport;

— the development of biology and medicine, which will provide reliable means of curing illnesses, improving man's living conditions and family planning.

Within the framework of these basic trends, research and development of individual scientific and technical problems will depend on national priorities, the conditions and resources within each country, and on efforts made on a national, regional and world scale. There is no doubt that technological progress includes tremendous potential opportunities for raising the economic and cultural level of developing countries, creating the material preconditions for them to "step over" a number of intermediate stages in the historical evolution of productive forces. However, the use of the enormous potential opportunities of technological progress requires specific socio-economic conditions.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SOCIAL ORIENTATION OF DEVELOPMENT

The obstacles which the scientific and technological revolution encounters in developed capitalist countries, which are engendered by their deep-rooted socio-economic contradictions, testify to the fact that, given the powerful modern production apparatus and numerous highly-skilled personnel, the capitalist system limits considerably the rational use, improvement and further development of productive forces. Lenin drew attention to this long before the current scientific and technological revolution when he noted that "capitalist technology is increasingly, day by day, *out-growing* the social conditions which condemn the working people to wage-slavery."³ This has become particularly noticeable in our time, with the socialisation of production in developed capitalist countries reaching a truly gigantic scale and the appropriation of the social product, in spite of all state-monopoly measures, remaining private.

In developing countries, numerous obstacles block the path of the scientific and technological revolution, obstacles which result from their subordinate and dependent position in the world capitalist economic system, from the immaturity of their national capitalism, from the aggravation of social relations by pre-capitalist forms of economy, and from overall economic backwardness. In contrast with developed, capitalist countries, where the main task is the search for new ways of adapting state-monopoly capitalist relations to the productive forces which already exist and are constantly gaining in complexity, the task which faces developing countries is the creation of modern productive forces, without which there can be no self-generating technological progress nor, consequently, scientific and technological revolution.

A fundamental question arises in this connection: can capitalism solve this problem? A scientific analysis of the real development of

newly-liberated countries permits an unqualified negative reply to this question.

The very nature of the problems which developing countries have to solve in overcoming their age-old backwardness and in creating new productive forces and production relations is such that a social system based on exploitation and the pursuit of profit cannot solve them successfully in the interests of the majority of the population. This is equally true as far as both the general problems of the development of a backward economy and the specific problems of the development of science and technology in the Third World are concerned.

The restructuring of social relations and their liberation from all survivals of the Middle Ages and above all from backward agrarian relations, is the most important condition for improving agriculture, for development of the domestic market and for solving the problem of accumulation. The national bourgeoisie, with its multiple connections with semi-feudal land ownership, with merchant and usury capital and other pre-capitalist structures, is unable to carry out radical agrarian reforms—to eliminate estate and latifundia land ownership and archaic use of the land. It confines itself everywhere to superficial changes in the system of rents and does not solve the land question in favour of the peasants. Without thorough agrarian reforms, however, there can be no technological progress either in agriculture, or in industry and other branches of the national economy.

Another measure without which the problem of scientific and technological progress cannot be satisfactorily solved is connected with radical social reconstruction. This is the establishment of effective control over the activities of foreign capital. The most general trend in the policies of developing countries in relation to foreign capital in the last two decades has been to limit its freedom of activity—the investment sphere, conditions for the establishment of joint companies, reinvestment and the transfer of profits abroad and so on. All the same, the overall sum of foreign capital investment in developing countries increased significantly in comparison with the period just before the Second World War. The amount of profit annually exported from these countries by foreign monopoly capital (in spite of a certain fall in the rate of profit due to the limiting measures taken by national governments) continues to increase. This means that young states, excluding those with a socialist orientation, in which the position of foreign capital is put under pressure and undermined, have not succeeded in stopping the outflow of accumulations caused by the activities of foreign monopolies.

The most important economic problem—to ensure a planned restructuring of the national economy (including overcoming its agrarian and raw material orientation and coordinated development of industry, agriculture, the infrastructure and the services sphere) cannot be solved by private enterprise. It requires centralised, overall state planning of the basic economic proportions, the systematic redistribution of the national income in favour of the working classes,

2

efficient mobilisation of domestic accumulations and their use in the interests of the whole of society, i. e., a complex of measures which are linked with restructuring the society on a socialist basis.

The problem of employment, or the productive use of labour power, as shown by the development of newly-liberated states, cannot be solved by a market economy and capitalist profitability. A contradiction exists between the use of the national accumulation fund for raising productivity of employed labour and increasing the overall numbers of employed, a contradiction which requires an optimal balance between intensive and extensive ways of producing the national income. This balance takes account of the acuteness of the problem of employment, of the short- and long-term interests of development, of the overall magnitude and structure of the accumulation fund and a number of other factors. Only a state which acts in the interests of the whole of society can carry out a programme of measures making it possible in the future to solve such a complex problem as that of the full employment of labour resources.

The solution of internal problems of development in newly-liberated countries is inseparably linked with the necessity of restructuring their foreign economic connections on an equal and mutually profitable basis. Such is the basis on which relations between the young states and the socialist community develop. However, the overwhelming majority of developing countries have not yet broken away from the world capitalist economy. A large proportion of their foreign economic links is with developed capitalist countries. This is why progressive changes within this system of economy have become the issue of the day. Such a task is beyond the capabilities of individual developing countries. It will inevitably require considerable time, a persistent struggle against international monopoly capital and the bloc of imperialist countries and an alliance of all the anti-imperialist forces of the world. It is obvious that the deeper and the more radical the anti-capitalist transformation of the domestic life of liberated countries, the more rapid will be the restructuring of the system of international capitalist division of labour, since this is also basically anti-capitalist in nature.

Thus, a capitalist path of development is incapable of solving in essence any of the key economic problems facing developing countries, either because of the weakness of national capitalism within these countries, its exploitative nature and incapacity to solve problems beyond the bounds of the market economy, or as a consequence of its links with pre-capitalist forms of economy and dependence on foreign monopoly capital. Some of these problems never faced capitalism in the West, while others have become much more complex under contemporary conditions. Besides, the very borderline of underdevelopment has, in the time of the scientific and technological revolution, been pushed significantly upwards, and to reach the average level of world development today requires means and resources which national capitalism is in no position to mobilise.

Neither is capitalism capable of solving the specific problems of the development of science and technology in the Third World.

THE CREATION OF A SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL POTENTIAL

The creation of a scientific and technical potential is an indispensable condition for efficient use of world science and technology and for their further progress within developing countries. This includes such practical problems as the training and rational use of scientific and technical personnel; the construction of a network of research institutes, laboratories, design offices and of a national system for scientific and technical information; the establishment of an industrial base for making use of the discoveries and results of research and development; the discovery of organisational forms combining the individual components of the national potential into a single system. The solution of all these complex problems is not only beyond the capabilities of individual private capitalists, but also actually contradicts the very nature of capitalism, which in the main seeks returns on investments and avoids activities which bear no direct profit. This is why private capital cannot solve such problems satisfactorily either within developed capitalist countries or, even less so, in developing countries and why, from the very start, their solution here becomes a matter for the state.

For the same reasons, private capital is also unable to solve such an important problem of national scientific and technical policy as the determination of top-priority research problems and fields. The criteria of pay-off and profitability which govern private capitalist companies is not suitable here, for at issue are problems of a national significance, connected with large-scale, long-term projects, with strengthening state sovereignty or, for example, reducing the death-rate of the population and improving health services and similar problems, in relation to which a purely economic approach is not acceptable. Private capital is organically incapable of raising itself to an understanding of national interests or making them the goal of its activities.

An interesting admission was made in this connection by the National Science Foundation of the USA. In the opinion of this organisation, "the trouble with purely private-enterprise research is that too many research and development efforts of American industry are aimed at low risk, small step, product and process improvement that offers the necessary assurance of pay-off in the short term".⁴ It is not fortuitous that, in recent years, under the influence of competition with socialism, the state in all capitalist countries has taken over development of the national scientific policy and determination of the key scientific fields, thus recognising the inadequacy of private capital to cope with these problems. However, such a solution, being one of the ways in which imperialism adapts to the current situation, is inevitably no more than a half measure. Lenin's words that "socialism alone will liberate science from its bourgeois fetters, from its enslavement to capital, from its slavery to the interests of dirty capitalist greed"⁵ could not sound more topical than they do today.

Private capital everywhere demonstrates its total incapacity in the financing of science and fundamental research. The indeterminate nature of the expected results of research and the long period necessary for recoupment of expenditure induce capitalist companies to transfer the burden of such costs onto the state. Only in applied research, where not only are the results more rapid, but it is also possible to protect oneself from competition with patents, do private capitalist companies, particularly in industrially developed countries, occupy a relatively strong position.

Of particular significance for the technical reconstruction of the economies of backward countries is the widest possible application of technical innovations throughout the national economy. The system of private enterprise acts as a brake on this process. The stimulus to the use of new techniques and technology under capitalism is additional profits over and above the average. This is why it is in the interests of a company making a technical innovation to remain its sole owner for as long as possible. It is typical that in India, for example, laboratories organised on a cooperative basis with state participation do not enjoy the support of private capitalist companies which fear for their production secrets, in spite of the undoubted advantages of this form of organisation from the point of view of the efficient use of limited national resources. The same opposition by the industrialists of developing countries gives rise to the idea of the state buying up foreign licences and distributing them among several companies simultaneously.

At the same time, the use of modern technology intended for the manufacture of commodities for a mass market, while the domestic markets of developing countries are still restricted, leads to rapid monopolisation of production. The first company to introduce highly productive equipment becomes practically a monopolist in the given sphere. It must not be called a monopoly in the commonly accepted sense of the word: neither according to the scale of capital, nor degree of maturity of capitalist relations is it similar to a monopoly in highly developed capitalist countries. Nevertheless, it occupies a monopoly position on the market and has certain features characteristic of any monopoly, in particular, a tendency towards technical stagnation. Such monopolisation cannot help but slow down technological progress in developing countries.

Of considerable significance for speeding up the development of scientific research and application of its results in the national economy are coordination of the scientific efforts of a number of neighbouring countries and the organisation of specialisation and cooperation in the production of new techniques and technology. However, under capitalism these processes develop extremely slowly and in a contradictory manner, and the intervention of foreign monopolies in the integration processes in the Third World only aggravates conflicts and friction between the members of regional and subregional groups.

Successful economic integration, opening up broad scope for productive forces, is only possible on the path of socialist develop-

ment. More than half a century ago, when Soviet Russia, backward in economic and technical terms, set out towards socialist construction on the basis of advanced technology, Lenin emphasised that the use of such technology necessitates close economic cooperation between neighbouring countries on the principles of socialism, not capitalism. He was deeply convinced that "modern advanced technology imperatively calls for the electrification of the whole country — and of a number of neighbouring countries — under a single plan; that this is quite feasible at the present time; that agriculture, and particularly the peasantry, stand to gain most from this; that as long as capitalism and private ownership of the means of production exist, the electrification of a whole country, or a series of countries, firstly, cannot be carried out speedily and according to plan, and secondly, cannot benefit the workers and peasants. Under capitalism, electrification will inevitably lead to increased oppression of the workers and peasants by the big banks".⁶

If we consider that by electrification Lenin meant the transfer of the whole national economy onto a new technical basis, i.e., exactly that which must be accomplished in the near future in developing countries, one can only be amazed at the topicality of his descriptions of the two alternative possible ways of technically reconstructing the economy — the capitalist and the socialist — and their social consequences for the working masses.

In 1913, Lenin wrote the following on the technical possibilities of West European capitalism and the limitations on these due to the capitalist organisation of society: "On all sides, at every step one comes across problems which man is quite capable of solving immediately, but capitalism is in the way.... It has solved the most complicated technical problems — and has blocked the application of technical improvements because of the poverty and ignorance of millions of the population, because of the stupid avarice of a handful of millionaires."⁷

In the decades since these words were written, world science and technology has made considerable advances. The number of practical problems which could be rapidly solved by them in the Third World has grown immeasurably. However, they are not solved for the same reason that was indicated by Lenin: "capitalism is in the way".

The incapacity of capitalism to solve the basic problems of economic development of newly-liberated countries, including questions of scientific and technological progress, results in organisational and economic forms, which contradict the nature of capitalism as a system of private enterprise, becoming widespread in almost all countries of the Third World. These forms, characterised by such general concepts as the state sector of the economy and the state structure as a form of economy, are everywhere coming to the forefront of social life in developing countries.

The universal nature of this phenomenon must not hide the fact that the social nature of the state sector of the economy and the production relations it represents are entirely different in different countries. The state sector covers a broad spectrum of relations,

beginning from state capitalism and ending with different transitional forms which might be defined as socialist-orientated or pre-socialist.

The decisive factor here is the social and political orientation of the state power. This is why the social nature of this sector, which plays the leading role in the economies of the majority of Third World countries, is of such exceptional significance for the future development of the national economy and the fate of scientific and technological progress.⁸ What is the nature of relations of the state sector with the capitalist economic structure within the country and international monopoly capital and how do they change? In whose interests does the state sector develop? Do national interests or those of the exploiting minority dominate within it? Which social relations does it establish?

The answers to these questions are directly related to the determination of the direction of scientific and technological progress. If the state sector reflects the interests of the exploiting classes and supports capitalist relations, then this type of development is, as a rule, accompanied by increased infiltration of foreign capital and growing dependence on imperialism in the sphere of science and technology. In countries with a socialist orientation, where the activities of foreign capital are kept under strict control, the use of modern technical achievements and the development of the national scientific and technical potential in the future result in the strengthening of the country's technical independence and its mutually profitable participation in the international exchange of technical innovations.

The lack of correspondence between the needs of creating qualitatively new productive forces resulting from the scientific and technological revolution and the limited possibilities of national capitalism (both private and state) creates favourable conditions for the penetration of international corporations into the economies of developing countries. At the turn of the 1970s, in the countries of Africa and Asia (though somewhat earlier in Latin America) a clear trend was established by which the subsidiaries of these "supernational" monopolies became a major force opposing the state in its progressive technical policy and a kind of support for dependent anti-national development in contemporary conditions.

International corporations try to prove that they are responsible for the development of productive forces and the transfer of new techniques and technology to developing countries. It is true that many industrial enterprises built by these corporations are fitted out with the most up-to-date equipment. However, these enterprises do not, as a rule, correspond to the primary tasks of the technical reconstruction of the economies of young states. New enterprises turn out largely either secondary consumer goods or, if capital goods, so-called semi-manufactures which do not represent final products for the world market without further processing or completion with articles produced by factories in other countries. At the same time, these enterprises draw off a considerable amount of national

resources — the most skilled personnel, electricity, transport, storage space — from uses corresponding to the national priorities.

All the basic questions concerning the activities of such enterprises which are, in essence, individual workshops of huge production combines spread out geographically in different countries, remain beyond the control of the national governments. Developing countries are thus drawn into a new type of capitalist international division of labour which deprives them of all production independence. These international corporations insure themselves against the risk of nationalisation, since this only makes sense when a complete production cycle exists within the country.

Thus, as a result of the activities of international corporations, the productive forces in individual developing countries develop, but do so, as previously, in a one-sided manner, at the cost of the retention of old and the strengthening of new economic disproportions, upsetting priorities of economic development and the sacrifice of the national interests of young states to the selfish interests of international financial groups. Instead of economic independence, new forms of dependence develop, the essence of which (i. e., the subordinate position of developing countries in the capitalist international division of labour) remains unchanged even though young states thus reach a higher level of economic development.

The main danger here is that international corporations, in seizing the key positions in the economies of national sovereign states, tie them to a course of development which precludes the possibility of winning economic independence even in the distant future.

The only real alternative to this is, in our opinion, a course of development which opens up a socialist future.

* * *

Only socialism as a social system corresponds to the objective trends in the contemporary development of new productive forces resulting from the scientific and technological revolution. At the same time, it is only on the basis of this revolution that new productive forces adequate to socialism can be created. The dialectical link between these two processes operates particularly strongly today in the Third World. Here, the incapacity of capitalism to make use of the opportunities presented by modern science and technology for solving the key problems of development, for speeding up economic growth and radically improving the living conditions of the population yet again demonstrates capitalism's lack of historical prospects and its impending doom.

This certainly does not mean that the social conditions necessary for the upswing of productive forces and the development of the scientific and technological revolution in the Third World can arise spontaneously. Historical regularities are always realised by the political activities of the people. The lack of correspondence between the needs of the development of the productive forces of the former

colonial periphery and the social conditions obtaining in this part of the world can only be eradicated by a consistent revolutionary struggle by all progressive forces against imperialism, neocolonialism and internal reaction and by thorough progressive social transformations in preparation for the transition to socialism. The last few decades have shown that this transition can be accomplished either under the direct leadership of the working class and its political vanguard — the Communist party, or under the leadership of a bloc of revolutionary forces, headed by revolutionary democracy, which directs the advance along a non-capitalist path, opening up the prospect of a socialist future.⁹

In the first case, the time necessary for the transition to socialism might be considerably shortened, the rate of development significantly speeded up and the social transformations made directly socialist in nature. In the second case, the transition period is significantly drawn out and transformations have a clearly general democratic content and only gradually take a socialist turn.

The decisive influence of the socialist system on the development of the whole world, the progress in international détente, the steady growth of the economic might of socialist countries and their ability to render comprehensive assistance and support to the economic and scientific and technical development of the newly-liberated countries are the most important factors in the successful struggle of the working class, peasantry and all democratic forces of these countries for the transformation of society along socialist lines. The growing unity of all revolutionary forces in the world today is an earnest of success in this just struggle.

NOTES

- ¹ For more detail on this see "Science, Technology and Development of the Third World", *Social Sciences*, No. 1. (15), 1974.
- ² *The Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and Military Expenditure*, UN, New York, 1972, p. 43 (in Russian).
- ³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 19, p. 62.
- ⁴ *Foreign Affairs*, April 1973, p. 570.
- ⁵ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 411.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. 33, p. 137.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol: 19, p. 389.
- ⁸ For more detail see V. Levkovsky, "The State Sector: Its Social Content and Development", *Social Sciences*, No. 2 (16), 1974.
- ⁹ See, in particular, R. Ulyanovsky, "The Leninist Concept of Non-Capitalist Development and Our Time", *Social Sciences*, No. 2 (4), 1971; also *Socialism and the Developing Countries*, Moscow, 1974.

CRITICAL STUDIES AND COMMENT

Bourgeois Sociology and the Problem of a Social Ideal

IVAN ANTONOVICH

The establishment of a perfect social system has long been one of the focal problems confronting mankind. However, in the conditions of capitalism, the ideal of a perfect social system cannot but run contrary to the bourgeois individualistic ideology, and the interests of private ownership. The acuteness of that fundamental contradiction is borne out by the entire history of social thought under capitalism, the clashes between various social groups, classes, and mass movements. The mounting crisis of capitalism is ever more insistently leading bourgeois ideologists to seek for a solution of the problem and to try to blend what cannot be brought together, that with the aim of establishing an acceptable theoretical construction to be contraposed to the ideals today embodied in the socialist countries, and of helping preserve the capitalist system.

Examples of such attempts are provided by the numerous futurological concepts so much in vogue today in the West.

Futurological social forecasting is, in the main, directed towards the problem of reconciling internally contradictory individualistic aspirations with the "communal" aims of the political machinery; all this in a situation under which the ever greater centralisation of control over social processes under capitalism is not only activating all forms of social control but is stripping the individual of even a semblance of participation in decision-making, since the existing institutions of bourgeois democracy are turning into appendages of the centralised managerial system of the big corporations and of the privately owned process of production in the broader sense of the term.

I. Antonovich, D. Sc. (Philos.), Professor of the Chair of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy of the Humanities Faculty, Byelorussian Lenin State University.

Bourgeois scholars are giving preference to short-range forecasting of specific social processes. Although the subjects of many futurological forecasts are worded in general terms, e. g., the "prospects for peace", "the roads of cooperation", "the way out of the impasse", and the like, they incorporate the results of particular researches, such as the prospects for the development of the labour force, higher labour productivity, the development of the educational system and so on. "It is evident," writes O. Flechtheim, "that in this sphere of short-term forecasting the topics tend to become more numerous and more specific. In contrast to the more abstract and general speculations marking middle- and long-range developments, the immediate future in its concreteness and its nearness easily appeals to the public."¹

The concrete and specific nature of this forecast is of a special kind: irrespective of its aims and limits, the question of the system of social relations is not brought up for discussion; forecasting refers only to quantitative factors and to the organisational forms of their evolution. Such qualitative factors as the alignment of social forces in the process of production, and the correspondence of production relations to the level of the productive forces do not as a rule come up for analysis.

In general, bourgeois sociologists are more and more coming to see the task of futurology, not in helping mankind shape its future but in predicting what awaits it in a future that is being fashioned quite apart from its volition. In this sense, the social role of bourgeois futurology is a passive one: it does not indicate how the historical process should be purposefully guided, but merely attempts to determine what that process will look like in the short or the long run. It does not provide any outline of an ideal society, but merely describes the appearance of what will, in one way or another, appear in the future, irrespective of man's volition. Again to quote from O. Flechtheim: "Supposing then that it is beyond the power of Futurology to shape the future nearer to our heart's desire, we must proceed on the assumption that it will have to restrict itself to telling us what is in store for us. In so doing, it will base its forecasts among other things upon our fears and hopes, our omissions and actions. Still, if it were to show that our civilisation was doomed, if it were to demonstrate that a new global war was inevitable, if it were to establish that a rejected ideology had the best chance of success, we would have no way of preventing these developments."²

However, there are no grounds to reject futurological forecasting, bourgeois sociologists think. Any increase in our knowledge of the world—whether in its present condition or in the future—is an essential condition of normal human activities. "But even if Futurology were to confirm the gloomiest expectations of the pessimist," O. Flechtheim goes on to say, "it could at least, like meteorology, serve the personal welfare of some favoured individuals. As the weather forecast helps people to protect themselves against storms and floods, so futurological predictions might enable some to escape the social tempests, cultural deluges, and historical catas-

trophes. And if this lucky minority were to preserve not only their lives, but also some of the best social achievements and cultural values of the past, Futurology would have rendered some service to the future."³

What marks any look into the future is man's crossing of the frontiers of the unknown and rising to a new level—that of prudence and purposefulness, says the American scholar Fred L. Polak. That is the basis of the man of action, one who is guided by the needs of the moment, turning into a man of thought, with an awareness of the consequences of his actions and of future events. According to Polak, man's study of his life and activities revolves, one way or another, about the future, but in the sense, not of defining an integral ideal of society but of foretelling the prospects of individual social process.⁴

In the opinion of bourgeois sociologists, the need to gain a knowledge of the probable future is in no way dictated by the concrete socio-historical needs of society. They do not wish to understand that knowledge of the future should be gained with the purpose of perfecting social practice in the creation of the present, and of advancing towards a better and historically more perfect way of life. Of course, they are far removed from the historically obvious fact that state-monopoly capitalism is the final stage in the development of capitalism, which cannot but yield place to socialism. "...State-monopoly capitalism," wrote Lenin, in dealing with the historical fate of imperialism, "is a complete *material* preparation for socialism, the *threshold* of socialism, a rung on the ladder of history, between which and the rung called socialism there are no intermediate rungs."⁵ This absence of intermediate degrees between monopoly capitalism and socialism is why bourgeois futurologists are incapable of forecasting the future in terms of concrete social systems.

Nevertheless, the exacerbation of the futurological neurosis (it is hard to give any other name to this widespread vogue, which raged with particular force in the late sixties and early seventies) objectively stems from capitalism's approaching an impasse, this naturally being accompanied by vastly growing efforts on the part of bourgeois ideologists to find some way out. Futurology is the window through which such researchers would wish to discern the prospects, close or more distant, for social development. However, the view they get is a joyless one, for, as Lenin wrote, "...socialism is now gazing at us from all the windows of modern capitalism; socialism is outlined directly, *practically*, by every important measure that constitutes a forward step on the basis of this modern capitalism."⁶

That is one of the reasons why a positive social ideal is being rejected. The ever more clearly discernible objective determinism of social processes which is impelling development in a direction opposite to capitalism is frightening the non-Marxist futurologists, who are interested, not in objective scientific forecasting but only in a kind of forecasting that will help the future strengthening of capitalism. Hence bourgeois sociology's urge to enter non-social spheres, its exaggerated attention to forecasting the development of productive forces, not of production relations, and the search after

futurological models considered capable of solving social problems with the aid of non-social factors.

Of course, it cannot be said that all futurological forecasting by bourgeois sociologists has no significance at all to society as a whole. However, the non-social factors are predominant in such forecasting, which concentrates on technology in its self-contained role, the economic potential and the like; wherever mention is made of social factors, these are presented in the abstract, and bear upon society "in general", which allegedly consists of just as abstract anthropological one-dimensional human individuals.

It is an historical fact that capitalism is incapable of advancing positive aims of the social movements, in the same degree in which it is incapable of solving the social problems it has engendered. "On all sides, at every step," Lenin wrote, "one comes across problems which man is quite capable of solving immediately, but capitalism is in the way. It has amassed enormous wealth—and has made men the slaves of this wealth. It has solved the most complicated technical problems—and has blocked the application of technical improvements because of the poverty and ignorance of millions of the population, because of the stupid avarice of a handful of millionaires."⁷ That is why any positive analysis that is directed towards a determination of society's future is objectively obliged to establish the historical inevitability of capitalism yielding place to socialism.

It goes without saying that the class stand taken by bourgeois sociologists precludes the possibility of such a platform. That is why they limit themselves to predicting the quantitative evolution of individual social processes, and eschew any attempt to evolve an ideal for the society of the future.

LA BELLE ÉPOQUE AS THE EQUIVALENT OF A SOCIAL IDEAL

Led by Herman Kahn, researchers at the Hudson Institute in the USA are prominent in the area of forecasting by bourgeois sociology. Their yardstick in forecasting is *la belle époque*, that ideal condition of Western society alleged to have been peculiar to it in the past, and capable of reappearing in the future.

This play is marked by a rejection of gloomy apocalyptic predictions, which are replaced by a cautious optimism: thinking by analogy, it is asserted, prompts the conclusion that since *la belle époque* was inherent in capitalism in the past, it can return, given certain conditions.

According to the Hudson theorists, capitalism has seen two such epochs. The first was the period between the onset of our century and the First World War, a time of relative peace, rapid economic growth, the development of world trade, communications and the free movements of commodities and capital, and tolerance of business activities.

It will easily be seen that the choice of this *belle époque* as a criterion of futurological projections reveals the researchers' class

orientation. With reference to this period, one should recall Lenin's words that the turn of the century was an historical moment when "capitalism has been transformed into imperialism".⁸ This was expressed first and foremost in the high level of the concentration of production, which brought it to the monopoly stage. The distinctions between capitalist countries were minor ones of the forms assumed by the monopolies, or the time of their appearance. That is why the authors of the *belle époque* concept, Herman Kahn and B. Bruce-Briggs, have advanced as its characteristic feature the ideas of a "single community" and a "single world".

With the establishment of the monopolies' predominance, there begins, as Lenin pointed out, "...immense progress in the socialisation of production",⁹ all this accompanied by the growing supremacy of the monopolies, which spread to take in the political and the social areas, and are becoming masters of the entire capitalist social process. It is not fortuitous that Kahn and Bruce-Briggs have taken that *belle époque* as a criterion, for in following years the rule of the monopoly bourgeoisie became less unclouded. The concentration of the means of production in the hands of an ever narrower group led to the appearance of inner-class contradictions in the bourgeoisie, aggravated the oppression of the masses, sharpened social antagonisms, and ultimately laid the ground for the approaching crisis. The onset of the epoch of imperialism was the most promising in all its history, which is why, in the opinion of the Hudson experts, it should be repeated in the future.

The second *belle époque* was the period between 1953 and 1965, when imperialism still possessed colonial empires, though on a far reduced scale, and the USA held the capitalist countries of Europe in a tight financial and political grip.

In their futurological forecasts for the seventies and eighties, the Hudson theorists think that, thanks to their use of a surprise-free projection the third *belle époque* will begin in the mid-eighties. They do not venture to specify how long it will last, but think it should hold until the end of the century. Hopes for the arrival of that epoch are linked only with economic growth.

Kahn and Bruce-Briggs have calculated that in 1985 the world gross product will exceed \$6,000,000 million, as against \$3,500,000 million in 1970. The overall economic growth will outpace the population rise, while the annual per capita income in 1985 will average \$1,200, a 75 per cent increase as against 1970. However, the authors' calculations and expectations are associated with an absence of any radical social changes in the period under discussion.

Kahn and Bruce-Briggs consider that the industrialised half of the world will be creator and consumer in the *belle époque* they await. Thereby they have excluded from participation in that *belle époque* the entire population of the developing countries. Although economic development is expected to improve the conditions of the masses in the developing countries, no radical change will take place: the world will continue to be divided into two camps: developed and the developing, rich and poor countries. The developed countries will be

marked by a high level of industrialisation, with a typical and gradual "convergence" in their way of life.

Although the national state will remain the basic institution of political power, it will be unable, Kahn and Bruce-Briggs think, to oppose the sense of a "world community" which will be the main factor in bringing the peoples of the industrially advanced countries closer together. "The residents of this half of the world," they write, "will have remarkably similar urban bourgeois life styles, will enjoy the same or similar consumer goods and recreation, and will see, hear, and read much the same material in their media... In short, a large part of the population of the industrial (and post-industrial) societies will see themselves participating in world society, much as did the haute bourgeoisie of Europe and North America in La Belle Époque preceding the First World War."¹⁰

As we see, the Hudson theorists do not examine any aspect of social life, basing all their projections only on a quantitative increase in the gross product. They say nothing of the fact that, in the conditions of capitalist social relations, consumption takes place on a basis of inequality, which is determined by the social nature of production and the private-ownership nature of distribution.

That means that economic growth, with the social institutions of bourgeois rule remaining unchanged, can lead only to minor improvements in the workers' economic conditions, in just the degree necessary for the system of production to function smoothly. The lion's share of social wealth will continue to find its way into the safes of a handful of possessors of controlling interests in industrial and financial corporations.

What strikes the eye in this projection is the striving to preserve the *status quo*, which means, first and foremost, the preservation of capitalist relations of production. The latter are also seen by those theorists as a centripetal force which will attract other socio-economic systems as well, and fashion them in its own image. It is quite clear that when they speak of the *belle époque* of the mid-eighties and the uniformity of the way of life in all the developed countries, Kahn and Bruce-Briggs express the hope that the socialist countries they have numbered among the developed states will live according to the standards of capitalist social relations.

However, their striving towards verisimilitude prevents them from expressing themselves so frankly or from juggling with such terms as a "single industrial society", whose class meaning is clear enough. As they see it, the convergence of socio-economic systems will follow not the road of merging in a single industrial model but rather that of urbanisation which, they claim, holds out the prospect of a single "urban" way of life. In the third *belle époque*, life in the developed countries will become standardised with the approach to a "global metropolis"—a type of big city which will subordinate to itself the living processes of any national state to such a degree that it will gradually turn into a nation-wide conurbation.

The *belle époque* forecast the Hudson theorists came out with in the early seventies bears a resemblance, on the whole, to their

previous work. However, this time they prefer to extrapolate, not so much actual trends as the needs and hopes of the bourgeoisie, to which they have imparted the force of normative values of orientation, and development purposes. The accent is on forecasting rates of economic, scientific and technological development, and political prospects. The social aspects do not figure in futurological forecasting although economic development trends are drawn up in such a way that it is easy to surmise the lines they will follow: social aims boil down to the preservation of capitalist social relations and their conversion into a fundamental model.

This rejection of social forecasting is one of the most vulnerable features of futurological research, not only of the Hudson theorists but also of the authors of many other short-term forecasts. Objectively, its causes stem from the trends of social progress and its motive forces simply failing to coincide with arbitrary schemes designed to direct world development towards a renaissance of the bourgeoisie's golden age, when the capitalist system held sway throughout the world.

THE "IDEAL OF MAN" AND A "MORAL SOCIETY"

The concept of a third *belle époque* cannot of course be called a social ideal. With the exception of individual economic calculations, it contains no social characteristics, follows up no trends in the development of social structures, and presumes no roads or means of achieving social equality and freedom. What is most important, it lacks the integrity of a complete model which might be contraposed to the optimistic ideals of communism.

That is why individual bourgeois sociologists continue to seek for such a model, but in doing so, they, like the Hudson scientists, eschew the social area. When, in his time, Oswald Spengler spoke of the decline of Europe, he did not address himself to humanist liberals, utopians, pacifists or "improvers of the world", in his search of recipes for the elimination of crises. "Man is a predator" he would repeat, with reference to the bourgeois and the capitalist proprietor; in this he was undoubtedly right in some measure.¹¹

But since the bourgeois—"the predator"—is incapable of accepting any other society except one in which he is at the top, the task of establishing an ideal society has been shouldered by liberals, pacifists and representatives of the bourgeois intelligentsia, with their fear of the future and their misgivings of capitalism's tomorrow. Such people are working in two directions: they are out to create an ideal of man and an ideal of society. The ideals themselves are restricted ones, for it is declared, the task consists in a search not for the best model of man and society, but for a model that is "least unacceptable"; the aims are seen not in the dynamics of progress but in a process of evolution in which negative phenomena are fewer in number than the positive ones, while hopes boil down to the creation of a variant that will make it possible to survive and maintain continuity. The

transference of the past into the future and the preservation, in the new, of the greatest number of elements of the old — such are the unvarnished aims of the creation of a liberal-bourgeois social ideal.

The theorists of the liberal bourgeoisie regard seekings after the meaning of life as the basis in the creation of an ideal of man, with the philosophers of religion standing in the forefront of such seekings. "There is no gainsaying that the question of the meaning of individual's life cannot today be regarded dogmatically in a manner peculiar to catechism," writes the West German philosopher of religion Rupert Lay, "but that does not mean that he cannot become an object of philosophical or theological discussion. Besides, that question of the meaning of life cannot today be considered in isolation from an entire complex of other questions which reflect the semantic structure of the world and mankind."¹²

The question of the meaning of human life is examined by non-Marxist thinkers in the manner of abstract logical speculation. Such people claim that an understanding of the meaning of life is achieved when the individual realises that it should be sought within limits that are broader than rigid judgements hemmed in by a framework of truth or falseness. "When we pose the question of meaning," Rupert Lay writes, "we should understand that though the answer may be subjected to scientific analysis, it is not in itself scientific."¹³

From this, however, bourgeois sociologists draw a conclusion that contradicts this thesis, namely, that it is human life that is subject to scientific definition, since its meaning can be reduced to the meaning of history, while the latter can be reduced to a realisation of day-to-day human affairs and actions. Since they are the outcome of concrete motivation, they also possess concrete meaning. To avoid contradiction, such researchers assert that the scientific in this sense is practically equal to man's exact appraisal of the purposefulness of daily life, thanks to his having been provided *a priori* with the idea of the meaning of life. In the absence of that idea, his daily affairs would lose all significance and interest to man.

It follows that man aspires towards a search after the meaning of life through the very fact of his existence. That striving, the bourgeois sociologists assert, is expressed as a hope of finding one's particular place, one's significance and one's meaning, such hope being the prime mover of any active man. Thus, hope as an incentive of historically comprehended advance is equated with the meaning of life. The purposeful direction of hope towards practical action is the greater dynamism communicated by meaningfulness to the individual's human condition. "The meaning of the individual's life," Rupert Lay writes, "consists in his cognition of the concrete historical situation, of his own destiny and his own boundaries, all this enabling him to cognise the absolute aim of hope and to act accordingly so as to change the world (social life and social consciousness in the first place) for himself and for others."¹⁴

This abstract wording of the meaning of life as activity contains neither elements of an ideal nor any humanist content, since absent

in it is any indication of the nature of that activity, any definition of the "absolute purpose of hope" or the means of its achievement. Religious philosophers who have come out in support of this concept of the meaning of life avoid giving any definition of the ideal of purposeful human existence in terms of religious belief. That was done in the past, but life did not bear out religion's promises of an earthly paradise. That is why they prefer to use secular terms and assert that happiness is the meaning of life.

As is common knowledge, the bourgeoisie are out to halt historical progress, keep the present structure of capitalism in its present condition, and preserve it as it is as long as possible.

Its flexibility in respect of the present and the future is limited to that structure, although it has in considerable measure modified its stand as compared with previous historical periods, and is also revealing a definite readiness for compromise.

The specific feature of the current moment in social progress consists in that the revolutionary transformation of the world according to the objective demands of the laws of history is not a theoretical imperative but a task that can be accomplished in practice, a dynamic process of world-wide scale and tremendous force. That task was first formulated by Karl Marx whose theory, as Lenin wrote, "...made clear the real task of the revolutionary socialist party: not to draw up plans for refashioning society, not to preach to the capitalists and their hangers-on about improving the lot of the workers, not to hatch conspiracies, but to *organise the class struggle of the proletariat and to lead this struggle, the ultimate aim of which is the conquest of political power by the proletariat and the organisation of a socialist society.*"¹⁵

The blending of revolutionary theory and the class practice of the proletariat has determined the advance of historical progress towards socialism, a process of transformation which has involved the whole world and is irreversible. The obviousness of that situation has amazed the imagination also of certain bourgeois philosophers of history. They no longer give thought to bringing to a complete halt the movement of world developments towards the socialist ideal, but merely hope that they will be able to localise that development and to gain for themselves some place in the revolutionary world.

In the opinion of the theorists of the liberal bourgeoisie, the ultimate aim of the advance towards the ideal of man should consist in the "humanisation of progress", which many of them see as man's naively utopian return to Nature. "Humanising progress," writes René Huyghe, "means returning our decisive concepts to contact with Nature. Now that is something we have lost. For five thousand years or more civilisation has been agrarian; it has remained that right down to our days. That is to say, man has lived in a collaboration with Nature, and therefore in harmony with it. He has accepted things just as they have been in fact and has tried to improve them when he came across grass, he turned it into corn; when he came across an aglantine, he produced a rose from it."¹⁶

The naively romantic idealism contained in this call is a contradictory one. In the first place, man in his interaction with Nature has been guided by his interests at all stages of his activities, and this interaction has been an active one. In the process of that interaction, man's world has appeared as a world of culture, which is nothing else but a world of the conquest of Nature. In this process, the initiative has always belonged to man. "The animal merely *uses* his environment, and brings about changes in it simply by his presence; man by his changes makes it serve his ends, *masters* it."¹⁷

All the portraits of the ideal of man as produced by bourgeois sociology are contradictory, which precludes their being embodied in concrete social reality. In his summing up of the numerous abstract schemes in the shape of a more or less complete figure, the US bourgeois humanist Anthony Hartley has set forth his idea in the following words: "The problem of describing an ideal type of man adapted to the late 20th century is, therefore, one of finding for him a relationship to modern industrial society which neither isolates him from it nor submerges him in it. The element of individual freedom and aristocratic detachment which he requires to be exemplary must be preserved; but so must a real connection with the world around him. No doubt, he should be in that world but not of it. He should take part in its activities, but refuse to accept its values."¹⁸

However, the two abstractions contraposed to each other, namely, man and the world, are unequal and non-equivalent if only because the bourgeois humanists are themselves aware of them with different degrees of distinctness. Thus, since man, in his ideal condition, is defined by them as the completeness of a self-contained and self-determinative essence which merely draws upon the world for his resources but does not blend with it, they do not present a full picture of the ideal world. They are not even agreed on whether that macro-ideal should be called a "world", "society" or anything else. Though they do speak of an ideal of society, they often measure it with the yardstick of their representation of the ideal of man, whose future social condition they express merely through the state of his consciousness.

Thus, to the US sociologist Charles Reich, the ideal society is "Consciousness III", a new view of the world which is already emerging on a social foundation which the author characterises as the rock bottom of the American corporative state. He alleges that it is represented by a "new" generation which is distinct from "old", which has created the contemporary world of technology and financial corporations, by the very fact of its being obliged to live in that world.

For E. Fromm, the social ideal is a "sane society", one marked by a capacity for love and creation, a sense of fellowship, the ability to soberly appraise inner and outer reality, and to develop objectivity and reason. As practical steps towards the achievement of that ideal, Fromm recommends precise information about society and social life, presented in a manner within the understanding of all citizens;

participation in management, the inculcation of a sense of common purpose, and similar things.¹⁹

Of other ideals of society, we could name J. García's "moral society", Ph. Gérard's "federal world", and a number of similar concepts current in Western sociology in the seventies. These ideal types, however, do not lend themselves to sociological analysis, since they lack the social element, an assessment of the possibilities for the evolution of capitalism's structure, social relations and so on. Bourgeois sociologists, who refrain from encumbering present-day capitalism with any sociological criteria of the ideal, do not recognise the possibility of social creativity along the road towards the ideal in other social systems either. Their ideal society is nothing more than a moral imperative, a romantically utopian abstraction, one that is suitable for arguments on general humanistic themes but not for any kind of purposeful historical practice.

The substitution of moral and ethical imperatives for social reality has long been failing of the idealist philosophers, who for centuries have been hoping to cure the ulcers of an exploiter society with the aid of pious wishes and "noble" intentions they have tried to inculcate on the masses — that very object of exploitation. However, they have not ventured to propose this "humane" measure to those in power, the owners of society's wealth and masters of the process of production, to those who have been the subject of exploitation — the ruling class. The bourgeois sociologists of today are no exception. Just as before, they do not make so bold as to call the capitalist class the main generator and subject of social evil.

Many of them, however, have come to recognise the narrowness of moral voluntarism; they are becoming aware of what Lenin said as far back as the early years of our century: "Our 'subjective preferences do not determine the changes in historical periods'"²⁰ If bourgeois sociologists continue to appeal to moral perfection as the main instrument in achieving the social ideal, it is not because they have faith in its effectiveness but because they can offer no other means, for they are hemmed in by the framework of bourgeois reality and the bourgeois world outlook.

* * *

In the 20th century, the logic of the historical process brought about a radical turning point in mankind's development from its pre-history to a genuine history of ever greater and progressive development. That turning point was the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia, which was the point of departure for the development of the communist social system, that acme of human civilisation. The struggle between the new, communist social system with capitalism, which is on the way out, has become the basic content of our times.

As a new socio-economic system on the ascendant, communism has firmly assumed the historical initiative, which capitalism has lost

for all time. That is why capitalism is all the time going over to the defensive, its ideologists bending every effort to create apologetic concepts that run counter to the fundamental laws of social progress and are incompatible with historical reality.

The task of establishing a positive social ideal has been taken up by Marxism-Leninism as the scientific theory of the new social system. Guided by it, the peoples of the socialist countries are successfully giving reality to the ideals that doctrine has substantiated.

NOTES

- ¹ O. Flechtheim, "Futurology: the New Science of Probability", York, 1972, p. 273.
- ² Ibid., p. 275.
- ³ Ibid., pp. 275-276.
- ⁴ See F. L. Polak, "Crossing the Frontiers of the Unknown", *The Futurist*, New York, 1972, p. 286.
- ⁵ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 25, p. 359.
- ⁶ Ibidem.
- ⁷ Ibid., Vol. 19, p. 389.
- ⁸ Ibid., Vol. 22, p. 202.
- ⁹ Ibidem.
- ¹⁰ H. Kahn, B. Bruce-Briggs, *Things to Come. Thinking about the 70s and 80s*. New York, 1972, p. 44.
- ¹¹ See Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West*, New York, 1959, pp. 159-193.
- ¹² Rupert Lay, *Zukunft ohne Religion*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1970, p. 165.
- ¹³ Ibid., p. 169.
- ¹⁴ Ibid., p. 174.
- ¹⁵ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 210-211.
- ¹⁶ René Huyghe, "L'homme et son destin", *La nouvelle revue des deux mondes*, Paris, April 1973, p. 6.
- ¹⁷ Frederick Engels, *The Dialectics of Nature*, Moscow, 1964, p. 182.
- ¹⁸ Anthony Hartley, "Neither Bureaucrat nor Hippie. On the Ideal of Man in a Mass Society", *Encounter*, March 1973, p. 8.
- ¹⁹ See E. Fromm, *The Sane Society*, New York, 1955, pp. 69-71.
- ²⁰ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 253.

VIEWS AND OPINIONS

Overwhelming Joy of Knowledge

VASILY SUKHOMLINSKY

The remarkable Soviet teacher, Vasily Sukhomlinsky, entitled one of his works as follows: "I Give My Heart to the Children". These words are borne out by his whole life, for he devoted 33 of his 52 years to teaching in the village of Pavlysh, Kirovograd Region. It was there that he was awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labour and elected to the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences as a corresponding member. With the passage of time, the pedagogical and theoretical legacy of this rural headmaster is attracting the attention of ever wider circles of readers in the USSR and abroad. Here is an article from his archives.

If you want a first-year pupil to learn anything in the classroom, to prevent learning from being a burden on him, and to make it easier and not harder for him to learn as he gains new knowledge, you must see to it that the child becomes a thinker and a researcher. You must see to it that learning is not closed in on itself within the walls of the classroom, for otherwise it ceases to be mental education and becomes a mechanical transfer of facts and truths from the teacher's head to the heads of the children. Metaphorically speaking, alongside the classroom there must be a field of intelligent work inspired with thought. This field may be very small, and there is no need to have large tracts of land. Indeed, it could very well be confined to a small box filled with soil. The most important thing is that the child should simultaneously see, observe and do. Wherever all these three are present, there is also vibrant thought developing brain.

Meanwhile, there are some schools (and they are not few in number) where the only purpose of teaching is to have children assimilate, that is, remember, and be prepared to recite, some set of facts. It is this kind of narrowing down of the aims of education that goes to create the difficulties which result in overstrain and sharply reduce the pupils' interest in their lessons.

The teaching of a small child is a very subtle and intricate process. The concern to have the pupil assimilate a definite volume of knowledge is only one aspect of the matter. The other, and perhaps even more important task is to have his brain develop as he assimilates knowledge, that is, to have the child become ever more

intelligent and developed. The cornerstone is a blend of instruction and mental training.

Mothers and fathers tell us with alarm: at first their child did well, absorbing knowledge without any special effort, but then he found it more and more difficult to study as the months went by. Why is that so? Why is it that the store of knowledge the child has gained tends to become something of a heavy burden? There we find a gap between the assimilation of knowledge and mental training. The ideal, the correct type of teaching should result in learning becoming easier and easier, instead of more difficult, as the child acquires more and more knowledge.

At this point we come to the most fragile thing of all — the child's memory. Mental training starts with care and consideration of the child's memory, with concern for training it and making it stronger. It is quite intolerable, and is evidence of a low standard of teaching, when we hear that in some schools the teacher merely exploits the child's memory, merely loading it, without doing anything to train the mind. The careless and uncouth handling of the child's memory is an evil which is bound to hamper the development of the personality.

Take a closer look, say, at a mathematics lesson in some first form. The children are offered one problem after another, for the teacher believes that efficiency of education is promoted if the children solve as many problems as possible in one lesson. The children are tired, and towards the end of the lesson they can hardly understand what the teacher is saying. This is followed by a lesson of grammar. Once again they have to memorise and memorise. What is the outcome? A child returning home with dull eyes, indifferent to everything around him. The best thing for him would be to run on the lawn and get a breath of fresh air, but the inexorable daybook demands that he should get on with his homework.

I repeat that the human memory, the child's memory in particular, is a very fragile and tender thing. But what is the meaning of a well-developed memory? Human thinking is discrete. This means that in a thousandth of a second our thought switches from one object to another, and this switch of thought is, in effect, the instantaneous switch of function, the work of one group of brain cells to another. The fact that one group of cells (neurons) is instantaneously switched on and another off, to be switched on again in the next instant, in effect means that man thinks. The secret of mental training, I think, is to engage in special work from the very first year for the purpose of developing the discrete nature of thinking and, consequently, to develop memory. At first sight this regularity appears to be something of a theoretical abstraction. However, this is an elementary rule of day-to-day mental training for small children.

Educational work designed to produce a harmonious assimilation of knowledge and mental development must begin with a study of the child's individual peculiarities. Our teachers start their acquaintance with their future first-year boys and girls long before they arrive at school. In the spring, summer and autumn we take them out into the woods, into the fields, into the orchards. We go there to think and

to marvel. Indeed, we attach exceptional importance to the emotional hue of the child's thinking.

If the child's intelligence and memory are to be developed his thoughts must be expressed in an active attitude to the surrounding world. For our future first-year pupils we have several spots where the surroundings induce them to think. We see the child gaining a knowledge of the world, and anticipate his efforts at learning, and the possible difficulties this may produce. In one such spot we have dozens of plants, and the children observe their development from spring to autumn. This induces them to ask many "whys". Another spot is a room with pictures from the life of animals, and still another room is full of models of machines and mechanisms.

This preparation before school helps to bring out, to see and to study the peculiarities of each child's thinking. Children differ in the speed with which mental activity is switched from one group of cells to another. We make a study of all this, pondering how best to develop the brain of each: to train the ability to concentrate his thinking on one object and to switch it to another. That is the very substance of the training of the mind. Discreteness, the ability swiftly to switch one's thoughts is the source of a mental quality we call quickwittedness. In order to develop this ability we have "thinking classes" with nursery-school children and then with first-year pupils: the children observe natural phenomena, and seek to discover what is still unknown to them; they are surprised, they marvel. Helping the child to understand the unknown is one of the subtle secrets of pedagogical craftsmanship. The more vivid the understanding of the unknown, the more active the workings of the mind.

Of exceptional importance in developing the child's mind is the balance between what has been inserted into his head ready-made and what has reached it and been established there through his own reflections. The more the child has to memorise in the classroom (and that is inevitable), the more active must be the laboratory of his creative thought, in which the child himself is the chief toiler and architect. On our experimental plot, each first-year pupil has his own row, for the specific purpose of securing a harmonious blend of these three things: seeing, observing and thinking. Intelligent work inspired with thought and amazement is, metaphorically speaking, the deep water on which the vessel of thought will float. Intelligent hands shape the intelligent head; self-reliant thought springs, like flame from the spark, when the little man, in touch with nature as a toiler, instead of the indifferent observer, discovers for himself the numerous "whys" and provides the answer himself as he sees, observes and does.

Why does the sunflower follow the sun? Why is the potato shoot green in the sun and white in the cellar? Why does the spider hide in his nest before the rain, and spin his web before the weather is fine? Why do the cat's eyes shine? Why are seeds warmed up in the sun before sowing? At the moment of intense thinking over each of these questions the child's thought is switched from one object to another a great number of times, as the object is probed from every side. The

child learns to think, while observing, and to observe, while thinking, and that is the whole point of the school of thinking which helps him successfully to gain knowledge in class.

There is nothing monotonous in the school of thinking. One group of children are engaged in observing plants out in the steppe and on the meadow; another is looking into life in a pond; a third is enthusiastically growing flowers in a hothouse; a fourth is building houses, factories and power stations out of small wooden components — cubes and little boards; a fifth is breeding fish in an aquarium; a sixth is planting acorns and growing little oaks; a seventh is attracted by the world of unusual events. We have one spot where everything is unusual: an ear of wheat growing on a stalk of maize, something that looks like a pumpkin growing out of a cucumber flower, etc. One hears what? how? why? on every hand. Every child is thinking about something and asking the teacher. Everyone feels a rising interest in something, for without interest there is no joy in discovery, no inclinations, no living soul, no human individuality.

Theorists and dreamers stand out among the children. The theorists probe deep into the details of things and phenomena, seeking to get at their substance: in their thinking one will notice an inclination to reason and provide logical proof. The dreamers see things and phenomena in general outline: they are much impressed by the beauty of the sunset, by the storm-cloud; they are delighted with colour schemes, while the theorists pose questions: why is it that the same spot in the sky can be blue and then turn red?

The little man's consciousness is very sensitive to the assessment of his successes in learning and to what adults think and say about his advances. Awareness of his success, the sense that his efforts have not been in vain, the teacher's praise and encouragement are all highly important incentives for the fine and whimsical thing which is known as the child's willingness to learn.

The experienced teacher will take special care to see that no child goes home without having experienced the exciting sense of success. In the child's joy lies the source of the spiritual strength that he needs to overcome the difficulties, for it is so hard to master more and more knowledge from day to day, and to sit and concentrate on one's work for four and sometimes five hours a day. If the teacher has failed to imbue the child with the joy of success, school will become a heavy burden on the little man, who is not yet strong enough and lacks the necessary moral experience.

But how are we to achieve the ideal condition in which no pupil goes home gloomy and disappointed, that no childish heart should painfully shrink at the thought: I am good for nothing. Indeed, an inexhaustible source of the joy of success lies in the fact that thought lives in activity, that thought is transformed into real fruits of labour. The labour of thought is, in effect, the source of the joy of success. What the experienced teacher of first-year pupils will be most careful to do is to have the knowledge and skills secured, obtained, acquired by the child always in motion, that is, always applied in the workings of the mind, which constitutes the meaning and the substance of

learning. The craftsmanship and art of teaching in primary school — in the first form, especially — consists in giving the child knowledge as an instrument for him actively to use, aware of and sensitive to the fact that he is making use of that instrument. Through the awareness and the experience of handling this fine instrument, the child feels himself to be a gainer of knowledge, and from this springs the joy of success. In primary school — in the first form, especially — there must be no knowledge that is inert, frozen, apparently stored up in reserve. Where knowledge is inert and frozen it becomes a burden, and where knowledge is a burden, there can be no sense of joy from success.

INSTITUTE OF SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION FOR THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

The Institute of Scientific Information for the Social Sciences of the USSR Academy of Sciences (INION) is a relatively new establishment in the system of the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union. It was founded in Moscow in 1969 and in the short period of its existence it has become the country's major centre of scientific information.

INION was created as a result of the growing importance of the social sciences and of the necessity to supply systematic information about the ever increasing flow of literature in the field of social knowledge. It is a complex scientific establishment in which scholars of various branches of the social sciences are represented. The Institute acquires and subjects to textual information processing works on the social sciences, first and foremost works on scientific communism, philosophy, economics, history and law. Just a few years ago a system of scientific and technical information alone existed in the USSR, with the All-Union Institute of Scientific and Technical Information (VINITI) as its main establishment. Thanks to

INION, the pre-conditions were created for the organisation of a system of information in the social sciences.

The system of scientific information for the social sciences which exists at INION at present, is connected with various levels of current and retrospective information on the world flow of publications. At the first level, the current bibliographic processing of world literature is carried out. As a result of this work, 28 bulletins are put out on new Soviet and foreign literature on economics, philosophy, sociology, the state and the law, history, philology and literary problems in the socialist countries, the development of science and scientific research, and so on. Every year all the series of bibliographic bulletins reflect 280-300 thousand documents of various kinds: books and articles on the social sciences.

The next level of information is the issue of two abstract journals by INION *Social Sciences in the USSR* and *Social Sciences Abroad* in sixteen series. These abstract journals give selective current abstract information on the most significant publications in the field of the social

sciences in such series as "The Problems of Scientific Communism", "Economics", "Philosophy", "The State and the Law", "History", "Linguistics" and "Literary Criticism". Besides the above-mentioned subjects, the *Social Sciences Abroad* also includes the series "The Science of Science" and "Oriental and African Studies".

In 1975 through its agents abroad V/O Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga ran a subscription to all the series of the abstract journal *Social Sciences in the USSR* which comes out in Russian. All the series of abstract journals have constant, carefully worked out rubricators, but the material under individual headings depends on the current entries of publications to INION.

The rubricator of each series of an abstract journal covers the main research trends in a given field, reflects the main general theoretical works, source retrieval, questions connected with the development of individual regions of the world, and so on. In the series "Economics" of the *Social Sciences in the USSR* among the permanent headings there are the following: "The Economic Problems Involved in Creating the Material and Technical Basis of Communism"; "The Centralised Planned Management of the Economy and Long-Term Social and Economic Forecasting"; "Defining and Increasing the Efficiency of Social Production, Improving Its Structure and Proportions"; "The Social Problems of a Developed Socialist Society, the Standard of Living of the Soviet People"; "The Problems of Developing the Economies of the Union Republics, Large Economic Regions and Individual Branches of the Economy"; headings on the problems of the socialist and developing countries,

on the economic problems of the industrial capitalist countries, questions of international economic relations and criticism of bourgeois economic theories.

The publication of abstract journals is managed by the Editorial Board whose Chairman is V. Vinogradov, head of INION, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and a prominent specialist on the economic history of the USSR and of the European socialist countries. The Editorial Board also includes many distinguished Soviet scholars: Academicians N. Inozemtsev, M. Khrapchenko, F. Konstantinov, A. Narochitsky, A. Rumyantsev, and E. Zhukov; Corresponding Members of the USSR Academy of Sciences O. Bogomolov, F. Filin, D. Gvishiani, V. Kudryavtsev, M. Rutkevitch, V. Solodovnikov and others.

The creation of the system of abstract journals of the INION of the USSR Academy of Sciences is an extremely important step in forming a social science information service in the USSR. Abstract information in the social sciences has its own peculiarities, and its own specific nature which had to be taken into consideration when these journals were created. The most important problem of all is the selection for abstracting, of the most significant scientific literature on the social sciences. This is a question of science and can only be dealt with by highly qualified specialists in all branches of the social sciences. On the other hand, the content of a scientific work on the social sciences cannot be formalised to the same extent as a scientific and technological document. In an abstract of a scientific work in the field of the humanities the structure of the work must be presented, the author's ideas

must be stated briefly but in detail, as well as the peculiarities of the source of the document; the author's stand on debatable questions relating to the subject must be shown without any additional comment on the part of the abstractor, the relation of the author to other scientific works in the given field; the social and ideological significance of the given work must be revealed by emphasising the essential features. It is also important to expose the method of investigation and describe the factual and statistical material on which the author bases his work, and so forth.

The objective exposition of these points of view in the abstract means that it does essentially differ from the short or extended annotation given in the scientific and bibliographic descriptions contained in bibliographic bulletins.

The complex character of social knowledge is evident even at the level of current abstract information. Among the series of abstract journals there are series on separate branches of science, as well as series on some of the complex questions of social knowledge and on questions pertaining to individual countries or regions. These complex problems with regard to information in the social sciences are fully manifest at the next level of information work—the level of retrospective information when the problems-subjects, integral approach is prevalent.

In the social sciences the solution to many urgent research questions is connected with the study of complex socio-economic and ideological problems, in the elaboration of which representatives of many branches of the social sciences participate. Take, for example, the question of the social aspects of the current scientific and technological revolution (STR). Of course, the

pressing problems of the STR can only be given an integral elucidation, when the economic, social, political, ideological and also scientific and technological aspects of the STR are examined in a comprehensive manner. INION has arranged the systematic issue of abstract information on questions of the interrelations between the scientific and technological revolution and the economic development, on the social and ideological problems of the STR, on the organisation of scientific activity in the conditions of the STR and on the environmental problems in the conditions of the STR.

Many questions of international relations, which have their own economic, socio-political and ideological aspects, are of a complex nature. Methodological problems of the social sciences as well as many questions of information pertaining to individual regions and countries are many-sided. It may be noted, in particular that, despite the process of extending much of the research in the field of social knowledge, and working it out in detail, there is at the same time an obvious tendency towards an increase in literature on subjects connected with individual regions and countries, which forms a considerable part of today's entries to the INION fund.

Retrospective abstract information on problems and subjects is connected with an important and essential side of the work of the INION which expands its activity on the principle of cooperation with the leading institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences, where the main problems with regard to the social sciences are worked out. The Institute of Scientific Information for the Social Sciences takes into account the main tendencies in the research carried out at the institutes

of the USSR Academy of Sciences, in selecting subjects for its research and, correspondingly, for its publications. This is connected both with the improved acquisition procedure and with the issue of information publications. On the other hand, it is becoming more and more usual to issue joint publications of information material together with such centres of the USSR Academy of Sciences as the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations, the Institute of the USA and Canada, the Institute of Sociological Research, the Institute of Philosophy, the Institute of the History of the USSR, the Far East Institute and the Institute of the Economy of the World Socialist System.

The complex character of INION, and its staff of highly qualified specialists representing various branches of social knowledge create a unique situation which allows an ever higher level of information work, the compiling of scientific and analytical surveys reflecting the main tendencies in the development of the social sciences and of other information material of a conceptual and generalising character. Scientific and analytical surveys are prepared by the most eminent scholars in that particular field and are, without any doubt, works of scientific research. The specific peculiarity of these works is the exact indication of the sources analysed on branches of knowledge as a whole, on complex problems or, retrospectively, on one of the subjects of the research being done by various authors in different countries.

In conformity with its tasks INION has scientific information departments and sectors organised according to branches and regions. These are departments carrying out

work in the field of scientific communism, philosophy, sociology, economics, history, the state and the law, the science of science, Oriental and African studies, and also subdivisions on the problems of the socialist countries, the capitalist countries of Western Europe and the USA, on the social, economic and ideological problems of the scientific and technological revolution and of the international workers' movement.

INION puts out information materials which assist in dealing with the problems of management in the field of social science, in the planning of scientific research, and in the development of international scientific ties between Soviet and foreign scholars. *The Bulletin of International Congresses, Conferences, Symposiums and Meetings* comes out regularly. The bulletin publishes the dates, places and subjects of international meetings of scholars in the social sciences and gives the addresses of the organising committees.

The development of a system of information in the social sciences is connected with the acquisition of current world literature. INION subscribes to literature from 115 countries and exchanges publications with 1,610 scientific organisations in 62 countries.

An important feature of the Institute of Scientific Information for the Social Sciences of the USSR Academy of Sciences is the fact that it includes in its composition the Main Library for the Social Sciences of the USSR Academy of Sciences. This library was founded in 1918, and is extremely rich in the most interesting scientific documents, including books and periodicals, all in all some seven million documents. Such an organic combination of an extremely large main library and the

Institute of Information makes it possible to substantially improve the acquisition of sources of information and to solve on a global scale the problem of creating an automated system of information storage, retrieval and output. By including this main library in its composition, INION, in its new building which was opened in May 1974, offers the staff of the institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences the best possible working conditions, and also allows foreign scholars who come to the Soviet Union to carry out research on their own subjects.

Besides a common reading room, the Institute has at its disposal special studies for philosophy and scientific communism, economics, the literature of the socialist countries, history, law and UN documentation. It boasts a big bibliographic department which possesses a unique collection of reference materials and information card indexes.

The Institute carries out a great deal of research in the field of information retrieval languages and other problems of creating an automated system of information in the social sciences.

INION has extensive international ties with many countries, thus developing cooperation in the field of information, above all with scientific information centres in the socialist countries.

SOVIET-US COOPERATION IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Under the Soviet-US General Agreement on Contacts, Exchanges and Cooperation signed in Washington on June 19, 1973, the first meeting of the Commission of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Academy of Sciences of the USSR on Contacts and Collaboration in the Social Sciences and Humanities was

The basis for this cooperation is formed by the expanding joint work between scholars in the socialist countries on elaborating such topical present-day problems as: the regularities of the development of socialist society and of the world socialist system; the problems of the management and efficiency of socialist production; questions of the theory and history of the international workers' movement; topical questions of the present-day ideological struggle, and others. Many forms of multilateral and bilateral cooperation between scholars in the socialist countries are being developed. The Institute has agreements with and carries out joint activity according to definite plans of cooperation with scientific information centres in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia and Poland. INION takes an active part in working out the general conception and in implementing definite measures for the creation of an international information system for the social sciences in the socialist countries.

M. Gapochka,
Cand. Sc. (Philos.),

Deputy Director of the Institute
of Scientific Information
for the Social Sciences.

held at Tarrytown (N. Y.) in March 1975.

The members of the Commission from the US side are Dr. F. Burkardt (President Emeritus of the Council of Learned Societies); R. Lumiansky (Vice-President of the Council); G. Turner (Vice-President of the Council); Professor W. Leon-

tiff (Harvard University); Dr. M. Thompson (American Historical Association); B. Manning (Council of Foreign Relations), Professor R. Merton (Columbia University); Dr. W. Estes (Rockefeller University); and A. Wallace (University of Pennsylvania). The delegation of the USSR Academy of Sciences, which took part in the work of the Commission, was headed by Academician N. Inozemtsev (Director, Institute of the World Economy and International Relations) and included Academician E. Zhukov (Institute of World History); B. Lomov, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences (Institute of Psychology); N. Mansurov, D. Sc. (Philos.), (Institute of Sociological Studies); I. Neupokoyeva, D. Sc. (Philol.), (Gorky Institute of World Literature); and A. Movchan, Cand. Sc. (Law), (Institute of the State and Law).

A Protocol containing the Commission's recommendations and listing specific measures for promoting contacts and cooperation between the two sides in the social sciences was drawn up as a result of the fruitful discussion that was held in a businesslike and constructive spirit.

Economics. The Commission subscribed to the agreement reached earlier between the Stanford Research Institute on the American side and the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations and the Institute on US and Canada Studies on the Soviet side, with the participation of other centres and experts to study the forms and methods of establishing and developing economic relations between the USSR and the USA. Moreover, it was agreed to hold a joint symposium on long-term prospects of Soviet-US economic relations viewed within the framework of world econo-

mic development. The Commission found that it was desirable to organise cooperation in the study of problems such as "Capital Investment in the Process of Production (Including Methods of Complex Assessment of New Technology)" and the "Utilisation of Input-Output Analysis, Including Multiregional Aspects"

History. The Commission recommended the organisation of a bilateral exchange of bibliographical information and copies of archive documents and the promotion of scientific collaboration in the following areas: history of cultural and economic relations between the USSR and the USA, the application of quantitative methods to the study of history, the role of the state in the economic development of the USSR and the USA, and the concept of progress in the history of man.

Law. Agreement was reached on the following priority topics of study: Soviet-American trade law and practices, federal-local relationships and problems of local government and law of the sea, and also on a number of topics for subsequent study.

International Relations. The priority topics selected were "American-Soviet Relations and Negotiations" and "Machinery for the Regulation of International Conflicts at the Global, Regional and Local Level". The topics designated for subsequent treatment were: "Scientific and Technological Progress and International Relations", "The Role of the United Nations", "Political Implication of Arms Control" and "Food Resources, Raw Materials, and Population Problems".

Sociology. The sides agreed to concentrate attention on long-range social prognosis, research methods and the use of indicators in the study

of social processes and on the structure of leisure time.

Literature. The Commission planned a series of symposiums on the topics "Editorial and Textual Principles Involved in Editing Classics of National Literatures", "Principles of the Writing of Histories of National Literatures" and "Problems in Contemporary Literary Theory and Criticism".

Psychology. The Commission approved priority areas of cooperation in the study of problems linked with the use of small computers in psychological research and also of theoretical problems in psychological experimentation.

Further, the Commission recommended the holding of joint study in

anthropology, archaeology and ethnography.

Provision was made for diverse forms of cooperation (colloquiums, symposiums, parallel research, exchanges of scientific literature, reports, publications, and also of scientists and experts to conduct lectures, young scholars, the joint compilation of scholarly works, the translation and publication of the works of Soviet and American scientists, and so forth) and it was stressed that the sides did not rule out the possibility of research into other topics or cooperation in other forms.

L. Voronkov,
Cand. Sc. (Hist.)

and social geography, political science and international relations, and philosophy.

The joint research, publications and symposiums will deal with the following topics, which are of mutual interest and have already been endorsed: traditional institutions in the process of modernisation of society; independent India and Soviet Central Asia; problems of secularisation in multi-religious societies: India and the USSR; comparative study of national revolutionary movement in India and the USSR; ancient civilisation in India and on the territory of the USSR: the problems of economic and social organisation of society; peace, security and foreign policy perspectives for India and the

USSR; development of socialist thought in the USSR and India in the 19th and 20th centuries; man and nature: philosophical implications.

On the basis of a comparative study of the Soviet and Indian experience, the following subjects will be jointly researched (they will also be investigated in publications and at symposiums): determinants of agricultural productivity; management of public state enterprises; problems of migration in the process of urbanisation; problems of regional planning and national development; problems of building a federal polity.

G. Kotovsky,
Cand. Sc. (Hist.)

FRENCH YEARBOOK

Vol. XVII of the *Frantsuzsky yezhegodnik* (French Yearbook) came off the press in Moscow at the close of 1975. The next volumes are being compiled. In our rapidly changing times the issue of such a non-dynamic form of publication as a yearbook in itself attracts attention: evidently publications of this kind are becoming, in a manner of speaking, an element, perhaps even an essential element, of the development of social thinking and meet pressing requirements.

In the short foreword to the first volume (1958), the Editors noted that considerable interest in French history has always been displayed in this country, whose progressive personalities, from Radishchev to Belinsky, Herzen and the great leader of the Russian revolution Vladimir Lenin, had the utmost respect for the liberation struggle of the French people. They wrote:

"In beginning the compilation of the *Frantsuzsky yezhegodnik*, the group studying the history of France at the Institute of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences hopes it will contribute to a deeper study of the history of France in our country. The cooperation between Soviet and French historians on the pages of the *Yezhegodnik* will, we believe, help to bring the two great nations closer together culturally."

These words state the principal aims of the publication that was then only being initiated.

To what extent have these aims been achieved? What has been accomplished by the *Frantsuzsky yezhegodnik* in deepening and promoting the study of the history of the friendly French people? Has it played a positive role in expanding cooperation between the historians of the two countries? Has this publication of the USSR Academy of

INDO-SOVIET COMMISSION

The First Meeting of the Joint Indo-Soviet Commission for Cooperation in Social Sciences was held in May 1975 in Moscow. The Indian side was represented by Professors Rasheeduddin Khan (Chairman), Moonis Raza, G. S. Bhalla and D. D. Narula, and Dr. Surajit Sinha. The Soviet side included Academician B. Gafurov (Chairman), G. Kotovsky (Vice-Chairman), P. Anikeev, V. Kondratyev, M. Urmancheyev, and N. Cheboxarov.

The session was opened by the two chairmen who emphasised the great importance of the setting up of the Indo-Soviet Commission for Cooperation in Social Sciences, and expressed confidence that its work would promote the research activity in both countries and the friendship and mutual understanding between the Indian and Soviet peoples.

The Commission's sittings were

marked by a friendly and constructive atmosphere and crowned by the signing of a Statement. Both sides considered it necessary to maintain cooperation through the exchange of visits of social scientists for a period between three months and one year, of scientific literature (books and periodicals), and of materials which could be used in the social sciences abstract series of the two countries. Agreement was reached on the periodical publication by each of the two sides of collections containing the works of scholars of the other side. Soviet and Indian scholars will carry out joint research, put out joint scientific works, and hold symposiums in the Soviet Union and India alternately. A long-term programme for these joint activities was drawn up, covering a period of five years and embracing the following disciplines: anthropology and sociology, economics, history, economic

Sciences, to be more exact, of its group studying the history of France, won recognition abroad, notably in France, among French scholars? Many other similar questions naturally arise when one speaks of a scientific publication that has been printed serially for nearly 20 years.

But answering these questions we should like to express our appreciation and grateful esteem for Vyacheslav Volgin, the initiator and inspirer of the *Frantsuzsky yezhegodnik*, who was its Editor-in-Chief until his demise in 1962. Despite the pressure of his scientific and public work and despite his age, this eminent Soviet scholar and outstanding student of the history of social thinking in France and the history of socialist philosophy, who was for many years Vice-President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, accorded much attention to the *Yezhegodnik*, which he regarded as a major contribution to the promotion of cultural relations between the Soviet Union and France.

Volgin proved to be right when he insisted that the *Yezhegodnik* should become an organ of Soviet-French scientific rapprochement. The first volume, in 1958, contained articles by three French scholars: "Lenin and the Lessons of French History" by Jacques Duclos, "The Revolutionary Committees of the Paris Sections (1973-1974)" by Albert Soboul and "Jean Jaurés and the Colonial Problem" by Jean Bruhat.

In the recent, including the latest, volumes of the *Yezhegodnik* one cannot fail to note the growing contribution from French scholars and the increasing range of subjects.

World famous French historians—Georges Lefevre, Fernand Braudel, Ernest Labrousse and Pierre Renouvin—have contributed to

the *Yezhegodnik*. Its doors are wide open to all French scholars of good will, regardless of their party affiliation or political views, to all serious historians devoted to the interests of science and recognising the benefits of Franco-Soviet scientific cooperation.

The *Yezhegodnik* has printed articles on the Great French Revolution of the 18th century by, among others, Marc Bouloiseau, Jacques Godechot, Ernest Labrousse, Marcel Reinhard, Albert Saboul and Jean Surateau. Some articles on this subject have been contributed by the noted German historians Werner Krauss and Walter Markow.

Problems related to the French revolutionary, democratic, working-class movement have been dealt with in articles by Guy Besse, Jean Bruhat, Germaine Willard, Claude Willard, Maurice Dommanget, Jacques Duclos, Jean Dautry, Maurice Choury and others.

French foreign policy and Russo-French and Soviet-French relations, which receive considerable attention in the *Yezhegodnik*, are the subjects of contributions from Jean Bouvier, Philippe Devillers, Jean-Baptiste Duroselle, René Girault, André Langevin, Luce Langevin, General Pierre Pouyade and Pierre Renouvin.

It must be noted that we have had contributions from Jean Bouvier, Jacques le Goff, René Girault and Albert Soboul long before they maintained their doctorates and won world fame in science.

Of course, most of the contributions to the *Yezhegodnik* are from Soviet historians, including scholars who are recognised experts on the history of France (Academics V. Volgin, and S. Skazkin, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences F. Potemkin, and Profes-

sors V. Dalin, Y. Zakher, O. Vainshstein, A. Lyublinskaya, B. Weber, B. Porshnev, A. Molok and E. Zhelubovskaya) and representatives of the young generation of students of French history (Professors A. Ado, L. Gordon, A. Konokotin and Y. Bessmertny, and Candidates of sciences Z. Belousova, S. Gurvich, Y. Kiseleva, S. Obolenskaya, I. Sivolap, A. Gordon and others).

It has always been our policy to enlarge the geographical boundaries of the contributions from scholars studying the history of France. We have printed articles by historians from the most diverse Soviet scientific centres, near and far from Moscow: T. Soltanovskaya (Kiev), V. Alexeyev-Popov (Odessa), R. Engelgardt (Kiev), I. Kisselgof (Ufa), Y. Trunsky (Kazan), and Y. Drazninas (Chita) to mention a few.

We have placed our publication at the service of writers and scholars working in fields contiguous to the history of France. Articles have been written for the *Yezhegodnik* by Ilya Ehrenburg and Konstantin Simonov, by art critics B. Vipper and N. Kalitina, by the French art critic Pierre Angrand, and by the literary critics T. Motyleva and Jean Pérus.

In reply to the questions asked at the beginning of this review I feel that I shall be expressing the opinion of our Editors when I say that within a period of just under 20 years the *Frantsuzsky yezhegodnik* has in certain measure achieved its aims: it has helped to deepen and widen the study of French history in the Soviet Union and has unquestionably helped to strengthen our contacts and links with French scholars and foster cooperation between the historians of the two friendly countries.

It is deeply gratifying to be able to state here that leading French personalities—Maurice Thorez and Jacques Duclos—have spoken highly of the *Frantsuzsky yezhegodnik's* contribution towards drawing together two great peoples—the French and the Soviet—culturally and strengthening the traditional friendship between them.

The *Frantsuzsky yezhegodnik* is the only publication in the Soviet Union and one of the few in the world devoted entirely to the history of France. It is known not only to scholars in many countries of the Old and the New World, who have written of their appreciation of it in their own scientific journals, but also to many non-specialists.

We are aware, of course, that our publication still has a number of shortcomings: in particular, it continues to be published behind schedule and, essentially speaking, like any other publication, requires improvement; we are making every effort to enlarge and diversify our main section: The History of Russo-French and Soviet-French Relations. In short, the field for improvement remains extensive.

Nevertheless, the contributors and staff of the *Frantsuzsky yezhegodnik* find satisfaction in the fact that during the past few years they have proved that this somewhat unusual publication has proved to be viable, necessary and useful, that it contributes to the general treasure-store of world science, to the strengthening of Soviet-French friendship and to drawing the peoples closer together spiritually.

Professor A. Manfred,
Editor-in-Chief,
Frantsuzsky yezhegodnik

In 1971 the Institute of World History of the USSR Academy of Sciences began to put out *Amerikansky yezhegodnik* (Annual Studies of America) in Moscow. The Executive Editor of the publication is Professor G. Sevostyanov, D. Sc. (Hist.), head of the History of the USA and Canada Department at the above-mentioned institute.

The appearance of a special serial publication on the history of the USA and Canada does to a certain extent reflect the data accumulated by Soviet specialists in American studies over several decades of serious research. Every year dozens of monographs and hundreds of articles on North American history are published in the USSR. These for the degrees of Doctor and Candidate of Sciences are also defended on that subject. This publication was thus justified as it allows Soviet specialists to become acquainted with their colleagues' latest research, with relevant historiographic, documentary and bibliographic materials and publications.

The circle of contributors to *The Annual Studies* and the range of themes they deal with are extremely wide. Works by young scholars from Moscow, Leningrad and other Soviet cities are published alongside those contributed by well-known researchers. The authors do, in fact, cover the entire history of the USA and Canada. You can find essays about those distant times when Europeans were only just setting out for the New World (L. Slyozkin, 1972, 1973) and scientific reports on the most recent events in American history, such as, for example, President Kennedy's policy with regard to the Black question (Y. Oleshchuk, 1972), on the presidential campaign

of E. McCarthy in 1968 (V. Linnik, 1972), and on the latest developments in the Indian movement (V. Gordeyev, 1974).

From the very beginning the study of fundamental processes of the social and economic development of the USA, of the ways and specifics of the development of North American capitalism has become a major trend in the American studies in the USSR. This interest is still keen as can be seen from the articles about the times and peculiarities of the last stage of the industrial revolution in the USA (A. Blinov, 1971), about the changes in the social structure of present-day American farmers (V. Zolotukhin, 1972) and about the development of capitalist relations in colonial Canada (V. Tishkov, 1973).

Another major line in the research of Soviet historians is the study of the role of the popular masses in history, the development of the class struggle and the growth of the workers', farmers and other mass movements. These questions are reflected in the following articles in the *Annual Studies*: on the ideological and political aspects of the crisis of "Gompersism" and of the formation of the Congress of Industrial Organisations (V. Malkov, 1971); on the policy of the American Federation of Labor (N. Kurkov, 1972; S. Askoldova, 1974; K. Kleimenova, 1972); on the origins and essence of trade-union Pan-Americanism (N. Kurkov, 1974); on the anti-monopolistic acts in the USA at the end of the 19th century (I. Suponitskaya, 1974); on the struggle of the Communist Party of the USA against the theory of "American exceptionalism" (A. Grechukhin, 1974). The *Annual Studies* also contains works on the farmers' movement in the

USA in the period between the two world wars (A. Kolodiy, 1971; E. Yazkov, 1972).

Soviet researchers are interested in the political history of the US domestic policy, in the nature of the political struggle in the country and the fates of its state and political institutions at different periods in history. Particular attention is paid to a study of state monopoly capitalism in the USA from a historical point of view. In connection with this question, materials were published on the origin of the anti-trust legislation in the USA (I. Suponitskaya, 1972), on the state control over labour relations during the Second World War (N. Sivachov, 1972), on the political struggle in the USA over the agrarian policy in the second half of the 1930s (A. Kolodiy, 1974), on the development of American naval power at the beginning of the 20th century (A. Raskin, 1974) and on the activity of the National Security Council during the presidency of H. Truman (G. Agafonova, 1971).

Over the last few years a comparatively new and intensively developed trend in Soviet-American studies is the research of the ideological aspects of American history, of the history of bourgeois reformism in the USA in particular. This research is reflected in the works on the ideology of bourgeois reformism at the turn of the century (V. Sogrin, 1971, 1974), on the American Christian Liberals in the 1920s and 1930s and the Christian-socialist tendencies in American protestantism at the beginning of the 20th century (A. Kislova, 1971, 1973). A special article has been published on Lenin's evaluation of bourgeois reformism in the USA and Western Europe (I. Belyavskaya, 1971). One of the essays deals with the surprising fate of the well-known Utopian novel by Edward Bellamy,

Looking Backward, and the role played by this work in the literary, social and political struggle in the USA (B. Gilenson, 1972).

Soviet historians and specialists in international affairs analyse the class nature and purposefulness of American foreign policy in different periods of US history and the role of the USA in the system of international relations today. In this connection, of particular interest are the materials devoted to the North American colonisation of Texas in the 1820s and 1830s (N. Potokova, 1974), the USA's relations with the European powers in 1917-1918 (Z. Gershov, 1972), the stand taken by the USA at the 1938 Lima Conference (I. Yanchuk, 1974) and the 1943 Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers (N. Smirnova, 1974), and to the role of the USA in founding the United Nations (A. Baryshev, 1973).

The achievements of Soviet-American studies in the field of Russo-American and Soviet-American relations are unquestionable. Scholars have brought into circulation a large number of previously unknown archive materials. Thus, it was in the *Annual Studies* that light was for the first time thrown on how American life, the history and policies of the USA were described in the well-known Russian journals of the 19th century *Delo* (Deed), *Slovo* (The Word) and *Dukh zhurnalov* (The Spirit of Journals) (I. Malkova, 1971; N. Bolkhovitinov, 1972). New documents on Russia's support for the struggle of the North American colonies for independence are published in the 1975 issue.

This issue is devoted solely to the American revolution of the 18th century. In connection with the 200th anniversary of this revolution, the contributors to the *Annual*

Studies have set forth their views and evaluations of some important aspects of the history of the War of Independence and of the formation of the USA. Biographical essays about some of the prominent figures in the American revolution are also printed here.

A serious study of US and Canadian history implies systematical account and analysis of the historical researches published and also of the entire process of the development of North American historical thought. This is why each issue of the *Annual Studies* contains an extensive historiographic section.

In the "Scientific Life" Section one can find information about the conferences of Soviet specialists

in American history, about their research in archives and libraries, both at home and abroad, and about their meetings with historians from other countries. The *Annual Studies* contains lists of doctorate theses on the history of the USA which have been defended in the Soviet Union, of the works of Soviet and foreign specialists in American history published in the USSR, and a bibliography of works on the history of the USA which have come out in the socialist countries.

V. Tishkov,
Cand. Sc. (Hist.),
Executive Secretary of the
Editorial Board of *Annual
Studies of America*

Congresses • Conferences • Symposiums

SHOLOKHOV JUBILEE

In May 1975 that classic of Soviet literature, Hero of Socialist Labour and Lenin and Nobel prizes winner, Academician Mikhail Sholokhov, celebrated his seventieth birthday. In this connection meetings, scientific conferences, sessions of academic institutions and writers' organisations were held in Moscow, Leningrad, in the capitals of the Union republics and in many other Soviet cities.

* * *

The main event was the birthday celebration held in Moscow on May 23. At this celebration the presidium was made up of the members of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee V. Grishin, A. Kirilenko and M. Suslov, the Alternate members of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee P. Demichev and M. Solomentsev, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee I. Kapitonov, members of the All-Union Jubilee Committee for Sholokhov's birthday celebrations, distinguished writers, Soviet cultural workers, representatives of the public and foreign guests. The meeting was opened by the chairman of the Jubilee Commit-

tee, writer N. Tikhonov. In his speech on Sholokhov, G. Markov, first secretary of the Board of the USSR Writers' Union, said: "Throughout his career as a writer he has created dozens of works, amongst which *And Quiet Flows the Don* and *Virgin Soil Upturned* tower like mountain peaks, reaching the heights of Soviet and world literature. The First World War and the Revolution, the Civil War, the formation of the Soviet system, collectivisation in agriculture, the Great Patriotic War against German fascism and the struggle of our people for peace and communism are all themes which have gone into Sholokhov's works like organic motifs of his artistic thinking, his talent and his experience of life.... Sholokhov's realism is socialist in character. Only a realist of this trend can understand the highly complex socio-psychological, ideological and political lattice of our stormy times". In conclusion, the speaker said that Sholokhov's seventieth birthday "signifies an important celebration, that it is much more than just an ordinary literary jubilee, and this celebration in honour of the writer has become nationwide in its scope."

* * *

The scientific session "Mikhail Sholokhov and World Literature" was organised in Moscow by the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Gorky Institute of World Literature of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Academician M. Khrapchenko opened the session with an inaugural address. The participants in the session heard papers on various aspects of Sholokhov's works, in particular, "Sholokhov and the Problems of the World Today", "Sholokhov's Innovation and the Development of Modern Literature", "Sholokhov's Worldwide Significance" and "Sholokhov's Artistic Truth".

* * *

"Mikhail Sholokhov's Traditions in Modern Prose Writing and Journalism" was the theme of a scientific conference in Rostov-on-Don organised by the North Caucasian Scientific Higher School Centre, the Rostov regional writers' organisation and the Rostov State University. I. Bondarenko, First Secretary of the Rostov Regional Committee of the CPSU, welcomed the participants in the conference. Y. Zhdanov, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Rector of the Rostov State University, made the inaugural speech. Scholars and writers from many towns in the Soviet

INTERNATIONAL MEETING OF INDOLOGISTS IN BERLIN

An International Sanskrit Conference was held in the GDR's capital in March 1975 in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the Department of Sanskrit Studies at Berlin University and in honour of the eminent German Indologists Franz Bopp and Albrecht Weber. This

Union read papers and gave reports at the plenary session and at sittings of the five sections.

* * *

"The Works of Mikhail Sholokhov and World Literature" was the theme of an all-Union scientific conference held in Moscow and sponsored by the Moscow State University, the Gorky Institute of World Literature of the USSR Academy of Sciences and by the Lenin and Krupskaya Teacher Training institutes in Moscow. The conference was opened by Professor A. Metchenko. It was also attended by literary critics from the socialist countries.

* * *

The works of Sholokhov have been published in the Soviet Union 829 times in an overall edition of 53,276,000 copies in eighty languages of the peoples of the USSR. The novel *And Quiet Flows the Don* has been published 263 times in the Soviet Union in 23 languages, and the overall edition was 12,893,000 copies. Sholokhov's books have come out more than 700 times in 47 countries in 45 languages. In the Soviet Union there is abundant scientific literature on Sholokhov. Soviet publishing houses have put out works on Sholokhov's writings some 100 times.

Conference was attended by scholars from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, India, France and Britain.

Attention was focused on India's cultural legacy, which has an important part to play in the deve-

lopment of Indian culture to this day.

Dr. Wolfgang Morgenroth, Head of the Department of Sanskrit Studies, gave a summary of Indian studies in Germany over the past 150 years. He noted that research in this area has been given a powerful incentive in the GDR as a result of broad contacts with India and other developing countries of the South Asian subcontinent. He drew attention to historical materialism's methodology, which allows bringing the objective regularities of social and cultural development to light scientifically.

The Conference set up two sections: historico-cultural and linguistic. The former section dealt mainly with the history of Indian studies at the universities in the GDR and at research centres and universities of other countries, and characterised individual distinguished indologists and their works. Mention must be made, among others, of the paper of Ralph-Dietrich Jung (GDR) on Ch. Lassen's famous work *Indische Altertumskunde* (Indian Antiquities); of Hanne Simon (GDR) on the activity of the historian Mathias Christian Sprengel, who initiated Indian studies at Halle University; of Johannes Irmscher (GDR) on the activity of Dimitrios Galanos, one of the earliest European Indologists, and his influence on the progress of Indian studies in Germany; of Zdravka Mاتیšić (Yugoslavia) on present-day Sanskrit studies at Zagreb University.

Interesting papers were read on various aspects of the history of ancient India, in particular, by Barbara Schetelich and Eva Ritschl (GDR) on the *Arthashastra*; Gyula Wojtilla (Hungary) on the *Krishnarahara*, a major mediaeval record of farm work and rituals;

Herbert Plueschke (GDR) on the present state of research into the problem of "Hither Asia and Indian Culture".

The study of the literary process in India was dealt with by many scholars, notably by R. N. Dandekar (India), in whose paper on the *Samwadasukta* in the *Atharwaveda* the hymns in the Vedas are regarded not as remnants of dramaturgical works but as ballads.

Questions that are essential for an assessment of literary works and which were usually ignored by scholars inclined to interpret every literary phenomenon in the light of orthodox Brahman categories were raised for the first time by Roland Beer (GDR) in the paper "Irony and Parody in the *Dashakumaracharita* of Danclin" and by L. Sternbach (France) in the paper "Samaya-s and Other Games of Skill in Ancient India". Categories of this kind were considered by the Polish Indologist and literary critic Christopher Byrski, who analysed the traditional notions about the aims of human life in the *Triwarga* and the *Chaturwarga*. This paper evoked an interesting discussion at which it was stressed that an assessment of literary works should not be confined to traditional aesthetic categories but that it should rest also on general humanistic and aesthetic criteria.

Questions concerning the relations between works of fine art and the works of cult narrative literature corresponding to them were raised by Dagmar Sörgel (GDR) and Siegfried Kratzsch (GDR).

Members of the Soviet delegation spoke on key problems that evoked keen discussions and considerable interest at the Conference. In the paper "The Ideological and Artistic Struggle over the Classical Heritage

in Modern India", Professor Y. Chelyshev, who led the Soviet delegation, showed that the problem of the classical heritage, which is closely linked with questions related to India's socio-political and cultural development, is of great practical interest today. This problem is in the centre of a sharp ideological struggle between the progressive and reactionary forces in India's culture and art.

In the paper "Contacts and Cooperation Between Russian and German Indologists in the 18th-19th Centuries", I. Serebryakov spoke of joint research and publications by Russian and German scholars and their impact on the development of Indology in Europe. For instance, the Sanskrit dictionaries (large and small) published by them remain to this day the foundation of almost all vocabulary studies of Sanskrit and modern Indian languages. Considerable attention was attracted by A. Sukhochev's "Ancient Indian Literary Traditions in Modern Urdu Prose", in which he showed the integral development of Indian cultures and criticised the religious-communal interpretation of these cultures.

N. Gafurova spoke of the figurativeness in the works of the well-

known Indian poet Kabir, noting that the sources of this figurativeness lay in ancient Indian epic poetry and stressing the innovations in the work of the poet and his ability to make use of the finest features of ancient Indian culture.

The language section dealt not only with linguistics. It also dealt with the history of science (oriented, naturally, on linguistics) and some questions of social psychology. Of the linguistic papers proper it is necessary to mention the papers "Problems of Sibilants in Sanskrit (a Phonological View)" by Jaroslav Vacek (Czechoslovakia), "Specifics of Pali Syntax" by Achim Fahs (GDR) and "Sanskrit Words in the 'Bahasa-Indonesia' and Their Distribution in Various Semantic Fields" by Harry Spitzbardt (GDR).

The discussions and the broad exchange of views and information at the Conference will help to foster the links between Orientalists of the socialist countries and their colleagues in other countries, chiefly in India.

Y. Chelyshev,
D. Sc. (Philol.),
I. Serebryakov,
Cand. Sc. (Philol.)

COLLOQUIUM OF SOVIET AND WEST GERMAN HISTORIANS

The second colloquium of Soviet and West German historians was held in April 1975 in Leningrad (about the first colloquium see *Social Sciences*, No. 3(17), 1974). It was attended by 14 eminent scholars from the FRG, headed by Prof. Dr. W. Conze. The Soviet delegation was headed by Academician A. Narochnitsky.

Two themes were discussed: "The methodology of studying the history of international relations" and "Soviet-German relations in 1918-1932". The importance of the subject-matter determined the keen tenor of the discussion.

In his report "On the Theory and Methodology of Studying the History of International Relations"

Academician A. Narochnitsky showed that the Marxist-Leninist approach and historical materialism were a dynamically developing philosophical system based on a class analysis of social phenomena, a comprehensive investigation of international processes in their dialectical interrelation with the major factors determining the direction of social development.

The West German historians K. Erdmann, D. Geyer, K. Hildebrand and A. Hillgruber put forward methodological constructions, which deny the class approach to historical analysis, to oppose the comprehensive Marxist approach. At the same time they themselves admitted that bourgeois science lacks the kind of universal methodology such as the Marxist-Leninist theory.

The Soviet historians L. Nezhinsky, V. Salov, S. Tulpanov, A. Furseiko, S. Khromov, V. Shishkin and others who took part in the discussion on the first theme substantiated the fundamental principles of Marxist-Leninist theory in its development and repelled the attempts by some West German scholars to tentatively interpret Marxism-Leninism and ascribe to it several questionable propositions. Both in the reports and in the discussion the Soviet historians showed that it is precisely the comprehensive Marxist approach that affords the greatest possibility for making the most rational use of the achievements of modern science.

The second item on the agenda was likewise the subject of an interesting discussion.

Soviet historians above all made a generalisation of the positive experience of Soviet-German relations in the 1920s in the political and economic spheres. A. Akhtamzyan, I. Galkin, R. Dolgilevich, I. Kob-

lyakov, V. Kulbakin and other participants in the discussion stressed that the Soviet Government in its relations with the Weimar Republic, with whom it sought to establish broad, mutually beneficial contacts consistently adhered to the principle of peaceful coexistence. They noted the positive effect Germany's recognition of the equality of existing property systems and state monopoly in Soviet foreign trade had on these contacts. The Treaty of Rapallo (1922) considerably strengthened the international position of the two states in the conditions in which the ruling circles of other capitalist countries were trying to crush Soviet Russia and pursue a discriminatory policy in respect to vanquished Germany. The cooperation between the two countries helped to strengthen their security and peace in Europe.

On the whole, the West German historians recognised the importance of the Rapallo policy for the two countries and assessed it constructively. Thus, K. Hildebrand characterised it as being absolutely necessary in view of the fact that both powers were in isolation. Interesting observations were made by K. von Aretin, W. Mommsen, H. Neubauer, J. Nötzoldt and H. von Strandmann. They noted that the relations under study were mutually beneficial and were undoubtedly the first positive experiment in cooperation of states with different social systems.

At the same time, some West German scholars tried to belittle the importance of the political and economic relations of Soviet Russia with the Weimar Republic for the entire system of international relations in the 1920s and also as regards Germany itself. They advanced the thesis that cooperation was of advantage only to Soviet Russia. This tendentious view, inherited from the

cold war period, was refuted by West German historians themselves. Thus, G. Rhode expressed the opinion that the Rapallo Treaty as a means of ensuring security was more essential for Germany than for Soviet Russia for whom it was of importance in other aspects.

Even more untenable was the thesis put forward by some West German historians that the Rapallo cooperation allegedly contradicted the idea of European security for it isolated Germany from the Western countries and engendered the contradictions which led to war between them.

However, the historical fact is that interimperialist contradictions in Europe particularly intensified not in the period of active Soviet-German cooperation but in the 1930s, after the fascist regime completely broke with this line and after its foreign policy became aggressively anti-communist and anti-Soviet.

The Soviet historians convincingly showed that imperialist wars are triggered by interimperialist contradictions; they substantiated the peaceful foreign policy of the world's first socialist state which consistently advocated peaceful coexistence and collective security in Europe.

Some West German scholars, wanting to justify the imperialists' boycott of Soviet Russia and their big stick policy towards it, persistently tried to ascribe to Soviet foreign policy "export of revolution", and the mounting tide of the revolutionary struggle in Germany to the activities of the Comintern, which was allegedly the "hand of Moscow". They had to admit, however, that they had no documentary facts corroborating such assumptions.

The Soviet historians I. Galkin, Y.

Polyakov, G. Rozanov and M. Orlova conclusively showed that the revolutionary events in Germany were the result of the extreme aggravation of internal contradictions. After noting the tremendous and obvious revolutionising influence of the October Revolution on the peoples of the world they proved by way of concrete facts that the Soviet Government's policy was based on non-interference in the internal affairs of other states. Already beginning with October 1917 Soviet Russia proposed this principle as a standard of international relations. It did not "export revolution", whereas the imperialist powers, as is common knowledge, mounted an armed intervention against the young Soviet Republic, which was an attempt at "export of counterrevolution". After the ruling classes of the West were compelled to abandon their attempts to destroy Soviet Russia with the help of force the thesis about the Soviet "export of revolution" was adopted by the reactionary forces who wanted to prevent the development of Soviet-German relations. This thesis was refuted indirectly by some of the historians from the FRG themselves who admitted that in all its relations with foreign states, both in the political and economic spheres, the Soviet Government proceeded from the standards of international law and the ideas of the equality of the opposing property systems and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states.

The Soviet historians emphatically rejected the attempts of some of the West German scholars to hold the USSR responsible for the advent of fascism to power in Germany. Reactionary West German historiography has long since represented this as a forced measure directed against the growing strength of the German

Communists, supported by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. V. Sipols and V. Fomin showed what were the real factors that made for the growth of the communist and working-class movement in Germany and the full extent of German imperialism's responsibility for the preparations and unleashing of the Second World War. Several West German historians acknowledged these arguments and the fact that the seizure of power by the Hitlerites in Germany was a preventive counter-revolution.

From all the aforesaid we see that the scientific problems posed by the colloquium evoked pretty sharp

SOVIET-INDIAN SYMPOSIUM ON INDUSTRIALISATION

The Soviet-Indian Symposium "Social and Economic Transformations in Society in the Process of Industrialisation" took place at the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences in May 1975. The participants in the Symposium were the Indian scholars M. S. Gore (head of the delegation, President of the Indian Council for Social Science Research), Rasheeduddin Khan, M. P., V. B. Singh, M. P., Amiya Baghchi, B. S. Bhalla, C. T. Kurien, T. S. Papola, C. Rangarajan, Moonis Raza, and Zafar Imam and the Soviet scholars G. Shirokov (head of the delegation), A. Kolontayev, O. Malyarov, A. Medovoy, A. Mitrofanova, I. Nekrasova, S. Senyavsky, G. Sdasyuk, V. Telpukhovskiy, T. Checheleva and V. Yashkin.

The participants in the Symposium concentrated on the problem of industrialisation in conditions of a developing economy. The search for solution of this problem was based

ideological discussion. Both sides acknowledged the usefulness of such meetings which give their participants the opportunity to familiarise themselves with new materials and the research being done and also to better understand the position of the other side. The colloquium adopted a final communique which stated that despite the different approaches to many questions agreement was reached on a number of the scientific problems discussed. It is planned to hold the next meeting of historians of the USSR and the FRG in 1977.

N. Narochnitskaya,
Cand. Sc. (Hist.)

on an analysis of the historical experience of industrialisation in different countries, first and foremost in India and the Soviet Union (in its Eastern republics in particular).

Stressing the objective necessity for industrialisation and its primary role in ensuring the allround economic and social development of society, the speakers indicated erroneously of contrasting its course to that of the development of agriculture, for it is industrialisation that creates the necessary material prerequisites for the latter's rapid growth. At the same time it was noted that if the steady growth of agricultural production is not provided for and the necessary funds are not accumulated in agriculture, it is impossible to achieve high and stable rates of industrialisation. It is most important to attain the correct combination of industrialisation with the development of agriculture and a corresponding distribution of capital investments.

It is likewise necessary to find the correct correlation between the development of the traditional branches of light industry and that of the capital-consuming branches of heavy industry. As was noted in a number of the papers, the former guarantees more rapid returns on capital investments, which is extremely important where there is an acute shortage of capital. On the other hand, however, only the creation of its own heavy industry can provide a developing country with economic independence and the technical re-equipment of its entire economy, as well as more rapid rates of long-term economic development.

Besides the necessity for radical changes in the industrial structures of the economy, which has been distorted by colonialism, there exists in the countries of the Third World a no less acute need for reorganisation of the territorial structure, for progress in the backward regions and for an evening out of the regional levels of development. Speakers who dealt with this subject pointed to the indisputable necessity for a purposeful policy in developing backward regions. They also stressed that this problem should not be solved in isolation from the general tasks of economic and social development in a country as a whole. It was noted that the optimum correlation of investments must be found in backward and developed regions, where, if we consider the short-term prospects, these investments usually give more rapid returns on the capital invested.

Attention at the Symposium was focused on an analysis of the specific features of the social and economic structure of the developing countries, which stem from their colonial past and create particular difficulties in industrialising these countries.

One of these features is the "dualism" of the social and economic structure of the economy in general and of industry in particular. As was noted in the papers and reports, overall economic development cannot be achieved without eliminating this "dualism" and creating a single and integrated economic system.

At the Symposium an important place was given to the discussion of the role of small-scale industry in the process of industrialisation. Relying on tradition, primitive technology and being poorly connected with modern large-scale production, this industry is incapable of accomplishing the tasks of industrialisation on its own. But a lot of people are linked with small establishments, which play a definite role in decreasing unemployment. Thus, small-scale industry must be preserved for a considerably long period in the development of the countries of the Third World and must participate in the process of industrialisation.

In a number of papers and reports it was noted that this participation is possible only if small-scale production is modernised, if it acquires a modern scientific and technical basis and better cooperates with large-scale industry. The accomplishment of this task is connected with the general process of industrialisation and with the development of its most important component, that of large-scale manufacturing industry. In the final count, the elimination of unemployment does depend on the rate of development of that industry, although in the short term, the uncontrolled growth of the large-scale manufacturing industry can aggravate the employment situation. Although the solution of this problem is greatly connected with the rates and character of industrial development, it depends on some other factors as

well. The development of agriculture and of the infrastructure also plays an important role here.

In this connection, the question was broached of the need for a definite and purposeful policy in the development and use of equipment and technology—both on the scale of the whole country and in each individual branch of the economy—for the purpose of finding an optimum solution at each definite stage to both problems of increasing the productivity of labour and problems of employment.

The rates and effectiveness of industrialisation do to a large extent depend on its social and economic model and on the road of development chosen. The participants in the meeting concentrated on these ties. In their papers and reports they pointed out that industrialisation on the basis of "free enterprise" did not correspond to the interests of the masses in the developing countries. This enterprise whose driving force is the urge for profit, tends to be attracted to industries and territories where capital investments give the greatest immediate return. Therefore private capital cannot provide for the radical changes needed in the industrial and territorial structures of the economy in the developing countries. It cannot guarantee a rapid development of domestic engineering and technology to meet the demands of these countries. The growth of private enterprise presupposes the further long-term preservation of dependence on foreign monopoly capital and leads to the intensification of monopoly trends in the economy, to the rapid ruining of small-scale production and to the aggravation of unemployment.

It was noted at the Symposium that the increasing disparity in distribution of incomes connected with

the growth of private enterprise, far from leading to higher norms of accumulation and higher rates of economic development in the developing countries, holds it back. Creating greater demand among the rich strata of the population and relatively reducing the purchasing power of the masses of the people, the growing inequality tends to direct the structure of capital investment and production towards the manufacture of luxury articles to the detriment of the production of the most important consumer goods and of the means of production. Therefore, restriction of economic inequality and the unproductive consumption by the upper strata of the population is an important prerequisite for increased accumulation and rates of development.

The role played by the state in the process of industrialisation evoked lively discussion at the Symposium. Papers and reports on this question have stressed that it is precisely the development of the state sector and of state regulation that ensures the accomplishment of most complex tasks of industrialisation: increasing the norms of accumulation and capital investment on the scale of the whole economy; the creation of new capital-consuming branches of heavy industry; the development of backward regions; the development of engineering and technology to meet the needs of the developing countries to the utmost; the consolidation of economic ties within the economy and the transformation of the traditional small-scale production into more effective forms of economy; the restriction of foreign and local national capital; the reduction of social inequality, and so on.

Moreover, many participants in the Symposium warned against giving the state sector an absolute role

in the economy. They stressed that this role is determined by the social and economic structure of the country and the general social and economic course taken by the state. In the hands of different classes the state sector and state regulation play different roles and they can become an instrument for the development of capitalism or a means of socialist transformations.

The following questions were also discussed at the Symposium, which was marked by a high scientific level

CHRONICLE

* *The 23rd Session of the Commission of Historians of the USSR and the GDR devoted to the causes, character and consequences of the Second World War*, was held in Moscow. A delegation of scholars from the GDR headed by Academician H. Bartel and some 250 Soviet scientists took part in its work. Opening the session, the Vice-President of the USSR Academy of Sciences P. Fedoseyev drew attention to the fact that amidst the complex of scientific problems facing the participants in the conference, the connection between the history of the war and the present, between the events of thirty years ago and those of today, was being precisely traced. After the inaugural address by H. Bartel and two reports, one by Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences P. Zhilin on the political character and political consequences of the Second World War, and the other by Professor R. Brühl on the Soviet Army as the liberator of the German people from Hitler fascism,

This review covers events of March-May 1975.

and a creative and friendly atmosphere: the correlation of industrialisation and urbanisation; the influence of industrialisation on social institutions and on the social and class structure of society; the role of industrialisation in consolidating the national unity of a country; the effect of industrialisation on the economic position of various classes and strata of society.

O. Malyarov,
Cand. Sc. (Econ.)

the work of the session proceeded in sections where a large number of papers were heard in which German and Soviet historians threw light on various aspects of the origins, character and results of the Second World War.

* *The International Scientific Conference of Literary Critics devoted to the 30th anniversary of the victory over fascism* was held in Berlin. It was organised by the Central Institute of the History of Literature of the GDR Academy of Sciences and the Gorky Institute of World Literature of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The conference was attended by more than two hundred scholars from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the FRG, the GDR, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, the USSR and Yugoslavia. It was opened by Professor Ziegengeist, Director of the Central Institute of the History of Literature of the GDR Academy of Sciences. Professor W. Kalweit, Vice-President of the GDR Academy of Sciences, gave the speech of welcome. The conference stressed the invaluable role played by the Soviet Union and Soviet culture in the defeat of fascism, in

defending mankind's intransigent spiritual values and the importance of anti-fascist literary traditions in the struggle against imperialism today. A joint report entitled "On the Responsibility of Socialist Literature in Our Time" (A. Hiersche, E. Kowalski and L. Richter — GDR) spoke of the need to study the literatures of the socialist countries, taking into account the common features inherent in the literature of developed socialism and also bearing in mind the national traditions and specific cultural needs of each country. Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences G. Lomidze read the paper "Multinational Soviet Literature — the Keeper of History". Professor D. Schiller (GDR) gave a report entitled "Thoughts on Anti-fascist German Literature". At the conference there were three sections: "The Anti-fascist Alliance and Literature"; "The Literature of the Anti-fascist Resistance", and "Present-Day Socialist Literature in the Struggle Against Fascism and Imperialism".

*The Institute of Ethnography of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Leningrad Chemistry and Pharmaceutics Institute held an *All-Union Scientific Conference on "The Ethnographic Aspects of the Study of Folk Medicine"* in Leningrad. The participants in the conference included more than 150 ethnographers, biologists, medical researchers, physicians and pharmacists, representing nearly 60 scientific and research establishments and institutions of higher learning in the Union and autonomous republics. A paper by Y. Bromley, Director of the Institute of Ethnography of the USSR Academy of Sciences, was devoted to the prospects for a study of folk medicine by ethnographers in close contact with specialists in

medicine and biology. The following reports were also heard: G. Yakovlev — "On Folk, Traditional and Scientific Medicines"; A. Shreter — "The Use of Ethnographic and Linguistic Materials in Quests for New Medicaments of Vegetable Origin"; G. Nikolayeva — "The Medical and Biological Aspects of a Study of Folk Medicine" and others. Most of the papers and reports (about 60) were heard and discussed in four sections: paleomedicine and the medicines of early class societies, medicine of the Orient, the medicines of the peoples of Europe and the Caucasus, and medicinal plants.

* *The conference "The Latest Discoveries of Soviet Archaeologists"* in Kiev attracted some 400 archaeologists from all the Union republics of the USSR. Several papers were heard at the plenary sessions, among them reports on the results of archaeological explorations in the Ukraine in 1973-1975, on the progress made by a Soviet-Afghan expedition, on explorations of the ancient capital of Armenia, Artaxata, and so on. The paper by Academician B. Rybakov "The Fates of the Slavs in Ancient Times" evoked great interest. Some 200 papers and reports were heard and discussed in the eleven sections, dealing, in particular, with the Palaeolithic period, Neolithic period, Aeneolithic period and the Bronze Age, Early Iron Age, ancient archaeology, Slav and Russian archaeology, the theory and methodology of archaeological science.

* *The USSR-US Joint Symposium on Economic Issues* attended by representative delegations of scholars from both countries was held in Washington, D. C. The Soviet delegation was headed by

Academician T. Khachaturov, and the American delegation by Professor F. Machlup of Princeton University. The symposium was devoted to the effectiveness of capital investments and Soviet-American economic relations. The effectiveness of the integral programming of the development of natural resources was extensively discussed. At the end of the symposium Soviet economists went round a number of American universities and scientific establishments. In New York the Soviet delegation visited Columbia University and the National Bureau of Economic Research, where a seminar was held on the influence of the state on national and international economy. The delegation also visited Princeton University and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, and the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce of the University of Pennsylvania.

**The Scientific Conference on the "Formation of Nations in Central and South-East Europe"* organised by the Institute of Slavonic and Balkan Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences, was held in Moscow. Some 100 historians, ethnographers, philosophers, linguists, literary and art critics from many towns in the Soviet Union and also from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Hungary, Poland and Rumania took part in the conference. After the inaugural speech given by D. Markov, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the following papers were read: Y. Bromley, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences—"Ethnos—Nation—Nationality"; I. Miller—"The Formation of Nations. The Place Occupied by This Problem Amidst All the Processes of the Transition from Feudalism to

Capitalism in Central and South-East Europe"); V. Freidzon—"On the Principles Used in Dividing into Periods the Process of the Formation of Nations Among the Peoples of the 'Austrian Empire'"; A. Mylnikov—"The Stages of the Formation of National Consciousness at the Time of the Formation of Nations"; L. Obushenkova—"A Comparative Analysis of the Processes of the Formation of the Polish, Hungarian and Slovak Nations". Nearly 40 papers and reports on the following subjects were also heard: the general and the specific in the formation of nations; the economic and social aspects of the formation of nations; the linguistic aspects of the formation of nations; the history of the development of the conceptions of a nation; the development of national consciousness.

*More than 800 scholars attended the *Scientific Conference "The Philosophical Conflict of Ideas in Natural Science Today"* which was held in Moscow. The main papers were the following: "The Ideas of Lenin and the Struggle Against Anti-Materialistic Views in Natural Science Today" read by Academician P. Fedoseyev; "The Philosophical Conflict of Ideas Around the Problem of the Objective and the Subjective in Physics Today" by M. Omelyanovsky, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; "The Philosophical Conflict in Biology Today" by Academician N. Dubinin; "The Current Revolution in Astronomy and the Problems of World Outlook" by Academician V. Ambartsumyan (jointly with V. Kazyutinsky). Reports were also delivered by Academician M. Mitin—"The Problems of the Union of Philosophy and Natural Science in the Present-day Ideological Strug-

gle" and by Academician E. Fyodorov "The Scientific and Technological Revolution, Ecology, and the Struggle of Ideas on the Future of the Environment"), and also papers by Professors V. Barashenkov, V. Gott, V. Kuznetsov, S. Melyukhin, Y. Sachkov, B. Ukraintsev, and A. Ursul, throwing light on the conflict of ideas in the various fields of natural science.

**The 5th All-Union Symposium on Psycholinguistics and the Theory of Communication* was organised in Leningrad by the Institute of Linguistics of the USSR Academy of Sciences jointly with the Commission for Psycholinguistics under the Central Council of the Society of Psychologists of the USSR. The main subject dealt with at the symposium was "The Psycholinguistics of the Text". The participants included more than 200 scholars from 40 towns in the Soviet Union, among them psycholinguists, and also linguists, psychologists, sociologists, social psychologists, etc. The following questions were discussed: the coherence and entirety of the text; psycholinguistic and general psychological problems of communication; the linguistic problems involved in the creation and perception of the text; the psycholinguistic problems connected with the development of speech and learning a language; the psycholinguistic problems of the pathology of speech; experimental research of the text. At the plenary sessions general questions on the psycholinguistic analysis of the text were discussed, among them the arrangement of the text, the socio-psychological peculiarities of

the text and the function of various kinds of texts.

*A *theoretical conference "The New in the Theory of Socialist Realism"* was held in Moscow in the Academy of Social Sciences under the CC CPSU. The main report "On Some Unsettled Problems of the Theory of Socialist Realism" by L. Yakimenko, D. Sc. (Philol.), defined the three groups of problems under discussion: socialist realism as a qualitatively new type of creative writing; the poetics of the socialist creative method; the international significance of the literature of socialist realism and the present stage of the ideological struggle. Papers were read by D. Markov, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences—"Problems of Stylistic Differentiation in the Literature of Socialist Realism"; M. Parkhomenko, D. Sc. (Philol.)—"Current Problems of the Typology of Socialist Realism"; Z. Kedrina—"Some Peculiarities of Studying the Method of Socialist Realism as a Multinational Process"; T. Motyleva—"Moral Problems as a Sphere of the Manifestation of Partisanship"; N. Gei—"The Activeness of the Art of Socialist Realism"; L. Zemlyanova—"On the Struggle Between Marxist and Bourgeois Literary Criticisms in the USA"; Y. Surovtsev, Cand. Sc. (Philol.)—"On Socialist Realism as a Trend in Literature and Arts"; V. Gusev—"On the Romantic Style in Soviet Prose of Recent Years"; V. Dementyev—"Concept of the Lyrical Hero in Modern Soviet Poetry", and I. Golik—"The International Mission of Socialist Realism".

BOOK REVIEWS

ЛЕЛЬЧУК В. С. *Социалистическая индустриализация СССР и ее освещение в советской историографии*. М., изд-во «Наука», 1975, 312 стр.

LELCHUK V. S., *Socialist Industrialisation in the USSR and Its Analysis in Soviet Historiography*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1975, 312 pp.

The historical experience in the transformation of the USSR into an industrialised socialist state is of tremendous scientific and practical importance. The generalisation of this experience is still meaningful for the struggle against bourgeois ideology.

The book under review contains an analysis of the extensive writings on the problem and a characteristic of the stages and specific features of socialist industrialisation. The author sets forth Lenin's views of the industrial revolution and industrial development in pre-revolutionary Russia, characterising the course and specific features of capitalist industrialisation. Russia was one of the medium-developed countries where the victory of a proletarian revolution in the early 20th century turned out to be the most probable.

Lenin's ideas have been decisive in determining the way of building the material and technical basis of socialism in the USSR. The concrete analysis of the starting lines for the industrialisation of the USSR helps to clarify the specific features of its various stages. The author is quite right in opposing the narrow view of industrialisation as amounting to the construction of a modern technical basis. Socialist industrialisation was a success only because it was directed by the Communist Party, involving the realisation of the ideas of scientific socialism and the development of creative activity among millions of working people. One important result of industrialisation was the final establishment of the socialist form of property in the towns, the elimination of unemployment, and the emergence of millions of skilled Soviet workers.

The author shows that industrialisation in the non-Russian republics and regions differed in pace and proportions. At the same time, tasks like the build-up of new branches of large-scale industry, the winning of technical and economic independence and the strengthening of the country's defence capacity could be fulfilled, and were in fact

fulfilled, only on the scale of the whole Soviet Union.

In 1975, it was 50 years since the adoption of the historic decisions on industrialisation by the 14th Congress of the CPSU(B). The reader

will find many interesting items in this book about the origins of these decisions and the successes in realising them.

Professor V. Drobizhev,
Dr. Sc. (Hist.)

КУМАНЕВ В. А. *Революция и просвещение масс*. М., изд-во «Наука», 1973, 336 стр.

KUMANEV V. A., *The Revolution and the Education of the Masses*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1973, 336 pp.

This monograph is a notable contribution to the historiography of the cultural revolution in the USSR generally and of the Soviet system of education in particular.

In addition to presenting basic theoretical principles and a description of literature and sources, the foreword gives a brief critical review of Western historiography.

Kumanev shows the great importance of Lenin's theoretical and practical work to the cultural revolution in a formerly backward country. Lenin devoted unremitting attention to the problem of education in view of its extreme urgency and organic link with the country's economic and general cultural rejuvenation and the strengthening of its political system.

Kumanev begins his study with a review of the state of education in pre-revolutionary Russia, including the non-Russian areas. The next four chapters are devoted to the victory of the October Revolution and the beginning of mass education; the transition to peaceful construction after the First World War and the education of adults; the socialist reconstruction of the national economy and the problem of trained

cadres; the victory of socialism and the upsurge of mass education. In the closing section the author describes the international significance of the Soviet experience of organising education and entirely eradicating illiteracy.

He shows that the Communist Party has always regarded the education and training of the workers and peasants as an integral and indivisible process of the moulding of the new man, of the conscious fighter for socialism, that from the very first days of the revolution education was the front of a bitter class struggle.

The author notes the unfading value of the experience accumulated during the early phase of the work of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government in the sphere of education, a stage that saw quests and inestimable solutions, particularly in drawing up the programmes and methods of educating children and adults. Kumanev has gathered extremely interesting material on the role played by public organisations in disseminating elementary knowledge, on cultural progress in the countryside and on the cultural revolution in the Soviet Eastern republics, and in particular, on the solution of the problem of a written language in these republics.

The speedy abolition of illiteracy and cultural backwardness was part of the work of implementing Lenin's plan for the country's postwar economic rehabilitation and the direct building of socialism.

Socialist economic reconstruction, launched in the latter half of the 1920s, became the principal factor of the further advance of the cultural revolution. Kumanev deals at length with problems that were crucial during the years of the First Five-Year Plan. These problems included the acute shortage of skilled labour, the moulding of a new people's intelligentsia, the training and education of worker reinforcements that were coming en masse from the countryside, and the speediest elimination of illiteracy among the peasants who had taken the road of production cooperation. A solid foundation for

resolving the problem of cadres and consolidating the Soviet economy and culture had been built by the end of the First Five-Year Plan period.

The last chapter describes the upswing of mass education in the 1930s in connection with the victory of socialism in the USSR, when the aim was not only to achieve universal elementary literacy but to reach the level of knowledge that, as Nadezhda Krupskaya wrote, was necessary for labour productivity, for fruitful social work and for the reorganisation of life on socialist principles.

A. Silenko

ИГРИЦКИЙ Ю. И. *Мифы буржуазной историографии и реальность истории. Современная американская и английская историография Великой Октябрьской социалистической революции.* М., изд-во «Мысль», 1974, 271 стр.

IGRITSKY Y. I., *The Myths of Bourgeois Historiography and the Reality of History. Modern American and English Historiography of the Great October Socialist Revolution,* Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1974, 271 p.

The object of Y. Igritsky's research is more than a hundred works by English and American scholars. The author concentrates on an analysis of books which have made the most appreciable mark on Western Sovietology, either due to the attempt of their authors to make an objective analysis of the first socialist revolution, or, on the contrary, due to their active participation in working out anti-communist con-

cepts of the October Revolution. Igritsky attempts to describe the main stages in the development of the Anglo-American historiography of the October Revolution, to trace the evolution and explain the class purpose of the concepts of certain historians. In particular, the author deals with the positions of E. Ross, W. Chamberlin, L. Shapiro, R. Daniels, L. Kochan, J. Carmichael, T. von Laue, J. Clarkson, O. Radkey and A. Ulam. The works of E. Carr are analysed in less detail, and this may be because they require special critique.

The first chapter throws light on the development of bourgeois historiography from 1917 to the end of the fifties. The following chapters deal with individual problems: a critical analysis of the bourgeois historiography of the sixties and the beginning of the seventies given in such a way as to disprove the main outlines of Sovietology (denial of the historical regularity and the conditions on which the October Revolution as a socialist revolution and its democratic, popular character de-

pendent, the accusation that the Bolsheviks "did away with freedom and democracy" and founded "the dictatorship of the party"). Igritsky points out the contradictions in the ideas of bourgeois historians, at the same time recording their interesting observations and judgements which go beyond the framework of the conceptions shared by Western authors.

The author looks into the entire spectrum of the views of bourgeois historians on the nature of the October Revolution, defines modifications in their conceptions in the sixties and seventies, which reflect the peculiarities of the contemporary stage in the ideological and political struggle between socialism and capitalism. In the book bourgeois Sovietologists are divided into three main groups. The first group includes those who consider that the October Revolution occurred as a result of the specific features inherent in the development of the so-called backward countries whose goal is to catch up with the economically advanced countries in the shortest possible space of time. The second group concentrates on the political reasons for the overthrow of both the monarchic and the bourgeois-landowner governments, i.e., they underestimate the dependence of the October Revolution on social conditions. And, finally, the third group believe that even in the conditions existing in Russia the October Revolution might never have occurred.

Criticising the concept of the "undemocratic nature" of the October Revolution, Igritsky exposes the erroneous interpretation of the interrelation between the masses and the revolutionary party in the revolution. In answer to the bourgeois authors who assert that the Bolsheviks were

victorious thanks to the "manipulating" with the masses, Igritsky remarks: "The facts, documents and research by Soviet historians convincingly show that at the time of the October Revolution the Russian masses were not in the least 'benighted', passive, disposed to anarchy and easily subject to 'manipulation'. For the Constitutional Democrats, the Mensheviks, and the S.R.'s (members of the Socialist Revolutionary Party), at whose disposal were both the means of coercion and the official propaganda machine which had a far better material base than that of the Bolsheviks, were not able to 'manipulate' the masses."

Y. Igritsky argues that bourgeois historians misconstrue the interrelation between the Bolshevik Party and the Soviets and, in point of fact, they evade the issue of the support given the Bolsheviks by the Soviets. He refutes the erroneous judgement of the attitude of the masses of the workers, soldiers and sailors towards the armed uprising planned by the Bolshevik Party headed by Lenin.

The last chapter contains convincing criticism of bourgeois historiography on questions of the organisation of power after the victory of the socialist revolution. In particular, the historical justification of the dismissal of the bourgeois Constituent Assembly is pointed out. The solution of the political crisis caused by the Constituent Assembly and the confirmation of the absolute rule of the Soviets, writes the author, were in the interests of the overwhelming majority of the people who approved the measures taken by Soviet power on issues of war and peace, its nationalities policy and the first socialist changes in the economy.

I. Olegina

ПЛЕТНЕВ Э. П. *Космополитизм капитала и интернационализм пролетариата*. М., изд-во «Международные отношения», 1974, 160 стр.

PLETNEV E. P., *The Cosmopolitanism of Capital and the Internationalism of the Proletariat*. Moscow, Mezhdunarodniye Otnosheniya Publishers, 1974, 160 pp.

The new type of international monopolies that has appeared in the capitalist economy since the war is attracting swiftly growing attention throughout the world and evoking arguments and debates. There is as yet not even an accepted term to designate the new monopolies.

E. P. Pletnev justifiably considers that the crux of the matter is, needless to say, not in the name but in giving a comprehensive idea of this phenomenon's essence. He has set himself the aim of ascertaining how, in the process of the internationalisation of capitalist production, the cosmopolitan interlocking of capital (the formation of supranational concerns) takes place and how the ranging of capital formation beyond national boundaries affects the extent to which the international proletariat is exploited and the efficacy of its class struggle. Pletnev examines the objective process of the internationalisation of all areas of life, including the economy and wage labour in capitalist society.

Among the many specifics distinguishing the multinational enterprise from the usual monopolies, most researchers note the former's enormous economic might. As a rule, the industrial giants spread beyond the national market and, alongside the mother company, have innumerable

branches in various countries. In the early 1960s, 200 industrial corporations were in control of nearly one-third of the capitalist world's output. It is estimated that at the beginning of the 1990s from two-thirds to three-quarters of that output will be in the hands of between 200 and 300 companies. The economic potential of the multinational enterprises is growing almost three times quicker than the entire capitalist economy. It is indicative that the largest and most powerful European concerns are of US origin. Three-quarters of the multinational enterprises are run by US financial groups that are bringing increasing pressure to bear on the economic life of other countries. But there are multinational monopolies with mother companies in Britain, France, the FRG, Holland, Japan and other countries. This fact alone makes untenable the attempts of some people, Pletnev contends, to portray these monopolies as a purely US phenomenon.

The multinational enterprises' economic policy, which can hardly be brought under state control and is often aggressive, has inevitably generated a new type of contradictions in the capitalist world. The multinational enterprises find themselves in conflict not only with other but also with their own governments. For instance, despite the US Government's benevolent attitude to the multinational enterprises, officials here not without reason accuse the supergiants of taking out of the country many thousands of workplaces by channelling investments overseas. The multinational enterprises find themselves in even deeper and sharper conflict with foreign economic complexes. The government concerned has very little means of controlling the multinational enterprises, while the latter have

the most diverse means of pressuring that government.

While disseminating new technology and some scientific and technological achievements throughout the world, the multinational monopolies prefer to have full possession of the fundamental sources of these achievements and usually do not permit their subsidiaries to engage in serious research. The reluctance of the multinational enterprises, by virtue of their monopolist nature, to contribute to the effective levelling up of the economies of different countries creates the material basis for the emergence of new contradictions of the capitalist system.

The main distinguishing feature, Pletnev stresses, springs from the huge capital accumulated by the multinational enterprises and the international concentration of production, as well as from other material conditions. This feature is their global approach to investments and the formation of capital, in other words, their approach to the capitalist world economy as a single sphere of investment and a universal source of investment capital. The multinational enterprises not only regard the entire world as a potential source of revenue but are, in fact, turning the capitalist portion of the planet into their source of profit.

Thus, unhampered investment in different countries and privileged access to the financial resources of these countries (one cannot but agree with this crucial argument) constitute the new specific, without which the other characteristics of the multinational enterprises are easily discerned in the old forms of monopoly associations.

This makes it obvious that capital's cosmopolitan character, re-

vealed by Karl Marx, has grown more pronounced in our age, which is witnessing the establishment of supranational monopolies whose characteristics are indifference to where capital is invested, impersonality, flexibility and mobility, and which regard non-national profit as supreme and flout the sovereignty of states. The supranational approach of the multinational enterprises to the formation of capital, i.e., the mobilisation and investment of capital outside state boundaries, predetermines their supranational approach to the hire and employment of labour power. This is seen in the monopoly selection and utilisation of the most efficient labour power, which give the multinational enterprises a financial and technical advantage over local entrepreneurs and also the advantage that they can pay higher wages and salaries.

However, it would be a mistake to regard the multinational enterprises as lavish benefactors bringing employment and abundance to working people. Their penetration into the economies of a steadily growing number of countries enhances the organic structure of capital in these countries and thereby leads to a relative reduction of the demand for labour. Multinational enterprises throw manpower out into the street more intensively than reemploy it.

As regards the higher wages and salaries paid by the multinational enterprises' subsidiaries, this "boon" conceals labour exploitation of a degree which is higher than the mean national level. The multinational enterprises do not raise the wages of local personnel to the level of their country of origin. Nonetheless, a certain raise in wages that they get compels the local personnel to work excessively hard and abide by the stricter organisation of labour. The

latter circumstance evokes discontent among workers and the striving to safeguard themselves against superexploitation by means of strikes.

Eruptions of class conflicts are extremely dangerous to the multinational enterprise, for a condition of the efficient operation of their concerns is the continuity of the production cycle from a factory in one country to a factory in another. Hence its striving to site factories where the labour force is "more pliant", in other words, poorly organised, divided, ruled by dictatorships, and so on. It forms its work personnel of several and even several scores of nationalities, for it is interested in having a psychologically atomised "collective" that does not mix during their leisure hours.

Pletnev closely examines the essential changes that have taken place in the conditions of the struggle waged by the proletariat following

the appearance of multinational enterprises and convincingly shows that gradually, with the accumulation of experience and the evolution of new forms of the international organisation of workers, the "lull" in this struggle is giving way to mounting class conflicts at the factories operated by multinational enterprises.

The emergence of cosmopolitan associations of capital, which are a new phenomenon of capitalist reality, have unprecedented possibilities for subjecting the proletariat to superexploitation, and represent a huge and highly manoeuvrable force in the class struggle, and heighten the importance of the internationalist education of the working people. Proletarian internationalism, international working-class solidarity, the working people's united action and trade union cohesion today acquire new qualities.

M. Karamanov

ЛУРИЯ А. Р. *Об историческом развитии психических процессов*. М., изд-во «Наука», 1974, 172 стр.

LURIYA A. R., *The Historical Development of Mental Processes*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1974, 172 pp.

The principle whereby human psychology is conditioned and changed in the course of the historical development of society is a basic principle of psychological science. A. Luriya's book makes a substantial contribution to the development of this principle. It brings out the specific mechanisms and conditions

under which man's mental activity is transformed as a result of a fundamental change in the socio-economic structure of society. It sums up and explains the results of psychological researches carried out in the remote areas of Uzbekistan in the period of the radical reorganisation of the socio-economic structure brought about by the October Revolution. The aim of the study was to ascertain whether the change of socio-historical structures and the changes in the nature of social practice entailed no more than an expansion of experience; or whether they led to a basic remoulding of the pattern of mental processes, to a change in the level of mental activity, to the formation of new psychological systems.

The unique feature of the study is particularly evident when compared with the works of some other representatives of contemporary historical psychology—Meyerson, Vernan, Mandrou, etc. These authors, too, have studied the changing of human psychology at turning points in the history of society, for instance, in the period of Ancient Greece's transition from the Homeric epoch, from the primitive-communal system to the classical era and Hellenism. In so doing they apply the methods of historical science, attempting to recreate, from the survivals of spiritual and material cultures, certain peculiarities of the mentality of men who lived in the past epochs. A. Luriya's work, on the contrary, is a psychological study carried out by means of experimental-psychological methods, with elements of instructional experimentation.

In the first chapter of the book the author expounds the initial methodological principles of his research, defines its place in the elucidation of the problem concerning the socio-historical nature of man, and describes the conditions and methods of his study. He makes a penetrating and well-grounded critical analysis of the basic concepts in the study of psychological processes at different stages in the development of society and in the context of different cultures, and examines in this connection the views of E. Durkheim, L. Lévy-Bruhl, C. Lévy-Strauss, R. Thurnwald, F. Boas, M. Mead, J. Bruner, M. Cole and many other representatives of psychological, sociological, anthropological and ethnographical thought. This analysis has made it possible to bring out the progressive tendencies in comparative psychological researches, and to deduce the principle

of considering the specifics of the mental activity of man in different societies in closest connection with the specifics of his practical activity and his language. This principle acknowledges the fact that the basic forms of mental processes are common for all stages of historical development, since they are determined by certain common social conditions of human existence. The author, however, refutes the oversimplified theory, put forward by E. Sapir and B. L. Whorf, of direct parallelism between language and thinking. The book proves that language participates in different ways in the formation of various mental processes, that a word or a grammatical form often conveys diverse systems of semantic communications, and that the same vocabulary may represent entirely different forms of generalising phenomena.

In subsequent chapters the author outlines the results of a comparative study of perception, the processes of abstraction and generalisation, inference deduction and conclusion, reasoning and solution of problems, imagination, self-analysis and self-awareness among diverse groups of the population—from illiterate peasant women to girl students. The results of the study convincingly bear out the author's hypothesis about the historical formation of psychological processes understood as complex systemic-semantic, functional entities whose structure is determined by socially conditioned types of human activity. Hence it follows that socio-historical advances not only introduce new content in the psychological world of man, but lead to the creation of new forms of conscious activity, of new structures of cognitive processes, and raises the human mind to new levels.

Finally, the book shows the social conditions and the stages of the realisation by the individual of his psychological characteristics and his traits—from the peculiarities of his outward behaviour as described by others, peculiarities which are not infrequently identified with the characteristics of the social group to which he belonged (to a team, section or a collective farm), through a situational description of one's characterological qualities, to the categorial analysis of one's own motives and inner qualities. The author attributes this evolution of the process of realisation to the qualitative transformation of the forms of communication in the structure of collective forms of activity, which require joint planning and discussion of the effectiveness of the work done by a given team and its members.

Having conclusively proved the necessity for a historical approach to man's mental activity and that it is conditioned by socially determined forms of creative activity, this study projects two important theoretical questions. The first one concerns definition of the nature of thinking, necessitated by the domination of the look-and-do forms of practice. The second is related to the connection of this thinking with logical discursive cogitation. This issue becomes particularly pressing in the light of the striking fact that short instructional courses prove to be adequate for the emergence of a structure of categorial abstract thinking. Answering the first question, the author defines thought formed through practical experience as that of the look-and-do type. He speaks of the "look-and-do forms of

generalisation", of the "look-and-do, situational nature of thought". Yet the whole content of the research, the pattern of the experiments and the very interesting records of the experiments permit to assume that this type of thought is rather of the nature of graphic-intuitive or even, according to J. Piaget's classification, specific-operational thought. The closeness of this type of thought to the categorial-logical may partially explain why the latter easily takes shape under the influence of instruction.

This proposition can supplement the author's invaluable explanation of the formation, in the process of collective work and instruction, of new motives, which promote the actualisation of abstract cogitative systems (latent but regarded as "something inessential"), and the formation of new logical structures.

In addition to the above-mentioned questions, the research raises a number of important theoretical problems pertaining to different forms of motivation inherent in various cogitative structures; to the possibility of preserving and handing down from generation to generation complex cognitive structures—the heritage of the ancient lofty culture of Uzbekistan, which exist potentially side by side with more elementary structures, and to other issues.

A. Luriya's book is an important and, it may be said without exaggeration, a unique contribution to the methodology and theory of psychological science and to the development of its basic principle of historicism.

L. Antsyferova

ИЛЬЕНКОВ Э. В. *Диалектическая логика. Очерки истории и теории*. М., Политиздат, 1974, 271 стр.

ILYENKOV E. V., *Dialectical Logic. Essays on History and Theory*, Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1974, 271 pp.

The fundamental task the author has set himself is to ascertain the conditions and premises and specify some primary principles of the complex work that went into the creation of Logic in its Leninist understanding. Aware of the difficulties of this task, he notes the importance of collective efforts to interlock the chapters of the future *Logic*, the completed sections of the edifice under construction, into a dialectically integral whole.

He concentrates mainly on uncovering the content of a number of conceptions entering into the definition of logic, notably the conception of "thinking". He writes that "to determine this conception in its entirety, i. e., concretely, means to write *Logic*, for the true determination may be given by no means in a 'definition' but in 'unfolding the substance of the matter'".

This book consists of two interrelated parts: the first—"From the History of Dialectics"; and the second—"Some Questions of the Marxist-Leninist Theory of Dialectics".

In the first part the author considers the historico-philosophical solutions of philosophy's central problem, namely, the problem of the relationship between thinking and "things outside thinking", the coincidence of forms of thinking with forms of activity, i. e., the problems of truth, or the problems of the identity of thinking and being. An extremely interesting analysis is of-

fered of the logico-philosophical views of Spinoza.

Ilyenkov justifiably underscores Spinoza's great significance to the history of dialectics, his immense contribution to the development of logic. This high appraisal is reinforced with a review of Spinoza's thinking as an attribute of substance.

Spinoza's idea, which was brilliant for its profundity and simplicity, was that thinking and length were not two substances but only two attributes of one and the same substance. It allowed finding a real way out of the impasse of the dualism of mind and body, cut the Gordian knot of the so-called "psychophysical problem". Another reason, as Spinoza showed, why this problem could not be resolved earlier was that it was wrongly formulated.

Needless to say, Spinoza resolved this problem only on the general theoretical, methodological level. But even this "only" was enough for Spinoza, as the author points out, to "enter the history of science as an equal participant in its progress alongside Galileo and Newton".

Ilyenkov uses this example to examine a more general problem: the attitude of philosophy as a special science to particular natural scientific studies. The author is right when in criticising the positivist "negation" of philosophy as a science, he writes that fundamentally Spinoza's attitude cannot be explained if as one's point of departure one takes the notion that philosophy owed and will owe all its successes to a purely empirical "generalisation of the achievements of the natural sciences contemporary to it". For a comprehensive analysis we feel that it would have been appropriate to touch on the dangers harboured by a purely natural philosophical approach that turns philosophical

reasoning into fruitless speculations.

Much of this work is devoted to an analysis of the contribution that was made to Logic by leading representatives of German classical philosophy, the direct predecessors of the philosophy of Marxism. They, it is noted in the book, clearly realised and cogently expressed the fact that in one way or another all the problems of philosophy as a special science revolve round the question of the essence of thinking and its relationship with the external world.

To this day this remains a burning question to the development and improvement of natural scientific knowledge (as has been shown, for instance, by the physics of the microworld), and this process continues to move in the same direction, bringing to light the relativity and unilateral character of opposite conceptions and the need for their dialectical unity. This is the inevitable outcome of the fact, indicated by Lenin, that "natural science shows us ... the transitions, modulations, and the reciprocal connection of opposites" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 38, p. 362).

The most interesting section in this book is, in our opinion, devoted to Hegel's solution of the question of the subject of logic. It was due to Hegel that all the basic conceptions of logical science, chiefly the conception of thinking, were subjected to a most thorough analysis for the first time. After establishing the distinction between thinking "in itself" and thinking "for itself", Hegel drew the conclusion that in logic thinking "in itself" must become thinking "for itself". In Hegel's *Science of Logic*, the science of thinking, its forms, laws, content, process of development and so forth are scrupulously examined. Hegel showed that human activity includes

as one of its phases the act of realising thinking in an object action and, through action, in the form of things and events outside consciousness, and thereby, to use the words of Lenin, "came very close to materialism" (Ibid., p. 278).

The author deals at length with the three basic aspects of the sphere of the logical distinguished by Hegel: 1) abstract or rational, 2) dialectical or negatively sensible, and 3) speculatively or positively sensible. This, the author points out, is the basis on which logic is created, guided by which thinking becomes self-critical in full measure and no longer risks sinking into the stupidity of dogmatism or into the barrenness of sceptical neutrality.

Giving reasoned arguments against any superficial criticism of the Hegelian understanding of logic and its subject, in which the antithesis between the subjective and the objective (the world of thinking and the world of things outside consciousness) is allegedly ignored, the author shows that Hegel was aware of the distinction and contradiction between them much more acutely than his neo-Kantian and even neopositivist critics.

Ilyenkov does not confine himself to paying a tribute of respect to Hegel, his dialectics and positive achievements, which constitute an epoch in logic as a science. He deals also with the infirmities of Hegel's idealism, which were understood and surmounted by Marxism. "The deep-rooted failings of Hegelian dialectics", he writes, "are linked directly with idealism, as a result of which dialectics is easily converted into a mode of subtle, logically refined apologia of everything that exists."

As the author quite rightly points out, it became possible to surmount

the Hegelian conception of thinking and its objective-idealistic illusions, to preserve the positive results of Hegel's logic and, at the same time, purge them of mystical speculations only by a revolutionary-critical attitude to the world of alienation, to the world of commodity-capitalist relations. Precisely this was the attitude of Marxism.

Ilyenkov shows in detail how this problem was resolved by Marx and Engels. One of their services to history was that they established the fact that the individual sees the external world not simply and not directly as it exists in itself but only in the process of its change by man. The real equivalent of logical forms was found not in the abstract-general contours of the object seen by the individual but in the forms of human activity that changes the surrounding world. Correspondingly, the subject of thinking proved to be the individual in a combination of social relations; torn away from this social "context" he thinks as much as a brain removed from the body of man.

It is precisely in this, the author notes, that the problem of the nature of human thinking, the problem of the ideal rises to its full stature. It was adequately understood in Marxism as the product and form of spiritual production, as the result of the function of labour, of the sensual-object activity of the social man, of the remaking of nature by the labour of generations succeeding one another in the course of historical development. "For that reason the principal change that Marx and Engels introduced into the materialistic understanding of the nature of the ideal concerned mainly the active aspect of the attitude of thinking man to nature, in other words, the aspect that was developed chiefly, to use

Lenin's expression, by the 'intelligent' idealism of the Plato—Fichte—Hegel line and was abstractly-unilaterally, idealistically accentuated by them."

The problem of the coincidence of logic with dialectics and the materialist theory of knowledge is given considerable attention. This problem has occupied an important place in Lenin's philosophical legacy.

The author characterises in detail the Leninist understanding of the unity of logic, dialectics and the theory of knowledge, which represents the substance of dialectical materialism. He shows how the rupture between "gnosiology" and "ontology" which is a characteristic of past and present bourgeois philosophy, was surmounted. It is only on this basis that one can correctly understand Lenin's proposition that dialectics constitutes the logic and theory of knowledge.

Ilyenkov discusses the meaning of Lenin's famous formulation of the subject of logic, making a detailed textological analysis of its fundamental difference from Hegel's conception: "Logic is the science not of external forms of thought, but of the laws of development 'of all material, natural and spiritual things', i. e., of the development of the entire concrete content of the world and of its cognition, i. e., the sum-total, the conclusion of the *History of knowledge of the world*" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, pp. 92-93). Ilyenkov gives an argued criticism of the attempts to interpret the relationship of dialectics, logic and the theory of knowledge in Marxism in such a way that dialectics is turned into a special ontology, while logic and the theory of knowledge into special sciences albeit linked with dialectics but not merging with it and devoted solely to "specific" forms of

the reflection of the above-mentioned "ontology" in the consciousness of people: one (gnosiology) consists of "specific" forms of cognition, while the other (logic)—of "specific" forms of discursive thinking. In this connection, the author correctly emphasises that under this interpretation if dialectics is not regarded as the logic and theory of knowledge of material-

ism it becomes a dead pattern and turns into a sum of examples.

This book is unquestionably a contribution to the elaboration of the theory of Marxist dialectics and will stimulate further research into dialectics as logic, into its growing methodological role in modern scientific knowledge.

A. Pozner,
Cand. Sc. (Philos.)

ГРИНЕВИЧ Э. А. *Куба: путь к победе революции*. М., изд-во «Наука», 1975, 237 стр.

GRINEVICH E. A., *Cuba: Road to the Victory of the Revolution*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1975, 237 pp.

The Cuban revolution, which added a vivid page to the chronicle of the liberation struggle of peoples, has always had the close attention, solidarity and support of Soviet people. "The peoples of the Soviet Union and of Cuba are comrades-in-arms in a common struggle, and their friendship is firm"—this laconic statement in the CPSU Central Committee's report to the 24th Congress of the CPSU gives the essence of the attitude of the Communists and the entire people of the Soviet Union to the first socialist country in the Western Hemisphere.

The Cuban revolution was destined to be the first to translate into reality the general truth of Marxism-Leninism in the concrete conditions of Latin America. It eloquently showed the Latin American peoples that, to use the words of Fidel Castro, "in our epoch a genuine revolution and genuine independence can only be founded on socialist, anti-imperialist and internationalist principles". In this lies the immense historic service rendered by

the Cuban revolution and also the reason that there is such great interest in its experience. From the scientific standpoint it is of great importance to study the revolution's motive forces and analyse the internal political developments, the formation of the revolutionary vanguard that headed the struggle of the Cuban working people, and the forms and methods of action that ensured victory.

Many books, pamphlets and papers on various aspects of the Cuban revolution have been published in recent years throughout the world. Much attention is given to this subject by Soviet scholars, who have made a large contribution to the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the revolutionary process in Cuba. However, some important periods and problems of the Cuban revolution have as yet been inadequately studied. This omission is to some extent rectified by Grinevich, who writes of Cuba's political development in the period from 1952 to 1959, i. e., from the moment power was seized by the Batista military-police clique to the victory of the revolution.

Of course, the ground for the revolution had been prepared by the struggle of the Cuban people against Spanish colonial oppression and by the militant actions of workers, peas-

ants, students and intellectuals against capitalist exploitation and imperialist domination. All this is vividly described in the first chapter, which speaks of the revolutionary traditions of the Cuban people's struggle for liberation.

In subsequent chapters, using many sources, including studies by Soviet historians, economists and sociologists, the author analyses the political and economic situation in pre-revolutionary Cuba, traces the bankruptcy of the bourgeois political parties, brings to light the causes that led to the establishment of a dictatorial regime, describes how the revolutionary situation matured and the revolution developed up to the overthrow of Batista and gives details of the assault on the Moncada, the landing of the *Granma* and the heroic Sierra Maestra epic.

Grinevich vividly depicts the role played by the proletariat in the Cuban revolution. Using concrete examples, he shows how by pinning down considerable forces of the tyrannical regime the mass actions of the workers helped the operations of

the insurgents, how the general strike at the concluding phase of the struggle was a decisive factor enabling the people to achieve final victory.

He writes in detail of how the revolutionary forces attained unity, which was the key condition for a successful struggle against the dictatorship. This book gives readers a sound understanding of the process by which the revolutionary vanguard of the Cuban people was formed, a process that at first led to a virtual alliance and ultimately to the merging of the July 26 Movement, the Popular Socialist Party (Communist) and the Revolutionary Directory of March 13 on the basis of a Marxist-Leninist platform, and to the creation of the Communist Party of Cuba, which heads the building of socialism.

Grinevich's book is yet another contribution by Soviet Latin American studies to the elaboration of problems related to the Cuban revolution.

O. Darusenkov

ЛАВРЕЦКИЙ И. *Сальвадор Альенде*. М., изд-во «Молодая гвардия», 1974, 288 стр.

LAVRETSKY I., *Salvador Allende*, Moscow, Molodaya Gvardiya Publishers, 1974, 288 pp.

The events that have swept Chile in recent years have attracted worldwide attention. And it is only natural that this attention should be focused on Salvador Allende as the political figure who personified the attempt to effect by constitutional means radical socio-economic reforms with a socialist perspective—the attempt made by the Popular Unity Govern-

ment he headed. The interest in Allende's personality intensified after he had been murdered by mutineers; he died while fighting, thus showing an example of a revolutionary's heroism, courage and unswerving fidelity to his duty.

Scores of books and thousands of articles have been written about Allende, particularly after September 11, 1973. Those which have recently come out in Chile pursue the object of justifying the coup and complicity in it by slandering his actions and vilifying his memory. An example of such publications is *A Brief History of the Popular Unity*

Bloc, put out by the editors of the newspaper *Mercurio*. It sets out to convince the reader that Allende, far from being a democrat and a champion of the country's independent development, was in the service of what it calls "the sinister plans of international communism". Similar fabrications are concocted by the Christian Democrats headed by Eduardo Frei, who may be said to have been co-authors of the coup and are now trying to cover up their complicity in it with every questionable arguments. Their stand is reflected in H. Arriagada's book *From the Chilean Path to the Path of Insurrection*, which tries to prove that Allende, despite his assurances, allegedly profoundly despised the democratic system.

But this is not kind of literature that predominates in the stream of books and articles about Allende. Most of the works that have appeared abroad do justice to him as a political figure and examine the factors that caused the defeat of his government. But since the authors of these works have different political beliefs, they do not always come to similar conclusions, and they draw different lessons from the events in Chile.

The book *Salvador Allende*, put out in Moscow and written by the prominent Soviet Latin-Americanist I. Lavretsky, meets the interest of Soviet people in the events in Chile and voices their feeling of solidarity with the democratic forces of that country (Moscow's Progress Publishers is preparing a translation of the book into Spanish). This is not a biography in the accepted sense for the author does not aim at tracing Allende's life year by year. He shows the close relationship between the course of the country's social and political struggles and the forma-

tion of Allende's political career, and tells of how he became one of the main architects of what is called the "forty years of peace" in the history of Chile.

The author rightly notes that the decades of constitutional rule (beginning from late 1932) created an illusion that Chile had become a republic with a "special" democratic, peaceful path of development. However, a more careful study of the events of that period reveals a far more complex and contradictory picture. During the social conflicts that shook the country at the time, the ruling classes not infrequently resorted to force of arms to suppress the actions of the exploited. Suffice it to mention the massacre of workers in Santiago's working-class district of José-María-Caro in 1962, of striking workers at the El Salvador copper mine in 1965, and of homeless families in the town of Puerto Montt in 1969.

I. Lavretsky's book discusses Allende's political merits, by virtue of which he became a leader of the people's liberation movement. Allende had, above all, a correct understanding of the historic tasks on whose solution the country's social progress depended. The principal task was to abolish the domination of foreign imperialism and local bourgeois-landlord oligarchy, not for the sake of establishing an "independent capitalism", but for the sake of the socialist perspective. Allende also understood what was needed to achieve these goals—unification of the anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchy forces around the working class so as to secure power for the people. And, finally, he was well aware of the exceptional importance in the context of Chile of the alliance of the two main working-class parties—the Socialist Party (Allende

himself was one of its founders), and the Communist Party.

Not only was Allende an adherent of these views, he actively worked for their implementation. The book carefully traces the main landmarks in Allende's activities: the setting up of the Popular Front in 1936, the victory of its candidate in the presidential elections of 1938, Allende's participation in the Popular Front government; the formation, on the basis of the Socialist-Communist alliance, of the Popular Front in 1951 and of the Popular Action Front (FRAP) in 1956, the nomination of Allende as a candidate of the Left forces in the presidential elections of 1952, 1958 and 1964; the struggle to expand the Left coalition beyond the bounds of FRAP and the establishment in 1969 of the Popular Unity bloc; finally, Allende's victory in the 1970 elections and the advent to power of his popular government. This was a long ascent to the top, on the way to which many obstacles had to be overcome. Allende showed a persistence and purposefulness in overcoming them that can only be envied.

They deserve special mention because one of the obstacles in Allende's way was the anti-communist and sectarian sentiments in the ranks of his own party. The author of the book explains that this circumstance was due to the various trends within the Socialist Party reflecting the instability of the semi-proletarian and petty-bourgeois strata. It is to Salvador Allende's credit, Lavretsky writes, that he never belonged to any anti-communist trends, never shared their views, never took a cold-war stand. While certain members of his party after the presidency of González Videla and the beginning of anti-communist repressions took advantage of the situation to weaken

the Communist Party, Allende actively called for abrogation of the law "On the Defence of Democracy", under which the Communist Party was prohibited and the working-class movement subjected to systematic persecution. Even before the abolition of that law, he was heading a Socialist group which was ready to conclude an alliance with the Communists on the basis of joint struggle for radical socio-economic reforms corresponding to the given stage of the anti-imperialist and antioligarchy revolution.

But it would be wrong to conclude from this that Allende had no differences with the Communists and that he did not seek to strengthen the influence of his party. For all that he stood foursquare on unity of action of the working-class parties.

The book gives the reader an idea of the difficulties that beset the Allende government's activities in carrying out its Popular Unity programme. The Left coalition did not possess absolute authority. It had executive power (Allende called governmental power the "centre of gravity of the state"). But the people's power as represented by the Government was opposed by the old power, which defended the interests of the oligarchic and imperialist circles and extended its control to the parliament, the judicial bodies and to a great part of the mass media. The situation was complicated by the fact that the revolutionary forces failed to gain control of all the levers of executive power. Although under the Constitution the army should have been subordinate to the Government, the events of October 1970 (the murder of the commander of the land forces, General René Schneider, and the involvement of many top officers in a reactionary plot) showed that it was not a reliable

support for the government. In the government apparatus itself a big section of the officials was not on the side of the Popular Unity bloc, or was even hostile to it.

Allende was perfectly aware of the fact that to fully implement the programme of radical social, economic and political reforms, it was essential to wield all power. He linked the attainment of this goal with the task of winning the mass of the people over to the Government's side, and with the establishment (through reliance on the people and through constitutional means) of working people's control over legislative power. This would make it possible later to hand over the judicial bodies to the working people and introduce the necessary amendments in the Constitution and the code of law. The President of Chile said: "Today, when *La Moneda* [the President's residence.—I.R.] is in the hands of the organised working people, the Government expresses their interests, and not the interests of the monopolies and the imperialists. If tomorrow the representatives of the working people will merit their support and be entrusted with a majority of seats in the Congress, then the Congress will begin passing legislation not in the interests of the minority, but in the interests of the overwhelming majority of the Chilean population, so as to transform the existing institutions and bring them into conformity with the requirements of society, which is moving towards socialism." (Salvador Allende, *Su pensamiento político*, Santiago de Chile, 1972, p. 304.) Allende did not believe that this path of development of the revolutionary process would be easier to follow than the path of armed struggle for power, although he repeatedly emphasised that the

"Chilean path" entailed less social sacrifices.

The concept of absolute power to which Allende consistently adhered included, as an integral and determining element, the securing of the support of the people. Allende condemned the attempts of the ultra-Left elements (including those in the government coalition) to depart from the line of struggle for a deep-going transformation of the state institutions in accordance with the people's will expressed in the appropriate democratic form, their attempts, without due regard for the alignment of forces in the country, at voluntarist actions to create what they called "organs of people's power". He regarded such actions as the product of utopian plans born of political romanticism. It is relevant here to recall what Lenin said in May 1917 in connection with the situation in Russia at the time, for it is of general theoretical importance: "You cannot disregard the people. Only dreamers and plotters believed that they could impose their will on a majority. That was what the French revolutionary Blanqui thought, and he was wrong. When the majority of the people refuse, because they do not yet understand, to take power into their own hands, the minority, however revolutionary and clever, cannot impose their desire on the majority of the people." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 41, p. 433).

The success of advancement along the path of radical reforms, the achievement of full power and the overcoming of reaction's resistance depended on securing the numerical superiority of the anti-oligarchic and anti-imperialist forces in the country. After the coup the Chilean Communists described their policy as follows: "Working in close contact with President Allende and consistently prom-

oting unity of all participants in the Popular Unity, our Party made every effort to resolve the issue of power without recourse to armed struggle....

"It takes the strength of the masses to suppress the resistance of the reactionary forces that inevitably confront the people who advance towards their goals. It takes the strength of the masses to prevent violence by a real or potential body of reactionary power. The possibility of success on the non-armed path to power... implies the masses' ability to deflect and check attempts to unleash reactionary armed violence. That possibility emerges in a definite set of historical circumstances, and increases if the relation of forces becomes more favourable for the people and if the reactionary forces are increasingly isolated." (*World Marxist Review*, No. 7, 1974, p. 30.)

On the whole, Allende's course towards the further development of the revolutionary process in Chile coincided with the Communist Party's policy.

One of the central problems arising when considering the strategy and tactics of the Chilean revolution as Allende understood them concerns the role of violence in the struggle for democracy. Some Western writers analysing Allende's political activity and views suggest that he had become a victim of an allegedly insurmountable contradiction between adherence to the democratic path and the necessity to apply coercion to achieve revolutionary changes. But from a revolutionary's point of view such a contradiction is non-existent if coercion is applied in the interests of democracy, in the interests of the majority of the people and, in defence of their rights and gains, if it is applied by the people themselves against a handful

of exploiters. The peaceful development of a revolution implying the possibility of revolutionary transformations without armed uprising or civil war does not rule out violence in general.

But is there a possibility that Allende thought differently, that he hoped that the radical social, economic and political reforms in Chile, where bourgeois-democratic traditions have deep roots, would not evoke serious resistance and make coercion unnecessary?

Some of the President's pronouncements, particularly the improvised ones, seem to suggest this idea. For example, addressing the opening of trade-union courses in Valparaíso in January 1971, he said: "We do not want and we shall not use force. This does not mean weakness on our part, for we think that we have a force that is greater than material force, and that is moral force." (Salvador Allende, *La vía chilena hacia el socialismo*, Madrid, 1971, p. 91.)

A detailed study of Allende's views, of his speeches and actions enables us to conclude that he had no wish to initiate the use of coercion, especially in its extreme forms, which entail loss of human lives. But he considered it legitimate and imperative to resort to coercion in regard to those who unleash counter-revolutionary violence and transgress the law. So it would be a distortion of Allende's views to say that he believed in "non-violence".

Allende on many occasions warned that the response to reactionary violence would be revolutionary violence. And it is not because of his unwillingness to resort to coercion that the Popular Unity Government failed to stop the escalation of subversive activities. The Government's attempts to curb the conspirators by legal means were coun-

tered by the opposition, which controlled the parliament and the courts. When government agencies arrested the terrorists and saboteurs and tried to close down the radio stations and newspapers that openly incited rebellion, the judicial authorities released the criminals and lifted the ban on the reactionary mass media. The application of force to suppress the anti-government elements which broke the law and resorted to violence depended on the possibility of utilising the organs of coercion. But the army and the police did not represent a reliable support of the Government, and it could not form other armed units since this was prohibited by the Constitution.

Allende's tragedy was not that he, being inspired with revolutionary ideals, allegedly decided against the use of force to suppress the counter-revolution; it consisted in the fact that he and the Popular Unity did not succeed in securing such an alignment of social, political and military forces as would enable the Government to frustrate the counter-revolutionary intrigues against the implementation of the programme for anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic reforms, and to avert or effectively suppress an open rebellion. It was precisely this factor that was decisive in the developments that led to the overthrow of the Popular Unity Government and to the death of President Allende.

The author of the book shares this view. He considers a number of factors which ultimately brought about an alignment of forces unfavourable for the Popular Unity bloc. Among them are: differences between members of the Government coalition in regard to the ways and means of consolidating and further increasing the revolutionary gains; the desertion of the bulk of the

middle strata to the side of the Government's opponents and the predominating influence of the reactionary circles in the army. With respect to the last-mentioned factor, the author notes that Allende had tried to influence the army's stand by actively drawing patriotic-minded officers into the Government and appointing them to administrative and ministerial posts. But the President's military policy was too inadequate to turn the scales in favour of the popular forces. Besides, writes the author, the reactionary military succeeded in lulling Allende's vigilance with assurances of the armed forces' loyalty. Apparently, to Allende, too, we may apply the self-critical conclusion drawn by the Chilean Communists: "Then, too, there were many illusions about the army's devotion to its professional duty and the Constitution. As a party we committed one of our most serious errors in overestimating the democratic nature of the government system and not taking timely steps to reorganise it. This applies also to the armed forces." (*World Marxist Review*, No. 7, 1974, p. 30.)

Lavretsky does not confine himself to simply stating the facts, he shows the reader the confrontation of class forces behind the facts and why events took one turn or another. The book vividly illustrates and confirms the conclusions of the Popular Unity parties concerning the factors that led to the overthrow of the Allende Government. For instance, in a May Day appeal issued in 1974, the Popular Unity parties, analysing the mistakes they had made, indicated that the gravest error of the Left bloc was that it proved incapable of preventing the isolation of the working class and securing for it the support of the majority of the population.

4312

The Popular Unity parties unanimously admit that one of the key causes of their defeat was the lack of a united leadership of the revolutionary process—a leadership capable of pursuing a principled policy and averting the danger of "leftist" and rightist opportunism.

In addition to what the author says about Allende's idea of the struggle for deepening the radical reforms in the country and subsequent advancement to socialism, it is relevant to note that Allende dealing with the specifics of the revolutionary process in Chile, emphasised that its development had been taking place within the framework of bourgeois-democratic legality, of the existence of various parties and ideological trends, and freedom of political activity by the forces in opposition to the popular government. He saw in this the characteristics that distinguished the Chilean process from what took place in other countries, Russia in particular. That is why he spoke of the "Chilean path to socialism" and of the "second model of the transition to socialism" that Chile was to effectuate.

As we may conclude from Allende's pronouncements, this "second model" did not necessarily imply establishment of a proletarian dictatorship, which he regarded as but one of the forms of building a socialist society. True, he never said that his proposition was an indisputable truth. "I must say," he admitted, "that I am not a theoretician of Marxism. I have read the works of some Marxist theoreticians, but I have no intention of considering myself an authority on Marxism." (Salvador Allende, *La vía chilena hacia el socialismo*, Madrid, 1971, p. 59.)

The book under review vividly shows a key element in Allende's

activity, namely, loyalty to the chosen path, devotion to the people's cause. When the reactionaries openly staged anti-government actions, when the threat of fascism began to be felt and when the opposition was increasingly demanding the resignation of the President, he firmly declared that he would not step down, and not because it was a matter of satisfying personal vanity or seeking honour, but because he had been elected to that post by the people and he had no right to leave it by his own will or for the benefit of those who disregard the interests of the people. "I shall not leave the La Moneda Palace until the mandate given to me by the people expires.... I shall defend the popular government, for it is the people who have entrusted this task to me. There is no alternative. Only by riddling me with bullets can they prevent me from carrying out my will, which is to work for the fulfilment of the people's programme." (Salvador Allende, *History Is on Our Side*, Moscow, 1974, p. 253 [in Russian]). He repeated this assurance many a time without any desire to boast.

Even if Allende had resigned and left the country when the mutiny of September 11 began, he would have gone down in history as Chile's first popularly elected President, as a statesman and political figure who merited the gratitude of his compatriots for what he had done for the country. But he preferred to die fighting the mutineers who besieged the presidential palace, and he was actually riddled with bullets. Not long before his death, when the tragic outcome of events was already evident, Allende addressed his people over the radio for the last time. The book quotes this remarkable speech, full of the deepest faith in the Chilean people, in the triumph

of their just cause, and full of confidence that the banner he held with dignity until the very last moment of his life would be taken up by his brothers-in-arms and followers and brought to a victorious end.

Inspired by Allende's heroic act, the democrats and patriots of Chile took over from him the banner of struggle against the domination of the bourgeois-landlord oligarchy and imperialism. A year after the military coup, the Popular Unity parties proclaimed from deep hiding: "With deep emotion we bow our heads to the memory of those who fell in the struggle; they are personified by Salvador Allende, the first revolutionary President in our history. Our motherland still hears the echoes of his last words, full of grandeur, dignity and boundless faith in the power of the working class, and his heroic example lives on in our hearts. The vile calumny of the dictatorship has failed to stain his immortal image. A year after his death, addressing him from the country whose soil is stained with the noble blood of countless victims, we say: 'Comrade President, your people will never go down on their knees, will never allow themselves to be enslaved. They will close their

ranks to win freedom and advance the cause for which you fought and lay down your life.'" (*Izquierda Chilena Coordinador en el Exterior*, Rome, September 1974, p. 5).

In an interview given soon after the presidential elections of 1970 (it is reproduced in the book), to the question "What memory would you like to leave behind?" Allende answered: "That of a consistent Chilean". The book under review shows him as a man whose life afforded an example of revolutionary consistency.

Based on extensive material this highly interesting book is pervaded by a feeling of solidarity with the people of Chile. It is a necessary and a timely book because it acquaints the reader with the activity of a man who, to quote L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "was one of the most integral and noble figures in contemporary political life" (L. I. Brezhnev, *Our Course: Peace and Socialism*, Part Four, [September-December 1973], Moscow, 1974, p. 22), and because it helps us to comprehend the experience and bitter lessons of the past and to fight for a bright future.

I. Rybalkin

История Венгрии в трех томах.
М., изд-во «Наука», 1971-1972;
т. 1, 1971, 644 стр.; т. 2, 1972,
599 стр.; т. 3, 1972, 966 стр.

A History of Hungary in 3 volumes,
Moscow, Nauka Publishers,
1971-1972; Vol. 1, 1971, 644 pp.;
Vol. 2, 1972, 599 pp.; Vol. 3,
1972, 966 pp.

This work by a team of authors is the first-ever systematic exposition in Soviet historiography of the histo-

ry of the Hungarian people. The first volume covers the period from ancient times to the end of the 18th century; the second—from the close of the 18th century to 1917; and the third—from 1918 to 1970.

The history of the Middle Danube Area from ancient times to the 5th century B.C. is reconstructed in the first volume on the basis of archaeological relics and written records. Further, the reader is given an outline history of the Roman province of Pannonia, that was situated

in the western part of present-day Hungary. The history of the Middle Danube Area for the period between the 6th and 9th centuries is traced in the first volume.

The presentation of the history of Hungarian society proper, from its ethnogenesis to the end of the 17th century, while in the case of Transylvania to the year 1790, is also preceded mostly by a characterisation of sources. In the section on the ethnogenesis of the Hungarians until the 8th century the reader learns of the disputes between scholars regarding the territory initially settled by the Finno-Ugric peoples and also of the internal development of these peoples. (Here mention is also made of the existence of an Ugric population in the basin of the Lower Kama in the 16th-17th centuries). An analysis of the scanty information on the union of the Hungarian tribes in the 9th century and a critical collation of available data enabled the authors to show the true significance of the concept of "the acquisition of a homeland" by the Hungarians as a result of their settlement along the middle reaches of the Danube, where the conditions of habitation fostered economic and social progress, and to give the lie to the nationalistic interpretation of this concept solely as the conquest by the Hungarians of the population of the Middle Danube Area. The authors trace the formation of the class of feudal lords and show that the campaigns of the Hungarians in Western Europe and the Balkans were the result of the process of class formation and a factor accelerating that process. The source material cited here explodes the legend of bourgeois-gentry historiography that the Catholic Church played the principal role in the establishment of Hungarian statehood. A major step has been taken towards

revealing the socio-economic mainsprings of the various processes of feudal Hungary's internal and external political development.

This volume reconstructs the history of the offensive policy pursued by the Hungarian kings in the 14th century, a policy motivated mainly by the desire to strengthen the central authority while putting an end to feudal anarchy. The internal political development that led to the weakening of the central authority at the beginning of the 16th century predetermined that authority's military defeat (1526). A detailed description is given of the struggle against the Turkish onslaught, a struggle whose successes in the mid-15th century were due to the participation of the masses.

The period from 1526 to 1541 saw the Kingdom of Hungary disintegrate into three parts as a result of internecine strife and pressure from the Ottoman Turks. The history of each of these parts is treated separately. The authors write in detail of the condition of the Middle Danube population under the suzerainty of the Ottoman Empire. They show how Turkish rule gradually declined in the Middle Danube Area. The Transylvanian principality remained the centre of Hungarian feudal statehood and culture in the 16th and 17th centuries. At the close of the 17th century this principality was absorbed by the Hapsburg monarchy. The authors characterise the socio-economic processes in Transylvania in the 18th century, the mechanism of Hapsburg domination, Vienna's policy of retarding the development of urban crafts and the birth of capitalist relations.

The history of the class struggle during the epoch of feudalism receives close attention in the first

volume. A whole section is devoted to the peasant war of 1514. A study of Hungarian material and spiritual culture in the 11th-15th centuries reinforces the conclusion that this culture developed quite rapidly in that period. The history of chronology in Hungary is reconstructed in the section devoted to Latin-based literature and historiography.

The exposition of 18th-century Hungarian history is based on original studies of sources. In particular, the authors show the forces that fought for independence under the leadership of Ferenc Rakoszi II.

A point to be noted is that not all the questions dealt with in this volume are adequately elaborated. The Slavs had also contributed to the formation of the Hungarian ethnos, to its economy and material and spiritual culture. After the Hungarians had settled along the Middle Danube mutual influences were to be observed in many spheres of life. The complexity and scale of these long processes are such that they require further painstaking study.

In the second volume the authors examine the basic lines of Hungary's socio-economic and political development in the epoch when feudalism was falling apart, capitalist relations were being established and the transition to imperialism had commenced. This epoch was highlighted by two important events—the bourgeois revolution of 1848-1849 and the Austro-Hungarian Agreement of 1867. These events in large measure predetermined the further course of the class and national struggle and made a profound imprint on the subsequent destiny of all the peoples inhabiting the multinational Hapsburg Empire. Against a broad socio-economic background the authors show the process by

which bourgeois orders were established. They focus their attention on the socio-political struggle that was waged by the progressive forces of Hungarian society against feudal reaction. The national question, which was a major issue in the Hapsburg Empire and in Hungary itself, is considered here as subordinated to the class question. The authors not only clearly show the class narrowness of the anti-Hapsburg movement of the Hungarian nobility and its retrograde impact, but also its striving to suppress and oppress the Slav peoples and Rumanians inhabiting the Kingdom of Hungary. A good description is given of the Hungarian Jacobin movement, which is rightly regarded as the beginning of the class battles of modern times.

A detailed study is made of the reform movement of the 1830s-1840s. The authors describe the principal stages in the formation of non-Hungarian bourgeois nations and the national movements that began at the time.

They give a comprehensive picture of the revolution of 1848-1849, and show that the Hungarian revolution, too, despite its clearly pronounced national character, was actuated by social factors. They convincingly bring to light the bourgeois narrowness and national insularity of the bourgeois-gentry concepts of the national question. With reference to Hungarian history the reader is brought round to understanding the truth that in a multinational country a just settlement of the national question can only be achieved after the victory of the socialist revolution. While noting the progressive significance and achievements of the revolution of 1848-1849, the authors shed light on some of its negative

43/2
aspects. Social problems are given prominence in their analysis of the consequences of that revolution. They convincingly demonstrate, in particular, that even the absolutist regime established after the defeat of the Hungarian revolution could not nullify that revolution's main achievement—the abolition of serfdom.

Under the Austro-Hungarian Agreement of 1867 the Hapsburg Empire became a bi-central dual constitutional monarchy, each of whose two parts retained its independence in internal affairs. The authors unfold the class essence of the 1867 agreement, showing that the alignment of class forces at the time determined the historical need and possibility for this compromise between the Austrian bourgeoisie and the Hungarian landed aristocracy. They vividly depict the crisis of dualism, laying bare the process that led to the deepening of the contradictions between Austria and Hungary at the turn of the century and the growth of the class contradictions in Hungary itself on the eve of the First World War.

In this volume they trace the history of the working class and of the working-class movement in Hungary, characterising the extremely complex factional struggle of the 1870s-1880s and exhaustively analysing the development of the working-class movement at the close of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. In the section on the First World War, the authors assess the foreign policy pursued by Hungary's ruling classes, recapitulate the internal political situation in that country, notably the struggle between the political parties, follow the development of the working-class movement during the First World War and consider the impact on Hungary of

the February 1917 revolution in Russia. Further, they consider questions related to Hungarian society's cultural development, and in the section dealing with science and culture in Hungary they characterise the work of the leading representatives of these spheres.

The third volume opens with the events at the close of the Second World War and the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Austria-Hungary. Here attention is focused on the revolutionary processes in the country and the opposition to these processes by the international and Hungarian counter-revolution. The authors deal at length with the history of the Hungarian Soviet Republic of 1919, which sprang up under the direct impact of the Great October Revolution. Readers will be particularly interested in the sections on Soviet Hungary's links with Soviet Russia, and on the Hungarian revolutionary governments' social, national and cultural policies. New data is used to back up the conclusion that the Hungarian Soviet Republic was strangled by the Entente imperialists. The developments of 1919 in Hungary showed that the proletarian dictatorship in Russia was not a "specifically Russian phenomenon", that only the dictatorship of the proletariat can bring genuine democracy to all the working people. One of the main conclusions to be drawn from the dictatorship of the proletariat of 1919 in Hungary is that the determining role to be played by a united Marxist-Leninist party should not be ignored in any way. The treachery of the Right Social-Democrats played no little part in the fall of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, whose defeat was followed by grim years of counter-revolutionary and fascist domination (1919-1944).

The fascist system in Hungary had many features of "classical" fascist regimes. However, the situation in that country was determined by some specifics of the Horthy regime, one of which was the preservation of a semblance of parliamentarism. Towards the close of the 1930s Hungary was entangled in a web of unequal economic and political agreements with Hitler Germany. Eloquent facts are cited to show that even during these years the Hungarian working people continued their struggle. They were led by the Communist Party of Hungary, which was able to form an anti-fascist front towards the end of the Second World War and enlist the support of the masses.

The second part of this volume is devoted to the period from 1944 to 1970. By their very presence the Soviet Armed Forces, which liberated Hungary from the German and Hungarian fascists, helped the Hungarian people to depose the fascist regime. That regime fell in a situation in which a democratic, anti-fascist and anti-feudal revolution had been unfolding since the autumn of 1944. The authors underscore that from the very outset this revolution transcended the bounds of the usual bourgeois-democratic revolutions in that it contained elements of a socialist character. A democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry was formed with representatives of the middle and petty bourgeoisie taking part in the administration of the state. In the latter half of 1947 and the first six months of 1948 the socialist revolution triumphed in Hungary as a result of the more than three years' evolution of the democratic revolution into a socialist revolution. Prior to establishing its dictatorship the working class occupied firm positions in the administration of the state and in the

economy, and implemented a series of socialist reforms.

The success of the working class was facilitated by the circumstance that it relied on the fraternal assistance of the Soviet Union and also of other countries that had taken the road of socialism. The switch of the People's Democratic state to the fulfilment of the functions of a proletarian dictatorship was accompanied by the attainment of complete organisational and political unity by the working class, a unity expressed in the formation of a united workers' party, the Hungarian Workers' Party, in June 1948. The authors show that a sharp ideological and organisational struggle with the Right Social-Democrats preceded the union of Communists and Social-Democrats. At its 1st Congress, the Hungarian Workers' Party adopted a Programme which proclaimed the guidelines for the country's socialist reorganisation.

The period between 1948 and 1956 is closely examined. In addition to material that had been published earlier, the authors have drawn on archival sources, and this has enabled them to make a thorough analysis of and accurately assess the developments of those years. They convincingly show that despite the difficulties of the period of transition in Hungary during the first half of the 1950s, these were the years that witnessed the formation and consolidation of socialist relations of production in industry. The deep-going socio-economic reforms that were put into effect ushered in Hungary's conversion from a backward country into an industrial-agrarian state promoting its productive forces for the benefit of all the working people.

The authors devote a special section to the conspiracy organised by

the reactionaries against the young republic of workers and peasants in 1956 and to the failure of that conspiracy. Using a host of facts they demonstrate that the revolt in Hungary was not a "spontaneous eruption of popular discontent", as was subsequently asserted by bourgeois and Right-revisionist authors, but a carefully prepared action by external and internal counter-revolutionary forces. With the assistance of the Soviet Union the revolutionary forces of Hungary stamped out the counter-revolution and upheld the People's Democratic system.

This was followed by the Hungarian Communists' extensive work to eradicate the consequences of the revolt and consolidate the revolutionary and democratic forces in 1957-1958. Taking the setbacks of the past into account and, at the same time, drawing upon the finest experience accumulated in building socialism during the preceding years, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, formed in 1956, was able to unite the advanced forces of the people for the further building of socialism. It devotes much of its attention to strengthening the alliance of the workers and peasants as the foundation of People's Hungary. This may be seen from an analysis of the Party's many decisions on agriculture. Moreover, the authors characterise the HSWP's work in organising the economy, the steps it has taken to restructure the planning and management of the economy, its vigorous promotion of science and culture and its education of the masses in the spirit of socialist ideology.

The 8th Congress of the HSWP (November 1962) drew the conclusion that the foundations of socialism had been built in Hungary and set the task of furthering economic and cultural development, strengthening socialist national unity and achieving closer moral and political cohesion among the working people in the process of building a developed socialist society. These tasks are dealt with in one of the closing sections of this volume. Socialist Hungary's achievements are justifiably linked with the enhanced leading role played by the HSWP in all areas of society's material and spiritual life. The authors show the main guidelines of socialist Hungary's foreign policy, which are determined by its socio-economic system. The concluding section of the volume is devoted to the cultural changes in that country, changes springing from the development of science, art, literature and education in recent years.

This three-volume *History of Hungary* is the fruit of many years of work by a large team of Soviet historians. It owes much of its success to the invaluable assistance rendered by Hungarian scholars, to their consultations and advice. The publication of this work is a contribution to effective cooperation and friendly relations between Soviet and Hungarian historians.

Academician A. Okladnikov,
A. Samsonov,
Corresponding Member of the USSR
Academy of Sciences

ФУРСЕНКО А. А. *Критическое десятилетие Америки (60-е годы)*. Л., изд-во «Наука», 1974, 348 стр.

FURSENKO A. A., *A Critical Decade in America (the 1960s)*, Leningrad, Nauka Publishers, 1974, 348 pp.

The 1960s will go down in the history of the USA as one of the most complicated periods packed with important events. Although there is a considerable need for a profound and overall problem research of that period as a whole, it would, nevertheless, be wrong to underrate the significance of the special works which examine not all, but only the most important phenomena in social life in the USA in the period under review.

In his interesting book A. Fursenko, D. Sc. (Philos.) has proved that it is appropriate to state, in particular, the question of the evolution of the party system in the USA in connection with the social and political crisis of the 1960s, and also the question of the most important internal factors which became a catalyst for shattering this system. One may argue about the extent and depth to which the two-party system has been hit by the crisis, but its instability is quite apparent.

Without doubt the author has successfully analysed the interparty conflict during "the critical decade", which revealed the depth of the inner contradictions in the life of US society and amidst the various elements of the ruling class. As it became particularly acute, the rivalry made itself felt in the more and more frequent cases of political assassinations and in the striving of the conflicting groups to act tough and without compromise.

As is shown in the book, the mechanism of the two-party system already finds it difficult to retain

within its control all the possible centrifugal tendencies, ranging from the extreme Right to the Left radicals. And amongst the Republicans and the Democrats there appeared pretenders to the role of leaders and idols of the reactionary Vendée and also of the "new populism"; moreover the struggle to gain influence over the masses is frequently waged not in a conventional manner as it used to be, but in the form of a trend striving to constitute itself as an independent party. It would, of course, be a mistake to judge these movements from what they appear to be on the surface. Experience has confirmed yet again that they have in actual fact many times been used successfully as a lightning-conductor to preserve the stability of that same two-party system. The fact that the balance in the structure of the electorate has been disturbed is a far more serious symptom of the impaired two-party system. The changes in the electorate (beginning at the end of the 1940s) reflect more general irreversible tendencies in the social, economic and political development of the USA. Fursenko specifies the ideas on the essence of the current erosion of the basis of the two-party system by the very formulation of the question with regard to the erosion of the traditional electoral coalitions, on which both bourgeois parties have leaned since the 1930s.

The author also concentrates on the racial problem in the USA in this connection. A great deal has been written about the struggle of the Blacks for political and civil rights, and against racial discrimination. A. Fursenko examines this struggle above all from the point of view of the changes which occurred in the balance of forces in the US political arena during "the critical decade". The angle chosen allows us to

evaluate more fully the historical contribution made by the Afro-American liberation movement to the political struggle around the determination of the new national priorities in internal and external policies.

The youth problem is no less important in this sense. The movement of protest by young people as a phenomenon which directly reflects the upsurge of widespread opposition moods in the country called forth by the Black revolt and the acute conflict around the war in Vietnam, has been extensively dealt with in Marxist and, in particular, in Soviet literature. It examines, above all, the question of the ideological, political and psychological preconditions for the rise of the radical democratic student movement in the USA, its forms and scope and its relationship and interconnection with other movements of social protest in the country. Taking this into account, the author puts the problem in a new way and tries to find and make out the political parameters of the move-

Развивающиеся страны: закономерности, тенденции, перспективы. М., изд-во «Мысль», 1974, 463 стр.

Developing Countries: Regularities, Tendencies, Prospects, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1974, 463 pp.

This is a collective monograph prepared by the Department of Economy and Politics of Developing Countries of the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences (at that time headed by the late V. Tyagunenko, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences).

Here the Third World is considered in what may be called its spatial integrity. But this does not imply any arti-

ment. This aspect of the problem has as yet not been properly studied, although there can be no doubt about its importance.

Since the beginning of the 1970s, youth avant-gardism has been experiencing a decline, but it has not disappeared without leaving its mark, as some official American specialists in politics now try to prove. The peculiar "dissipation" of its basic system, the alternation of rises and falls, its various forms and ideological aspects and the rapid changes from explosive reaction to apathy are all real difficulties in an actually developing movement. By calling attention to the growing role of young people in influencing the electors, in the development of the conflict between parties and in the overall arrangement of the political forces, A. Fursenko takes a significant step in evaluating the prospects for one of the main components in the general democratic movement in the USA.

V. Malkov

official connection between Latin American figures and names with the conclusions drawn on the strength of the African and Asian material, but an effort to identify what is truly common to the Third World as a whole.

The importance and specificity of this work are determined by its generalising character: it relies on what was achieved by Marxist-Leninist thought in the 1950s and 1960s, and analyses new historical experience in the late 1960s and early 1970s. To some extent it is a record of the present state of Soviet science dealing with the Third World, together with its successes and outstanding problems. The book raises a number of moot points.

The methodological basis for the study is provided by the proposition

that the struggle for national liberation in many countries is now, in effect, developing into a struggle against exploitative relations, both feudal and capitalist. The authors seek to show the objective roots of this key regularity for the Third World and the mechanism of its origination and crystallisation in every sphere of social life, to analyse the prospects of this tendency, because there is need to combat the opposing variants of social development and to consider the inherent contradictions of this tendency.

Progressive scientists who are not Marxists (like Gunnar Myrdal) and Soviet scientists have written about the error of mechanically applying European experience, so that the formation of the capitalist mode of production in the Third World is likened to the same process in the West. But as a rule this has been a matter of no more than passing mention and some individual aspects. The point is that a systematic comparison of the genesis of capitalism in the first echelon of countries which took the way, and the historical peculiarities of the operation of the laws of capitalism and the corresponding formation of classes and also of all the superstructural elements in the Third World is of exceptional scientific and political importance. In this book such a comparison is being carried on consistently, and this is a great stride forward in the theory of every aspect of social development in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America: economic — within the framework of Marxist-Leninist political economy, political — within the framework of the theory of state and law, and ideological — within the framework of historical materialism.

This comparison shows the role of the basic contradictions of our day which springs from the existence and

struggle of two opposed social systems — capitalism and socialism — in the world arena, and the growing importance of the world socialist system, which has been exerting an ever more active influence on internal processes in the Third World countries and determining the course of history.

Exceptional interest attaches to the idea put forward by the authors that the existence in the modern world of a large group of countries lagging in their development is a natural product of the basic tendencies of the capitalist system itself, a special, "peripheral" expression of its general laws. From this follows the natural conclusion that this backwardness can be eliminated only by overcoming the laws of capitalism, and that consistent struggle against backwardness and dependence cannot but display a general anti-capitalist tenor both internally and externally.

The special form of evolution which has engendered the present-day Third World societies within the framework of the world capitalist economic system, and which still determines their key features may be called the dependent type of social development. The substance of this process is that the lines of the dependent countries' development are "targeted" by the interests of the ruling classes of the "metropolitan countries". Every phase in the development of countries within the world capitalist economy corresponds to definite forms of dependence, definite economic and socio-political structures of society. The forms of dependence keep changing, but the dependence itself, the relations of inequality are reproduced and even intensified.

The responsibility falling on the ruling classes of the imperialist countries for the economic and social

backwardness of the Third World countries and for the poverty and privations of their population is scientifically well-grounded within the framework of this conception. Dependent development, as the basic and essential definition of the condition of the former colonies within the system of the world capitalist economy is revealed by the authors throughout the whole work. It explains not only the specific features of the economic backwardness but also the peculiarity of the social structure of the Third World, the specific quality of the multisectoral economy, which has taken shape there not as a result of the natural evolution of the socio-economic structures of local societies but as a distorted reflection of the development of the world capitalist economy and the world productive forces in the internal structure of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

This is probably the first time in Soviet monographic literature that the specific form in which the general crisis of capitalism is expressed in its "dependent periphery" has been shown in such depth. In these countries, the crisis of private property is not the result of its "overdevelopment", but of its inclusion within the system of imperialism's worldwide socio-economic relations. The historical decline of private property in the Third World is also evidenced by the extension of the regulating activity of the state, a growth of the state sector which frequently expresses the tendency towards its transformation into the leading sector of society. Of course, this does not mean that there is no distinction between the various forms of private property. The monograph shows very well the inability of the private capitalist sector to exercise its system-forming function, and the sharp aggravation — as de-

pendent capitalism develops, with a peculiar combination of capitalist and pre-capitalist methods of exploitation — of all the disproportions and contradictions of dependent society.

Under the impact of world social processes, especially of the monopolisation of the scientific research basis by the imperialist countries, some types of monopoly and forms of dependence are destroyed and give way to others. Only a national state and the state sector of the economy it sets up are capable of withstanding the mounting tendency towards dependence in its new forms. Under the scientific and technological revolution, the leading role of the state in the Third World becomes a constant and dominating tendency. What is especially important from the standpoint of using the new opportunities generated by the scientific and technological revolution is the objective anti-imperialist content of the new functions of the state. The enlargement of the scientific and technical potential of the socialist countries has enabled them to extend assistance to the developing states in the formation of a national science, training of their own highly skilled personnel, and modernising the economy through the use of the latest scientific and technical achievements. Thus, the links between the Third World countries and the USSR and other countries of the socialist system tend to undermine the basis of the new and most dangerous type of imperialist monopoly, monopoly in the sphere of scientific and technological progress.

The common features in the characteristic of the economic activity of Third World states and in the definition of the specific features of their state sector should not lead us to underestimate the fundamental distinctions between the social nature of the state sector as determined by the

nature of state power and the country's social orientation. The monograph justly draws our attention to the growing role of the state sector even in the countries taking the capitalist way, including those with the most reactionary regimes. It also stresses the growth of the state capitalism subordinate to neocolonialism, whose establishment (in struggle against more progressive tendencies and factors, let us add) signifies a mounting tendency in dependent development.

I think that the authors are quite right when they say that the transitional nature of the leading socioeconomic and political and state institutions is an exceptionally important criterion of non-capitalist development. The state sector in the non-capitalist state is semi-socialist, they stress, with the socialist elements within it bound to grow to the extent to which the forces in power take the stand of the working class and the socialist revolution.

The growth of the tendency to switch to the socialist orientation (like the tendency of the growing role of the state) is traced in all the principal sections of the book. The real contradictions of dependent development of the productive forces and movement along the capitalist way; the impulses generated by the scientific and technological revolution; the possibility of using the state sector to tackle national tasks; the social changes in the Third World countries; and the fundamentally new opportunities opened up by the socialist system—all this goes to shape the tendency towards a rejection of capitalism and orientation upon socialism, which is seen above all as a means of solving the problems of dependence and backwardness. The non-capitalist way is becoming the most widespread variant of the alternative to dependent capitalist de-

velopment in the Third World countries.

The authors do not in any way underestimate the objective and subjective difficulties and contradictions of the non-capitalist way. They regard it as a way which does not in any sense exclude retreats and which is a lengthy transition period to the stage of actual socialist construction.

The central section of the monograph is highly interesting. It contains an analysis of the specific social structure of societies and the main social transformations in the Third World countries. I think that the authors are quite right in noting the extreme limitations of the opportunities and progressive potentials of the local bourgeoisie in the Third World [see, "Possibilities and Limits of Capitalism in the Third World" by R. Avakov, K. Maidanik and T. Pokatayeva, *Social Sciences*, No. 4 (22), 1975.—*Ed.*], emphasising the weakness and lack of independent initiative on the part of the local bourgeoisie, the authors add that from the outset it has seen state intervention in the economy as a permanently operating and necessary factor. But because the shaping of the state sector is a general tendency, the group connected with the functions of political, administrative and ideological leadership of society should be identified within the makeup of the ruling exploitative groups (in development along the capitalist way). This group, the authors believe, tends frequently to grow faster than the "bourgeoisie itself", and has a tendency to become the leading element in the formation of the ruling class.

Equal interest attaches to the analysis of the specific features in the shaping of the working class, the decisive progressive force in the Third World countries, the stratification of

the peasantry, and the emergence of new (modern) urban middle sections. Readers will also be undoubtedly interested in the new typological schemes of Third World societies: in economic level; in economic and social structures; in character of development (leading sectors); in political regimes; in type of revolutionary processes, etc.

It is highly important that there is emphasis not only on the need for further elaboration by Marxists of the complicated problems of the Third World. Some of these, which this monograph has stopped short of considering and whose importance has been brought out by life itself after the main effort has been put into the book, have been formulated. These are the counter-revolutionary potentials of "dependent state capitalism",

the unevenness of dependent development, the emergence and substance of dependent state-monopoly capitalism and so-called sub-imperialism, and a number of other problems.

The monograph tends to emphasise the profoundly scientific substantiation of the characteristic of the present stage in the national liberation struggle given by the 24th Congress of the CPSU, and shows the objective character of the tendency towards the non-capitalist way. This is the only way along which it is possible (not all at once or easily, of course) to do away with the poverty, and social and political deprivation of the masses, and to ensure their social emancipation.

S. Tulpanov,
D. Sc. (Econ.)

БЕРКОВСКИЙ Н. Я. *Романтизм в Германии*. Л., изд-во «Художественная литература», 1973, 567 стр.

BERKOVSKY N. Y., *Romanticism in Germany*, Leningrad, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura Publishers, 1973, 567pp.

In Soviet literary criticism, N. Berkovsky's book on German romanticism represents more than a detailed and systematic study of the subject. It is the result of many years of research by the scholar.

Berkovsky holds that the finest works of German romantic poetry are not the property of a closed and long-past phase of the development of literature, but a living literary tradition that on essential issues has risen above its time, a tradition that is linked with both the past and the future of art.

He confines the substance of German romanticism to the short period of its upswing and triumph at the close of the 18th century, its beacon being the victorious bourgeois revolution in France. "The romantics," he writes, "...were still full of its illusions, its hyperboles, its expectations and super-expectations when the revolution itself had, properly speaking, already ended and the bourgeois society created by it was acquiring distinct outlines that were hostile to everything Utopian. There was, however, a singular, unique hour when illusions could flare up with redoubled strength, and this was the hour of the romantics, an hour prolonged beyond its legitimate limits."

This formula is, in a way, the core of the concepts developed by Berkovsky. He takes this "singular hour", this summit of illusions, the romantic view of the world with its

ideal postulates and, on the basis of these postulates, judges the entire subsequent history of romanticism, judges it by the laws created by the romanticists themselves. Hence the meaningful reservation: "prolonged beyond its legitimate limits". In principle, he refuses to understand and accept as a regularity the further development of romanticism in Germany, a development that was full of tragic contradictions and fractures. He notes these fractures with sad regret, be it the turn of many romantic poets and thinkers to orthodox Catholicism (Friedrich von Schlegel, Clemens Brentano) or their disappointment with the elevated illusions of the "singular hour" (Achim von Arnim, Heinrich Kleist), or their conversion to the prose of worldly everyday life (Novalis, Ludwig Tieck). He sees in all this a distressing departure from the ideals of romanticism's youth, its "overclouding", and persistently searches all the later phases of romantic literature for traces of its former, initial inspiration, consistently accentuating life-asserting tones in the work of romantic poets (including the "younger" poets such as Ernst-Theodor Hoffmann).

Here all the criteria for assessing romanticism are drawn from the epoch of the Jena upsurge, while all the tragic vicissitudes of its destiny are taken out of its inner structure and regarded as irregular, as injected by circumstances. For Berkovsky romanticism is, above all, the art of elevated utopia, poetry and "philosophy of creating life". He not only reinforces this approach with a probing analysis of utopian "bright worlds" of romantic literature, but polemically directs it against the positivist criticism of the post-romantic epochs. He wrote of this in an article published some years ago.

(N. Y. Berkovsky, "Romanticism and Its Basic Principles", *Problems of Romanticism*, Moscow, 1971, p. 18 [in Russian].)

Underlying Berkovsky's concepts is the idea of creative freedom, which, he believes, determined the entire structure of romanticism as a cultural-historical phenomenon. At all levels of romantic thinking and art he pinpoints the renunciation of canons and dogmas, and the striving to depict in art the endless movement of life. Thus, according to him, one of the key principles of romantic poetry is disembodiment and the recreation of life not as something that has taken shape once and for all, as something fossilised, but as a "play of possibilities" creating a "bright chaos". This principle is also expressed in the famous romantic irony, in the idea of universality, and in all the more specific questions of the romantic style and poetic manner. This proposition helps the researcher to see many characteristic features of this poetic style in a new and unaccustomed light. He offers extremely interesting observations of romantic poetry's imagery system, in particular, of its favourite principle of metamorphosis, underlying which he sees the same striving for disembodiment.

Seen from the height of its primary ideals, the history of German romanticism is given in the book as a victorious, triumphant spectacle and, therefore, extremely attractive. But this triumph rests on a very important and strongly argued surmise: we have already noted that Berkovsky is inclined to strike out from the history of romanticism many of the subsequent contradictions in the work of the romanticists, the doubts that they cast on the ideals and illusions of their youth. However, it seems that in this case

many questions of the evolution of the romantic world outlook remain open. Were the many philosophical and creative tragedies of the post-Jena history of German romanticism (the fates of Brentano, Hölderlin, Kleist) purely external facts that did not tie in with the *fundamentals* of romanticism? Were the post-Jena *artistic* successes of romanticism, successes that are likewise unquestionable (the work of Kleist, Arnim, Hoffmann), merely the happy inertia of the elevated theories of Jena? On the other hand, did the Jena romanticism itself have no doubts about the unconditional righteousness of its postulates and were these doubts not recorded in the artistic and theoretical documents of that period? After all, the buoyant edifice of Novalis' *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* and the "darkened" vision of his *Hymnen an die Nacht* and *Geistliche Lieder* were written simultaneously just as the letters of Clemens Brentano to Bettina (Briefe an Bettina) hailing the "fullness of life", were written while he was working on his novel *Godwi oder das steinerne Bild der Mutter*, which speaks of the evil of this fullness. Novalis' treatise *Die Christenheit oder Europa* appeared earlier than *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*. A comparison of the dates in the given case provides evidence not so much of a descending evolution as of the existence, from the very beginning, of deep-going inner contradictions in the views of the romanticists.

These contradictions are also noted by Berkovsky. "The early romanticists," he wrote, "were victors to whom fear for their victories was not alien. A return to historical reality was unavoidable, and they could not help being apprehensive about what it would demand and how it would make this demand." This is a true and profound observation, and

Berkovsky returns to it time and again. But he develops it on side-tracks, of his main concept of romanticism as an art of "created life". Yet this idea is hardly secondary to the history of romanticism; with it is linked, essentially speaking, its entire range of ethic problems.

In the romantic fiesta of disembodiment there were, from the very outset, doubts of a profound moral character, namely, to what extent this unlimited freedom of the artist, this emancipated "play of possibilities", agrees with the actual, worldly requirements of ethics and humanism. Berkovsky justifiably writes that by its very essence romanticism demands "freedom". But will the true history of romanticism not be impoverished if we confine it solely to this unconditional and in many respects "theoretical" demand for freedom? Is it really so unessential that the romanticists regarded their soaring in the skies from yet another angle—not only as a blessed closeness to the heavens but also as a menacing remoteness from the earth? That was when they faced the problems of morals, of a search for a place and support in some earthly human community, and this, properly speaking, predetermined their adoption of the national idea and of religion. It is another matter that in their logical development these ideas often signified an actual departure from the initial postulates of romanticism, that the means of defending it frequently "destroyed the very object and aim of defence". On this point Berkovsky is quite right, and in such cases his uncompromising verdicts are particularly weighty—for instance, in his judgement of Kleist's *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, where to use his apt words the playwright "identified the German people with the Prussian

state in a most grievous manner". I feel that in other cases the aims of the romanticists merited closer attention: the "sobering" of Novalis and Tieck could, probably, be judged not as strictly as the author does at the close of the corresponding chapters, and this sobering could be regarded not only as "indifference", not only as the triumph of the "prosaicism of things" and "Biedermeier", but also as a kind of refracted striving towards reality, towards "the world as

it exists", towards a "settled way of life", a striving which Berkovsky sympathetically notes in Kleist, Hoffmann and Hölderlin.

Berkovsky's book settles many questions and raises many others. He develops a fascinating subject of study and cognition. In this, I should say, lies the viability and fruitfulness of this book by the late scholar Berkovsky.

A. Karelsky

САПУХАНЫ А. П. *Современная ирландская литература*. М., изд-во «Наука», 1973, 317 стр.

SARUKHANYAN A. P., *Modern Irish Literature*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1973, 317 pp.

The subject of this book is given in the title, namely, the present-day literature of a small country, the first of Britain's colonies to achieve liberation. While the author concentrates on the Irish literature of the period up to the last decade inclusively, she takes a look at the events of the end of the 19th century linked with the cultural movement known as the Irish Renaissance. The work of the participants in that movement is regarded as a bridge joining the new literature with the literature of preceding periods. Sarukhanyan examines the work of writers of different aesthetic schools and trends, analysing the work of writers who were close to modernism (I. A. Gregory, W. B. Yeats, J. Stephens, J. Russel, Th. Kincella) and writers who strengthened and promoted realistic trends (P. O'Donnel, L. O'Flaherty, J. Phelan, Sean O'Faolain, A. Clark, B. Behan), which were most strikin-

gly and fully embodied in the dramaturgy of Sean O'Casey.

The author gives most of her attention to the literature linked with democratic and realistic traditions, discussing those features in the literary legacy of such complex writers as Yeats and Gregory that bring them close to realism. Regrettably, Sarukhanyan overlooks J. Synge and J. Joyce, who, while conforming to Irish literary tradition, influenced world literature (especially its modernistic wing). The development of individual genres—biography, fiction and particularly dramaturgy, which scored unquestioned successes in the 20th century—receives considerable attention.

A major problem of the researcher is that modern Irish literature is bilingual: at present it is developing in the English and Irish languages. In foreign literary criticism the question of the national character of Irish literature remains unresolved. In criticising the proponents of the language criterion as decisive in determining the national character, Sarukhanyan maintains that they thereby deny originality to Irish writers working in the English language (these are in the majority). At the same time, she comes out against the

exponents of the religious principle, according to which the predominant influence on the formation of literature is attributed to Catholicism (although its significance in Irish social life is indeed great).

Sarukhanyan justifiably regards Irish literature as an integral and independent phenomenon with a clearly expressed national character that took shape during the long centuries of the Irish people's struggle for liberation from British colonialism. In the works of Irish writers she sees a national theme and imagery, a living link with folk-poetic traditions and mythology. She offers interesting arguments about the influence of Irish vocabulary on authors writing in English. In Ireland, Sarukhanyan notes, the English language, while acquiring, in the course of several centuries, features conforming to the psychological make-up of the Irish, has long since become a mother tongue alongside the Irish language. Naturally, Sarukhanyan does not venture to offer a final settlement of the language problem, but draws our attention to the interaction and mutual enrichment of two literary torrents flowing in one and the same channel.

She attributes the florescence of Irish literature in the first half of the present century to the influence of the revolutionary anti-imperialist movement in Ireland at the close of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. The division into periods suggested by her for Irish literature is linked with the different stages of that movement, which reached its climax in 1916 in the Dublin armed uprising and in the civil war of 1919-1921.

Lenin often referred to the revolutionary developments in Ireland, comparing them with the developments of 1905 in Russia. In the

article "Class War in Dublin" he wrote: "...that country, though it bears a double and triple national yoke, has begun to turn into a country with an organised army of the proletariat" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Moscow, Vol. 19, p. 333.). A large role in fostering national self-awareness was played by the writers of the Irish Renaissance and by the direct participants in and leaders of the Dublin uprising, among whom were the poets Patrick Pearse, Thomas MacDonagh and Joseph Plunkett, who opened the first and heroic page in the history of Ireland's new literature. In analysing their work, which is little known to the Soviet reader, Sarukhanyan shows how their poetry reflects their understanding of the inevitability and tragedy of the struggle for liberation and their awareness of the role they had to play in that struggle.

The Dublin uprising interests Sarukhanyan not as such but mainly from the standpoint of its enormous significance to the subsequent development of literature: it became the source of new social themes and strengthened the civil motifs in the works of W. B. Yeats, I. A. Gregory, J. Campbell, J. Russel and many others—in Ireland there is hardly a writer who has not referred to that period of history in one way or another.

Sarukhanyan holds that the living continuity of tradition is one of the hallmarks of modern Irish literature. This is borne out by the attention that is given to mythology and epic poems by Irish writers, who turn to this eternal source of themes, subjects and images and transform them according to their world outlook and the spirit of the times. Small wonder that the leaders of the Irish Renaissance regarded the rejuvenation of mythology and ancient sagas and the

publication of the works of folk bards as a paramount task. In the period of the upsurge of the national liberation movement—this is stressed in the book—mythological images were frequently used to depict the heroic ideals of the people and filled with patriotic fervour, while in the period of decline they were coloured with irony and pessimism to express disappointment and desperation.

Sarukhanyan presents the literary process in Ireland as a movement towards the realistic assimilation of reality. She painstakingly pinpoints realistic tendencies in the “non-realist” Yeats, who in his works written in the 1930s (particularly the play *The Death of Cuchullain*, 1939) surmounted his tragic attitudes of the 1920s. The works of Sean O’Faolain, L. O’Flaherty, F. O’Conner and, of course, Sean O’Casey, who portrayed the national liberation struggle, are analysed from this angle. The author shows O’Casey’s creative quests and his struggle for new social and aesthetic ideals.

The chapter dealing with the literature of the 1960s merits special

attention. The works of those years were written by authors of different generations and different creative styles. Sarukhanyan writes of the poems of Austin Clark and John Montague, the plays of Patrick Galvin and John Kean, the novels of Paul Smith, Richard Power, Walter Macken and Joseph Plunkett, and the short stories of John Banville. These works are evidence of the inextinguishable interest that writers show in the life of their contemporaries, in their joys and anxieties. As in the past, writers do not remain indifferent to their country’s social life—they follow the problem of young people’s future and the accompanying problem of emigration, and the struggle against neocolonialism and for civil rights.

Sarukhanyan does not evade the acute and complex questions of the development of national literature in the conditions of the political struggle of recent years. This book ends with a carefully compiled bibliographical index containing the titles of works of a general character and of works devoted to individual authors.

L. Litvinova

BIBLIOGRAPHY

NEW BOOKS BY SOVIET AUTHORS ON THE SECOND WORLD WAR*

A History of the Second World War. 1939-1945. In 12 volumes. (Chairman of the Central Editorial Commission A. Grechko), Moscow, Voenizdat Publishers, Vol. 1, *The Genesis of the War*, 1973, 367 pp.; Vol. 2, *On the Eve of the War*, 1974, 479 pp.; Vol. 3, *Beginning of the War. Preparations for Aggression Against the USSR*, 1974, 503 pp.; Vol. 4, *Fascist Aggression Against the USSR. Failure of the Blitzkrieg Strategy*, 1975, 535 pp.

About this publication see reviews by V. Trukhanovsky in *Social Sciences*, 1975, No.1(19), and by I. Mints in *Social Sciences*, No.4(22) for the same year.

Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union. 1941-1945. A General Outline. Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1975. In English, 679 pp.; in French, 496 pp.; in Spanish, 800 pp.

This collective work deals with the international situation, the foreign policy and internal position of the USSR at the close of the 1930s; traces the causes of the Second

World War, its various stages and consequences.

At the Head of the Defence of the Soviet Motherland. Essays on the Activities of the CPSU in the Great Patriotic War. Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1975, 407 pp.

The monograph, as the title suggests, gives a picture of the titanic work carried out by the CPSU in the war years. The book draws on earlier published works and on new archive materials.

Telpukhovskiy B., Deborin G. *Results and Lessons of the Great Patriotic War.* Second, revised edition, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1975, 439 pp.

In this work the authors examine the pre-history of Hitler aggression against the Soviet Union, the major battles on the Soviet-German front, and sum up the historical results of the war.

History of Diplomacy, Second Edition. Moscow, Politizdat, 1975, Vol. 4, *Diplomacy in the Second World War Years*, 752 pp.

The volume deals with the cardinal issues of Soviet foreign policy and international relations (1939-1945). The authors disclose the fatal conse-

* All books are in Russian unless otherwise indicated.

quences of the Western powers' Munich policy and retrace the efforts of the Soviet Union to ensure universal security and to check fascist aggression (1939-1941), and Soviet diplomacy's efforts, after the attack of Nazi Germany on the USSR, to form and strengthen a broad anti-Hitler coalition.

Liberation Mission of the Soviet Armed Forces in the Second World War, Second Edition, Moscow, Politizdat, 1974, 502 pp.

Based on numerous Party documents and materials of the State Archives of the USSR and of fraternal socialist countries, the book gives a detailed picture of the international policy of the CPSU and the decisive role of the Soviet Union and its Armed Forces in the liberation of the countries enslaved by German fascism and Japanese militarism. Much space is devoted to a criticism of the falsifications of history aimed at belittling the role of the Soviet Union in the defeat of fascism. (The book has also been put out by Progress Publishers in English and French.)

Anfilov V., *Failure of the Blitzkrieg*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1974, 615 pp.

Drawing extensively on archive material, the author tells of the events on the eve and in the initial period of the Great Patriotic War, and of the heroic struggle of the Soviet people against the fascist invaders, which led to the collapse of Hitler's Blitzkrieg plans.

Antosyak A., *In the Battles for the Freedom of Rumania*, Moscow, Voenizdat Publishers, 1974, 288 pp.

The book familiarises the reader with the history of the formation of the fighting alliance between the armed forces of the Soviet Union and Rumania at the closing stage of

the Second World War in Europe, the liberating mission of the Soviet Army in Rumania, and the impact of the Soviet Army's victories on the development of the revolutionary movement in that country.

Blank A., *In the Heart of the Third Reich. From the History of the Underground Anti-Fascist People's Front*, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1974, 237 pp.

The book is devoted to the Resistance in Hitler Germany in the Second World War years. The author shows the process of the unification of people of different social status and views around a common aim—to fight against fascism and for a free and democratic Germany.

Brotherhood-in-Arms, Moscow, Voenizdat Publishers, 1975, 383 pp.

Written by Soviet and Polish historians, the book, based on a wealth of documentary material, describes the main stages in the formation of the brotherhood-in-arms of the peoples of the USSR and Poland in the Second World War and the further development of Soviet-Polish cooperation in the post-war period.

The War in the Enemy's Rear, Book I, Concerning Some Problems of the History of the Soviet Partisan Movement in the Great Patriotic War, Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, 1974, 447 pp.

The book gives a picture, based on documents and archive materials, of the formation and development of the mass partisan movement on the temporarily occupied Soviet territory. Much space is devoted to the effective military operations of the partisans and to the forms and methods of the partisan struggle. Also described are the cooperation of the partisans with the Soviet Army and the sources of the material

and technical supplies to the partisan formations.

Vysotsky V., *Operation "Terminal", Potsdam, 1945*, Moscow, Mezhdunarodniye Otnosheniya Publishers, 1975, 208 pp.

The book is devoted to the diplomatic preparations for the Potsdam meeting of the Big Three—the leaders of the USSR, the USA and Great Britain. The author shows the international situation on the eve of the defeat of Hitler Germany, the diplomatic efforts of the USSR for a just and democratic postwar settlement and analyses the historic Potsdam decisions and their significance.

Murmantseva V., *Soviet Women in the Great Patriotic War*, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1974, 272 pp.

Drawing on a wealth of factual and archive material, the author retraces the political activity and labour of women during the Great Patriotic War. She shows their heroism at the front and in the partisan detachments, the significant role they played in industry, transport and agriculture.

Unvanquished Leningrad. A Brief History of the City in the Period of the Great Patriotic War, Leningrad, Nauka Publishers, 1974, 502 pp.

The subject of the book is the history of the heroic defence of Leningrad. The authors tell of the formation of people's volunteer units, the measures to fortify the city's defences, the heroism of the Soviet soldiers, the feats of labour of workers, engineers, medical personnel, scientists and cultural workers. The research is based on new archive materials, published documents and reminiscences.

Essays on Soviet Military Historiography, Moscow, Voenizdat Publishers, 1974, 415 pp.

The work analyses the historiography of the problems connected with the armed struggle of the Soviet people for the freedom and independence of their country. Special attention is paid to the history of building up the Soviet Armed Forces and the development of Soviet military thought.

Savelyev V., Savvin V., *The Soviet Intelligentsia in the Great Patriotic War*, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1974, 285 pp.

The book tells of the role of Soviet intellectuals in the achievement of the victory over German fascism. The authors made wide use of documents and materials of Party and state archives, scientific works and papers and magazines of the war period.

Sevostyanov G., Utkin A., *The USA and France in the War Years 1939-1945. From the History of Mutual Relations*, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1974, 391 pp.

The monograph analyses the relations between the two countries in the period under review, their effect on the course of military operations in the West and on the settlement of post-war issues.

Smirnov V., *The Resistance in France in the Second World War*, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1974, 327 pp.

The book gives a general picture of the development of the Resistance, and its various stages, throws light on the character and activities of the movement's individual groups and on the ideological, political and class struggle within the movement. The work is based on archive materials and publications of the Resistance.

The Soviet Home Front in the Great Patriotic War, Books 1-2,

Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1974, Book 1—300 pp., Book 2—367 pp.

The monograph tells of the CPSU's activities in directing the national economy in the war years. The research is based on extensive documentary and factual materials.

The Ukrainian SSR in the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union. 1941-1945. Revised and enlarged edi-

REVIEWS OF FOREIGN BOOKS IN SOVIET SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS

History.

Auxiliary Historical Disciplines

Дюгмеджиев Л. *Спомени и раз-мисли.* София, Партиздат, 1974, 206 с.

Рец.: Чернявский Г. *Новая и новейшая история.* М., 1975, № 3, стр. 170-171.

Bournasel R. *Rapallo: naissance d'un mythe. La politique de la peur dans la France du Bloc national.* Paris, A. Colin, 1974, 260 p.

Рец.: Максимычев И. *Вопросы истории.* М., 1975, № 6, стр. 197-199.

Budge J., O'Leary C. *Belfast: Approach to Crisis. A Study of Belfast Politics. 1613-1970.* London-Basingstoke, Macmillan St. Martin's Press, 1973, 396 pp.

Рец.: Крылов Л. *Вопросы истории.* М., 1975, № 5, стр. 192-194.

Dawn C. E. *From Ottomanism to Arabism. Essays on the Origins of Arab Nationalism.* Chicago-London, Univ. of Illinois Press, 1973, XI, 212 pp.

Рец.: Лазарев М. *Народы Азии и Африки.* М., 1975, № 3, стр. 192-195.

tion, Kiev, Politizdat Ukrainy, 1975, Vol.1—544 pp., Vol.2—512 pp., Vol.3—462 pp.

The first edition of this work appeared in 1967-1969 in the Ukrainian language. The Russian edition has been substantially supplemented with new documents that give a fuller picture of the events of the Great Patriotic War in the territory of the Ukraine.

Duraczyński E., Terej J. *Europa podziemna 1939-1945.* Warszawa. Wiedza powszechna, 1974, 410 s.

Рец.: Юрьева И. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам.* М., 1975, № 6, стр. 63-66.

Freidel F. B. *Franklin D. Roosevelt. Launching the New Deal.* Boston-Toronto, Little, Brown and Co., 1973, XII, 574 pp.

Рец.: Язьков Е. *Вопросы истории.* М., 1975, № 7, стр. 173-176.

Herlitz L. *Jordegendom och ränta. Omfördelningen av jordbrukets merprodukt i Skaraborgs län under frihetstiden.* Lund, 1974, 387 s.

Рец.: Кан А. *Вопросы истории.* М., 1975, № 7, стр. 176-179.

Iwański G. *Powstanie i działalność Związku proletariatu miast i wsi. 1922-1925.* Warszawa, Książka i wiedza, 1974, 360 s.

Рец.: Хонігсман Я. *Український історичний журнал.* Київ, 1975, № 6, стр. 147-148.

Klassenkampf. Tradition. Sozialismus. Von den Anfängen der Geschichte des deutschen Volkes bis zur Gestaltung der entwickelten

sozialistischen Gesellschaft in der Deutschen Demokratische Republik Grundriss. Berlin, Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1974, 794 S.

Рец.: Павлова-Сильванская М. *Международная жизнь.* М., 1975, № 7, стр. 133-135.

Kozik J. *Ukraiński ruch narodowy w Galicji w latach 1830-1948.* Kraków, Wydawnictwo literackie, 1973, 308 s.

Рец.: Борнс В. *Советское славяноведение.* М., 1975, № 3, стр. 104-105.

Lesnikow M. P. *Die Handelsbücher des hansischen Kaufmannes Veckinchusen.* Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1973, XI, 560 S.

Рец.: Мильская Л. В кн.: *Средние века.* Вып. 38. М., 1975, стр. 304-305.

Mangas Manjarres J. *Esclavos y libertos en la España Romana.* Salamanca, 1971, 515 p.

Рец.: Смирин В. *Вестник древней истории.* М., 1975, № 2, стр. 165-181.

Mitchell B. *The Price of Independence. A Realistic View of the American Revolution.* New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1974; X, 374 pp.

Рец.: Романов И. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам.* М., 1975, № 7, стр. 76-80.

Mitgang H. *The Fiery Trial. A life of Lincoln.* New York, Viking Press, 1974, 207 pp.

Рец.: Новиков В. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам.* М., 1975, № 6, стр. 76-79.

Monas S. *The Third Section. Police and Society in Russia Under Nicholas I.* Harvard Univ. Press, 1961.

Рец.: Деревнина Т. *Освободительное движение в Рос-*

сии. Саратов, 1975, вып. 4, стр. 111-118.

Osmańczyk E. *Był rok 1945...* Warszawa, PIW, 1974, 547 s.

Рец.: Немчинский Я., Немчинская З. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам.* М., 1975, № 5, стр. 70-75.

Palyga E. J. *Intervencje zbrojne USA w Ameryce Łacińskiej.* Warszawa, Wydawnictwo ministerstwa obrony narodowej, 1973, 208 s.

Рец.: Майхер Т. *Латинская Америка.* М., 1975, № 3, стр. 211-212.

The Peasant's Revolt of 1381. Ed. by R. V. Dobson. Bath, 1970, 427 pp.

Рец.: Венкстерн Л. В кн.: *Средние века.* Вып. 38, М., 1975, стр. 299-301.

Petraň J. *Nevolnické povstání 1775. Prolegomena edice pramenů.* Praha, Karlova universita, 1973, 280 s.

Рец.: Мильников А. *Советское славяноведение.* М., 1975, № 3, стр. 105-107.

Pistillo M. *Giuseppe di Vittorio. 1907-1924. Dal sindacalismo rivoluzionario al comunismo.* Roma, Ed. riuniti, 1973, 360 p.

Рец.: Кобылянский К., Канестри А. *Рабочий класс и современный мир.* М., 1975, № 3, стр. 181-182.

Proletariat in der BRD. Leiter des Autorkollektivs H. Petral Berlin, Dietz, 1974, 632 S.

Рец.: Корчунова Д. *Вестник Ленинградского университета.* Л., 1975, № 5. *Экономика. Философия. Право.* Вып. 1, стр. 113-115.

Rosenfeld N. E. *Holbergs Danmarkshistorie i Rusland. Danmarks*

Riges Historie som redskab i russisk samfundskritik under Katharina II. Kbenhavn, 1973.

Рец.: Коган М. *История СССР*. М., 1975, № 4, стр. 208-209.

Schirmer H. *Das andere Nürnberg. Antifaschistischer Widerstand in der Stadt der Reichsparteitage*. Frankfurt a/M., Rödeberger, 1974, 255 S.

Рец.: Крышкин Е. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 60-65.

Self and Society in Medieval France. The Memoires of Abbot Guibert of Nogent (1064?-1125). Ed. with Intro. and Notes by J. F. Benton. New York, 1970.

Рец.: Карева В. В кн.: *Средние века*. Вып. 38. М., 1975, стр. 301-304.

Serejski M. H. *Naród a państwo w polskiej myśli historycznej*. Warszawa, PIW, 1973, 343 s.

Рец.: Попков Б. *Советское славяноведение*. М., 1975, № 4, стр. 99-100.

Sierpowski S. *Faszizm we Włoszech 1919-1926*. Wrocław-Warszawa, 1973, 408 s.

Рец.: Манусевич А. *Новая и новейшая история*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 166-169.

Sokolovo. Praha, 1973.

Рец.: Деревянко П. *История СССР*. М., 1975, № 4, стр. 207-208.

Squire P. S. *The Third Department. The Political Police in the Russia of Nicholas I*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968.

Рец.: Деревнина Т. *Освободительное движение в России*. Саратов, 1975, вып. 4, стр. 111-118.

Studia historiae oeconomicae. Vol. 8-9, Poznań, 1973-1974.

Рец.: Носкова А. *Советское славяноведение*. М., 1975, № 4, стр. 97-99.

Tosi M., Roccati A. *Stele e altre epigrafi di Deir el Medina N 50001-50262* (Catalogo del Museo Egizio di Torino. Serie seconda-Collezioni, V.I.), Torino, Ed. d'Arte Fratelli Pozzo, 1972, 368 ill.

Рец.: Богословский Е. *Вестник древней истории*. М., 1975, № 2, стр. 154-162.

Vaughan T., Murray-Oliver A. A. St. C. M. *Captain Cook, R. N., the Resolute Mariner. An International Record of Oceanic Discovery*. Portland (Ore.), Oregon Historical Society, 1974, 97 pp.

Рец.: Свет Я. *Советская этнография*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 168-170.

Villanueva V. *Ejército Peruano: del caudillaje anárquico al militarismo reformista*. Lima, Librería-Editorial Juan Mejía Baca, 1973, 440 p.

Рец.: Селиванов В. *Латинская Америка*. М., 1975, № 4, стр. 222-224.

Problems of Today. International Relations

Гиольди Р. *Избранные статьи и речи*. Пер. с исп. М., Политиздат, 1974, 776 с.

Рец.: Казаков С. *Латинская Америка*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 201-204.

Топенчаров Б. *Равнис на СССР. Хроника за триумфа на историята над истерията*. София, Паргиздат, 1974, 254 с.

Рец.: Кривуля В. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 62-65.

Хятад дахь хэрэг явдлын тухайд. Монголын тов хэвлэл

хятадын талаар нийтлэгдсэн материалын эмтгэл. 1963-1973. Улаанбаатар, 1974.

Рец.: Гольман М. *Народы Азии и Африки*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 178-182.

Badstübner R., Bednareck H., Falk W. e. a. *DDR. Werden und Wachsen. Zur Geschichte der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*. Berlin, Dietz, 1974, 576 S.

Рец.: Павлова-Сильванская М. *Международная жизнь*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 133-135.

Barnds W. J. *India, Pakistan and the Great Powers*. New York etc., 1972, XIV, 348 pp.

Рец.: Портнягин А. *Народы Азии и Африки*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 207-208.

Barnett A. D. *Uncertain Passage. China's Transition to the Post-Mao Era*. Washington, Brookings Institution, 1974, XVIII, 387 pp.

Рец.: Ефимов Г. *Проблемы Дальнего Востока*. М., 1975, № 2, стр. 154-159.

Bloomfield L. P. *In Search of American Foreign Policy. The Human Use of Power*. New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1974, 182 pp.

Рец.: Шейн В. *Мировая экономика и международные отношения*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 129-132.

Cerda C. *Génocide du Chili*. Paris, Maspero, 1974, 134 p.

Рец.: Ефимова Г. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 75-80.

Darby Ph. *British Defence Policy East of Suez. 1947-1968*. London, Oxford Univ. Press, 1973, 366 pp.

Рец.: Ипполитов Г. *Вопросы истории*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 191-196.

Franke K., Reinhold O. *Friedliche*

Koexistenz und Klassenkampf. Berlin, Dietz, 1974, 63 S.

Рец.: Храпцов А. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 65-70.

Frontczak K. *Sily zbrojne Polski Ludowej*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo ministerstwa obrony narodowej, 1974, 463 s.

Рец.: Могилатов М. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 56-60.

Fuglsang V. *Kommunisterne og det danske samfund*. Kobenhavn, Forlaget Tiden, 1974, 182 s.

Рец.: Кан А., Карлсен А. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 65-70.

Gołombowski J. W. *Ideologia i polityka współczesnej socjal-demokracji*. Warszawa, 1974.

Рец.: Кривогуз И. *Рабочий класс и современный мир*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 182-185.

Halperin M. H. *Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy*. Washington, Brookings Institution, 1974, XIII, 340 pp.

Рец.: Владимиров М. *США — экономика, политика, идеология*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 95-97.

Hinsley F. H. *Nationalism and the International System*. London etc., Hodder and Stoughton, 1973, 191 pp.

Рец.: Дубинин А. *Международная жизнь*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 144-146.

Informational Mass Communication. Helsinki, 1974.

Рец.: Орехова С. *Вестник Московского университета. Журналистика*. М., 1975, № 1, стр. 90-91.

Kaushik D., Peerthum S. *Towards Collective Security in Asia*. Bombay,

Allied Publishers, 1973, VII, 75 pp.
Рец.: Портнягин А. *Мировая экономика и международные отношения*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 135-136.

Kendrick A. *The Wound Within. America in the Vietnam Years, 1945-1974*. Boston-Toronto, Little, Brown and Co., 1974, 432 pp.

Рец.: Пастернак Э. *США — экономика, политика, идеология*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 101-102.

Klugmann J. *History of the Communist Party of Great Britain*. Vol. 1-2. London, Lawrens and Wishart, 1968-1969. Vol. 1. *Formation and Early Years. 1919-1924*. 1968. 318 pp. Vol. 2. *The General Strike. 1925-1927*. 1969. 373 pp.

Рец.: Курочкина О. *Вопросы истории*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 188-192.

Latin America and the United States: The Changing Political Realities. Ed. by J. Cotler and R. R. Fagen. Stanford (Cal.), Stanford Univ. Press, 1974, 417 pp.

Рец.: Кобушко Т. *Международная жизнь*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 137-140.

Lazarus S. *The Genteel Populists*. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974, XVII, 303 pp.

Рец.: Каграманов Ю. *США — экономика, политика, идеология*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 84-86.

Lens S. *The Labor Wars. From the Molly Maguires to the Sitdowns*. New York, Doubleday Co., 1973, 366 pp.

Рец.: Лапицкий М. *Новая и новейшая история*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 171-173.

Marchais G. *Le défi démocratique*. Paris, B. Grasset, 1974, 249 p.

Рец.: Коломийцев В. *Новая и*

новейшая история. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 145-148.

Marchais G. *La politique du Parti communiste français*. Paris, Ed. sociales, 1974, 93 p.

Рец.: И. Ильин М. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 58-62; 2. Коломийцев В. *Новая и новейшая история*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 145-148.

Marulanda Veles M. *Cuadernos de cartapla*. Bogotá, 1973, 136 p.

Рец.: Жучкова Г. *Латинская Америка*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 213-215.

Montes E. *Sobre la situación de la clase obrera mexicana*. Mexico, Ed. de cultura popular, 1974, 34 p.

Рец.: Пчела В. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 70-75.

Mueller J. E. *War, Presidents and Public Opinion*. New York, J. Wiley and Sons, 1973, XXIV, 300 pp.

Рец.: Петровская М. *США — экономика, политика, идеология*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 100-101.

NATO heute. Hrsg. H. Rabe. Berlin, Militärverlag, 1974, 119 S.

Рец.: Волкон Н. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 58-63.

Praça A., Antunes A. e. a. *25 de Abril*. Lisboa, Casaviva, 1974, 183 p.

Рец.: Притворов А. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 72-76.

The Press. A Critical Look from the Inside. Princeton, N. J. 1972, 172 pp.

Рец.: Чибисов А. *Вестник Московского университета. Журналистика*. М., 1975, № 2, стр. 91-92.

Rosenberg L. *Sinn und Aufgabe der Gewerkschaften. Tradition und Zukunft*. Dusseldorf-Wien, Econ-Verlag, 1973, 309 S.

Рец.: Храмов А. *Рабочий класс и современный мир*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 188-189.

Russett B. M. *Power and Community in World Politics*. San Francisco, W. H. Freeman and Co., 1974, XII, 372 pp.

Рец.: Кокошин А. *США — экономика, политика, идеология*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 81-83.

Smith S. *US Neocolonialism in Africa*. Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1973, 264 pp.

Рец.: Мирский Г. *Мировая экономика и международные отношения*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 141-143.

Sterling R. W. *Macropolitics. International Relations in a Global Society*. New York, A. A. Knopf, 1974, 650 pp.

Рец.: Мельников Ю. *Международная жизнь*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 148-149.

Velasco. *La voz de la revolución. Discursos del Presidente de la República General de división Juan Velasco Alvarado*. T. 1-2. Lima, 1972, T. 1. (1968-1970). 288 p. T. 2. (1970-1972). 406 p.

Рец.: Ельшов Е. *Латинская Америка*. М., 1975, № 4, стр. 217-220.

Waffenbrüder — vereint, undesiegbar. Berlin, Militärverlag, 1975, 167 S.

Рец.: Енакиев О. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 53-58.

World Armaments and Disarmament. SIPRI Yearbook 1974. Stockholm, Almqvist and Wiksell, 1974, XVIII, 526 pp.

Рец.: Ванев В. *Мировая экономика и международные отношения*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 132-135.

Zimmermann Zavala A. *El plan Inca. Objetivo: revolución Peruana*. Lima, Empresa editora del diario oficial "El Peruano", 242 p.

Рец.: Королев Ю. *Латинская Америка*. М., 1975, № 4, стр. 220-222.

Der 22 Parteitag der Kommunistischen Partei Österreichs. Wien, Globus, 1974, 373 S.

Рец.: Швейцер В. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 67-72.

Arthaeology

Domestikationsforschung und Geschichte der Haustiere. Internationales Symposium in Budapest, 1971. Hrsg. J. Matolcsi. Budapest, Akadémiai kiadó, 1973, 402 S.

Рец.: Паавер К. *Советская археология*. М., 1975, № 2, стр. 278-280.

Faider-Feytmans G. *Les nécropoles mérovingiennes*. 1. Texte. 2. Planches. Kortrijk, 1970 (Les collections d'archéologie régionale du Musée de Mariemont. II).

Рец.: Амброз А. *Советская археология*. М., 1975, № 2, стр. 296-300.

Horedt K., Seraphin C. *Die prähistorische Ansiedlung auf dem Wietenberg bei Sighisoara-Schässburg*. Bonn, R. Habelt, 1971, 102 S. (Antiquitas, Reihe 3. Abhandlungen zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte, zur klassischen und provinzialrömischen Archäologie und zur Geschichte des Altertums. Hrsg. A. Alföldi, J. Straub und K. Tackenberg. Bd. 10).

Рец.: Дергачов В., Клейн Л. *Археология*. Київ, 1975, № 17, стр. 107-109.

Lumley-Woodyear H. de. *Le paleolithique inférieur et moyen du Midi Méditerranéen dans son cadre géologique*. V. II. Bas-Languedoc — Roussillon — Catalogne. Paris, 1971, 443 p., 10 tabl., 300 fig. (V supplément à "Gallia préhistorique").

Рец.: Праслов Н. *Советская археология*. М., 1975, № 2, стр. 275-277.

Thomas E. B. *Helme. Schilde. Dolche. Studien über römisch-pannonische Waffenfunde*. Budapest, Akadémiai kiadó, 1971, 155 S.

Рец.: Горелик М. *Советская археология*. М., 1975, № 2, стр. 292-296.

Ethnography

Boev P. *Die Rassentypen der Balkanhalbinsel und der Ostägäischen Inselwelt und deren Bedeutung für die Herkunft ihrer Bevölkerung*. Sofia, Verlag der Bulgarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1972, 269 S.

Рец.: Козинцев А. В кн.: *Расы и народы*. Вып. 5. М., 1975, стр. 343.

Données ethnographiques. Vol. 2. Hanoi, 1973 (Etudes vietnamiennes. N° 36).

Рец.: Чеснов Я. *Советская этнография*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 154-155.

Egar M. *The Muslims of Burma. A Study of a Minority Group*. Wiesbaden, 1972, 151 pp.

Рец.: Гохман В. В кн.: *Расы и народы*. Вып. 5. М., 1975, стр. 343-345.

Ethnographical Data. Vol. 1. Hanoi, 1972. (Vietnamese Studies. N° 32).

Рец.: Чеснов Я. *Советская этнография*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 150-154.

Jacobs W. R. *Dispossessing the American Indian*. New York, 1972, 240 pp.

Рец.: Фурсенко А. В кн.: *Расы и народы*. Вып. 5. М., 1975, стр. 345-347.

Lehtonen J. U. E., Räsänen M. *Kuorion Naaraniemi. Kansatieteellinen tutkimus*. Kuopio, 1973, 109 s.

Рец.: Шлыгина Н. *Советская этнография*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 179-182.

Man in New Guinea. Vol. I-V. Post Moresby, 1968-1973.

Рец.: Бутянов Н. *Советская этнография*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 188.

Ryan S. D. *Race and Nationalism in Trinidad and Tabago (a Study of Decolonization in a Multiracial Society)*. Toronto-Buffalo, 1972, 509 pp.

Рец.: Дридзо А. В кн.: *Расы и народы*. Вып. 5. М., 1975, стр. 348.

Philosophy

Дземидок Б. *О комическом*. Пер. с польского. М., Прогресс, 1974, 224 с.

Рец.: Соколянский М. *Вопросы философии*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 178-179.

Идеологическата борба на съвременния етап. София, Партиздат, 1974, 448 с.

Рец.: Кривуля В. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 26-32.

Кратка история на българската философска мисъл. София, Партиздат, 1973, 591 с.

Рец.: Брайович С., Морозова И. *Научные доклады высшей школы. Философские науки*. М., 1975, № 4, стр. 129-132.

"Масова култура" и идеология. София, Партиздат, 1974, 301 с.

Рец.: Лейбин В. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 35-42.

Янков М. *Актуални проблеми на марксистко-ленинската теория на познанието (Предметно-теоретическо и метатеоретическо равнище)*. София, Издателство на БАН, 1974, 225 с.

Рец.: Урсул А. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 33-39.

Hagen J. *Rationales Entscheiden*. München, W. Fink, 1974, 153 S.

Рец.: Бирюков Б. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 48-52.

Hao Wang. *From Mathematics to Philosophy*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974, 428 pp.

Рец.: Рузавин Г. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 51-57.

Jedynak S. *Etyka i socjalizm*. Warszawa, 1974, 260 s.

Рец.: Ганжин В. *Научные доклады высшей школы. Философские науки*. М., 1975, № 4, стр. 126-128.

Marksizam. Strukturalizam. Istofija, struktura. Beograd, 1974, 629 s.

Рец.: Брайович С. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 37-42.

Marxistisch-leninistische Philosophie in der DDR. Resultate. Standpunkte. Ziele. Hrsg. M. Klein, F. Richter. V. Wrona. Berlin, 1974, 294 S.

Рец.: Фурманов Ю. *Вопросы философии*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 179-181.

Philosophie et religion. Cycle de conférences avec participation de O. Bloch, C. Desse, J. Milhau e. a. Paris, Ed. sociales, 1974, 285 p.

Рец.: Кузнецов В. *Новые книги*

за рубежом по общественным наукам. М., 1974, № 6, стр. 42-48.

West M. L. *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient*. Oxford, 1971.

Рец.: Лелеков Л. *Вестник древней истории*. М., 1975, № 2, стр. 162-164.

Sociology

Проблемы развития социальной структуры общества в Советском Союзе и Польше. Москва-Варшава, 1974.

Рец.: Давидок Г. *Социологические исследования*. М., 1975, № 2, стр. 234-238.

Abels H., Keller B. *Obdachlose. Zur Gesellschaftlichen Definition und Lage einer sozialen Randgruppe*. Opladen, Westdeutscher Verlag, 1974, 193 S.

Рец.: Сивоконь П. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 52-55.

Arbeiterklasse und kulturelles Lebensniveau. Hrsg. G. Freitag, H. Harting u. a. Berlin, Dietz, 1974, 319 S.

Рец.: Петрова Е. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 44-47.

Positivism and Sociology. Ed. A. Giddens. London, Heinemann, 1974, X, 244 pp.

Рец.: Ермоленко Д. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 43-47.

Rose G. *Industriegesellschaft und Konvergenztheorie*. Berlin, Wissenschaften, 1974, 400 S.

Рец.: Фурманов Ю. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 30-35.

The Use of Time. Daily Activities of Urban and Suburban Populations

in Twelve Countries. Ed. by A. Szalai a. o. The Hague-Paris, Mouton, 1972, 868 pp.

Рец.: Кутырев Б., Патрушев В. *Социологические исследования*. М., 1975, № 2, стр. 226-229.

Psychology

Генов Ф. *Психологически аспекти на управлението. Основни проблеми*. София, Партиздат, 1974, 375 с.

Рец.: Савранский И. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 39-44.

Kahneman D. *Attention and Effort*. New York, Prentice-Hall, 1973, 246 pp.

Рец.: Величковский Б. *Вопросы психологии*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 172-173.

Kusmann T. *Sovietische Psychologie: Auf der Suche nach der Methode*. Bonn etc., H. Huber, 1974, 634 S.

Рец.: Лурья А. *Вопросы психологии*. М., 1975, № 2, стр. 169-170.

Norman D. A. *Models of Human Memory*. New York, Academic Press, 1970.

Рец.: Стрелков Ю. *Вопросы психологии*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 174-175.

Sarris V. *Wahrnehmung und Urteil*. Göttingen, Verlag für Psychologie, 1971, 278 S.

Рец.: Гайслер Г. *Вопросы психологии*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 170-171.

Law

Нямдоо Г. *Олон улсын хууль зүйн зарим ассудал*. Ред. Д. Дариймаа. Улаанбаатар, 1973, 131 с.

Рец.: Блищенко И., Жаргалхайсан С. *Советское государство и право*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 135-136.

Сабо И. *Право как правоотношения. Основы теории права*. Пер. с венгерского. Под ред. и со вступ. статьей В. А. Туманова. М., Прогресс, 1974, 268 с.

Рец.: Зорькин В. *Вестник Московского университета. Право*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 85-87.

Таджер В. *Гражданско право на НРБ. Обща част*. Дял 1-2. София, Наука и изкуство, 1972-1973. Дял 1. 1972. 200 с. Дял 2. 1973. 380 с.

Рец.: Чернышева С. *Советское государство и право*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 133.

Цонев В. *Теория на източниците на социалистическото право*. София, 1973, 421 с.

Рец.: Бондарев А. *Известия высших учебных заведений. Правоведение*. М., 1975, № 2, стр. 159.

Lexikon *Arbeitsrecht der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*. Von einem Autorenkollektiv unter Leitung von F. Kunz. Berlin, Staatsverlag der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1972, 443 S.

Рец.: Смирнов В. *Известия высших учебных заведений. Правоведение*. М., 1975, № 2, стр. 159-160.

Röder K.-X., Weichert W. *Das Dilemma des Antikommunismus in der Staatsfrage*. Berlin, 1974, 88 S.

Рец.: Габричидзе Б., Деев Н. *Советское государство и право*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 134-135.

Ziemiński Z. *Etuczne problemy prawoznawstwa*. Wrocław etc., 1972, 321 s.

Рец.: Черданцев А. *Известия высших учебных заведений. Правоведение*. Л., 1975, № 3, стр. 143.

Economics

Движение населения Югославии в послевоенный период. Выдержки из исследования, проведенного Центром демографических исследований Института общественных наук. Белград, 1974, 86 с.

Рец.: Чуйко Л. *Демографические тетради*. Киев, 1974, вып. 9, стр. 282-290.

Иванова В., Захариев А. *Эквивалентность и взаимная изгода на международном социалистически рынок*. София, Издательство на БАН, 1974, 125 с.

Рец.: Тарновский О. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 3-9.

Bérenyi J. *Eletszinvonal és szociálpolitika*. Budapest, Kossuth, 1974, 111 o.

Рец.: Филиппов В. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 3-7.

Capitalism: the Moving Target. New York, Quadrangle, 1974, XI, 159 pp.

Рец.: Парканский А. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 19-23.

Ciepielewski J. *Historia społeczno-ekonomiczna Związku Radzieckiego*. Warszawa, Państwowe wydawnictwo ekonomiczne, 1974, 519 s.

Рец.: Романов И. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 3-9.

Curzon V. *The Essentials of Economic Integration. Lessons of*

EFTA Experience. London, Macmillan, 1974, 319 pp.

Рец.: Кротов О. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 22-26.

Dupuis M. *Nationaliser (Quels groupes? Pourquoi? Comment?)*, Paris, Ed. sociales, 1974, 127 p.

Рец.: Коломийцев В. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 18-21.

Establishing a Business in Australia. Sydney, Bank of New South Wales, 1974, 82 pp.

Рец.: Барыбина И. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 22-25.

Ganguli B. *Multinational Corporations*. New Delhi, Chand, 1974, 112 pp.

Рец.: Доронина Н. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 17-22.

Gordon R. A. *Economic Instability and Growth: the American Record*. New York-London, Harper and Row, 1974, 216 pp.

Рец.: Березовиков Л., Мурашевский Т. *США — экономика, политика, идеология*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 79-81.

Gotta A. *Inflation et croissance depuis 1962*. Paris, Presses universitaires de France, 1974, 166 p.

Рец.: Глухарев Л. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 14-19.

Izakra W. *Czynnik ludzki w rozwoju gospodarczym krajów socjalistycznych*. Warszawa, Państwowe wydawnictwo ekonomiczne, 1974, 267 s.

Рец.: Рутгайзер В., Сидорова Н. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 9-14.

Jouet M. *Le socialisme se porte bien*. Paris, Ed. sociales, 1974, 128 p.

Рец.: Кухарчук Д. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 7-12.

Kock M. de. *Central Banking*. London, Crosby Lockwood Staples, 1974, 325 pp.

Рец.: Худякова Л. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 23-28.

Lakshmanan M. S. *Economic Development in India*. New Delhi. Hindustan Publishing Corporation, 1974, 214 pp.

Рец.: Владимирский Л. *Азия и Африка сегодня*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 54-55.

Perspectives on Inflation. Ottawa, Conference Board in Canada, 1974, 73 pp.

Рец.: Дмитриев С. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 12-16.

Sereghyova J. *Podnik v podmínkách socialistické integrace*. Praha, Svoboda, 1974, 136 s.

Рец.: Макарова Н. *Вопросы экономики*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 137-138.

Stark A. *Népgazdaságunk 30 éve*. Budapest, Kossuth, 1975, 156 o.

Рец.: Пряхин В. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 9-12.

Steiss A. *Public Budgeting and Management*. Lexington (Mass.) Heath, 1974, XV, 351 pp.

Рец.: Воронков А. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 26-29.

30 lat gospodarki Polski Ludowej. Red. K. Secomski. Warszawa, Państwowe wydawnictwo ekonomiczne, 1974, 384 s.

Рец.: Файнштейн П. *Новые*

книги за рубежом по общественным наукам. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 12-17.

Zilg G. C. *Du Pont: Behind the Nylon Curtain*. Englewood Cliffs (N. J.), Prentice Hall, 1974, XI, 623 pp.

Рец.: Осипова Н. *Международная жизнь*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 140-142.

Ecology

Berry B. e. a. *Land Use, Urban Form and Environmental Quality*. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago, 1974, 440 pp.

Рец.: Романова Г. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 29-32.

Environmental Policy. Concepts and International Implications. Ed. by A. E. Utton, D. H. Henning. New York, Praeger Publishers, 1973, IX, 267 pp.

Рец.: Хозин Г. *США — экономика, политика, идеология*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 97-99.

Global Problems of Modern Civilisation. Scientific Symposium. Prague, 13-15 Dec. 1973. In two parts. Vienna, 1974. (Peace and the Sciences. 1974, NN 1,2. Part 1. 65 pp. Part 2. V. 210 pp.

Рец.: Коваленко И., Маклярский Б. *Мировая экономика и международные отношения*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 137-139.

Literary Criticism

Ангелов Б. *Страницы из истории на старобългарската литература*. София, 1974, 235 с.

Рец.: Калиганов И. *Советское славяноведение*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 115-116.

Кувев К. М. *Азбучната молитва в славянските литератури*. София, 1974, 362 с.

Рец.: Бегунов Ю. *Советское славяноведение*. М., 1975, № 4, стр. 108-110.

Українські народні казки Східної Словаччини. Т. I-IV. Упорядкування, післямови та коментарі М. Гиряка. Пряшів, Словацьке педагогічне видавництво, Відділ української літератури, 1965-1972.

Рец.: Барат Л. *Советская этнография*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 182-185.

Хасбаатар Ц. *Утча зохиолын тухай бодол*. Улаанбаатар, Улсын хэвлэлийн газар, 1973, 159 с.

Рец.: Раднаев В. *Азия и Африка сегодня*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 55-56.

Ansley C. *The Heresy of Wu Han. His Play "Hai Jui's Dismissal" and It's Role in China's Cultural Revolution*. Toronto, 1971, 123 pp.

Рец.: Градов В. *Народы Азии и Африки*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 196-199.

A Concordance to the Poems of Osip Mandelstam. Ed. by D. J. Koubourlis. Ithaca-London, Cornell Univ. Press, 1974. XXII, 679 с.

Рец.: Григорьев В. *Известия АН СССР. Серия литературы и языка*. М., 1975, т. 34, № 3, стр. 285-288.

Danek W. *Józef Ignacy Kraszewski*. Warszawa, 1973, 547 s.

Рец.: Горский И. *Советское славяноведение*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 111-113.

W. D. Howells as Critic. Ed. by E. H. Cady. London-Boston, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973, 494 pp.

Рец.: Милославская С. *Вопросы литературы*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 303-308.

Pelc J. *Obraz — Słowo — Znak*. Wrocław, 1973.

Рец.: Софронова Л. *Советское славяноведение*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 117-119.

Smith V. L. *Anton Chekhov and the Lady with the Dog*. Foreword by R. Hingley. London-New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1973, 249 pp.

Рец.: Левидова И. *Вопросы литературы*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 270-279.

Linguistics

Андрейчин Л. *Езикови тревоги*. София, 1973, 265 с.

Рец.: Бояджиев Т. *Советское славяноведение*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 119-121.

Allén S. *Nusvensk frekvensordbok baserad på tidningstext V. 1-2*. Stockholm, 1970-1971.

Рец.: Алексеев П., Каспин И. *Научные доклады высшей школы. Филологические науки*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 114-118.

Kobilarov-Götze G. *Die deutschen Lehnwörter der ungarischen Gemeinsprache*. Wiesbaden, 1972, 571 S. (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica. Bd. 7).

Рец.: Kiss Y. *Советское финно-угроведение*. Таллин, 1975, № 2, стр. 144-147.

Lewicki I. A., Masłowski W., Sambor J., Woronczak J. *Słownictwo współczesny publicystyki polskiej. Listy frekwencyjne*. Warszawa, 1972.

Рец.: Алексеев П., Каспин И. *Научные доклады высшей школы. Филологические науки*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 114-118.

Otázky slovenské syntaxe, III. Sborník symposia "Modální výstavba výpovědi v slovanských jazycích". Brno, 27-30 září 1971.

Brno, Universita J. E. Purkyně, 1973, 399 s.

Рец.: Белошапкова В. *Вопросы языкознания*. М., 1975, № 3, стр. 130-134.

Sammallahti P. *Material from Forest Nenets*. Helsinki, 1974, 140 s. (Castrenianumin toimitteita. 2).

Рец.: Кюннап А. *Советское финно-угроведение*. Таллин, 1975, № 2, стр. 147-150.

Suhonen S. *Die jungen lettischen Lehnwörter im Livischen*. Helsinki, 1973, 250 s.

Рец.: Vaba L. *Советское финно-угроведение*. Таллин, 1975, № 2, стр. 142-144.

Oriental Studies

Studia turcica. Ed. L. Ligeti. Budapest, Akadémiai kiadó, 1971.

Рец.: Асланов В. *Советская тюркология*. Баку, 1975, № 1, стр. 101-111.

Education. Pedagogy

Проблеми на ръководство и управлението на възпитателната работа. София, 1972. (МНП, Управление «Възпитателна работа»).

Рец.: Верникова И. *Советская педагогика*. М., 1975, № 4, стр. 144-146.

Проблеми на управлението на възпитателната работа. София, 1974. (МНП, Управление «Възпитателна работа»).

Рец.: Верникова И. *Советская педагогика*. М., 1975, № 4, стр. 144-146.

Berstecher D., Dreze I., Fragniere G. e. a. *L'Université de demain*.

Préface de F. Edding. Introduction de G. Deurinck. Paris-Bruxelles, 1974, 220 p.

Рец.: Вульфсон Б. *Советская педагогика*. М., 1975, № 4, стр. 134-137.

Decaigny Th. *Technologie éducative et audiovisuel*. 2e ed. rev. et compl. Paris, F. Nathan, 1973, 183 p.

Рец.: Пискунова Н. *Советская педагогика*. М., 1975, № 6, стр. 145-148.

The Education of Teachers in Britain. Ed. by D. E. Lomax. London, J. Wiley and Sons, 1973, 469 pp. (Department of Education, Univ. of Manchester).

Рец.: Андреева Г. *Советская педагогика*. М., 1975, № 4, стр. 137-140.

Science of Science

Art, Science and Technology. The Genius of Leonardo. Dordrecht-Boston, D. Reidel Publishing Co., 1974, 133 pp.

Рец.: Новик И. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 47-52.

Klaus G. *Rationalität — Integration — Information. Entwicklungsgesetze der Wissenschaft in unserer Zeit*. Berlin, Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1974, 302 S.

Рец.: Зуев К., Кротков Е. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 7, стр. 32-37.

Metzger J. *Pour la science*. Paris, Ed. sociales, 1974, 187 p.

Рец.: Борисов В. *Новые книги за рубежом по общественным наукам*. М., 1975, № 5, стр. 47-50.

Subscriptions to SOCIAL SCIENCES can be placed with the firms and bookshops handling the distribution of Soviet periodicals:

Afghanistan

Ketabforushije, Ibn-Sina, Wazarate Matbouat, KABUL; Said Javad Ketabforushije, Mokaddam, Mokabele Depol, Advai Kartee Char. KABUL.

Arab Republic of Egypt

Modern Age Establishment, 20A Adly Pasha Street, CAIRO.

Australia

New World Booksellers, 425, Pitt Street, SYDNEY, N. S. W. 2000; International Bookshop, Pty. Ltd. 2nd Floor, 17, Elizabeth Street, MELBOURNE, Victoria 2000; C. B. D. Library and Subscription Service, Box 4886, G. P. O., SYDNEY, N. S. W. 2000; Socialist World Bookshop, 61, Liverpool Street, SYDNEY, N. S. W. 2000; Spring Bookshop, 7, Collins Street, MELBOURNE, Victoria 3000; Peoples Bookshop, 291, St. Paul's Terrace, Fortitude Valley, QUEENSLAND 4006; People's Bookshop, 27, Wright Court, ADELAIDE, South Australia 5000; Pioneer Bookshop, 75, Bulwer Street, PERTH, West Australia 6000.

Bangladesh

Standard Publishers, Ltd. 3/10, Liaquat Avenue DACCA-1; Sreejani 74, Station Road, CHITTAGONG; Jariya Shahitya Prakashani 10, Purana Paltan, DACCA-2.

Burma

Trade Corporation No. 9, 550/552 Merchant Street, RANGOON.

Canada

Progress Books, 487 Adelaide St., West, TORONTO 2B Ont.; Ukrainska Knyha, 962 Bloor Street West, TORONTO 4, Ont.; Troyka Limited, 799-A College Str., TORONTO 4, Ont.; Northern Book House, P. O. Box 1000, GRAVENHURST, Ont. People's Cooperative Bookstore Association, 341, West Pender Street, VANCOUVER 3, B. C.; Periodica, Inc., 7045 Avenue du Parc, MONTREAL 15, Que.; Librairie Nouvelles Frontières Inc., 96, rue Sherbrooke Ouest, MONTREAL 129, Que.

Cyprus

Sputnik, Ltd., Sophocleous 8, NICOSIA; People's Agency, Tricoupi Str. 53c, NICOSIA.

Denmark

Akademisk Boghandel, Universitetsparken, AARHUS; Dansk-Sovjetisk Bogkiosk Vesterbrogade 77, 1620 KOBENHAVN V; Rhodos International Subscription Agency, Strandgade. 36 DK 1401 COPENHAGEN K.

<u>Ethiopia</u>	Y. P. Yiannopoulos, International Press Agency, P. O. Box 120, ADDIS ABABA.	<u>Jamaica</u>	Independent Book Stores, 2, Wildman Street, KINGSTON W. 1.
<u>Finland</u>	Akateeminen Kirjakauppa, Postilokero 128, HELSINKI 10; Kansankulttuuri Oy Simonkatu 9, HELSINKI 10; Rantakirja Oy Koivuvaarankuja 2,02670 HAMEVAARA.	<u>Japan</u>	Kaigai Publications Ltd., P. O. Box 5020, Tokyo International, TOKYO 100-31; Nauka Ltd., 30-19, Minami-Ikebukuro, 2-chome, Toshima-ku, TOKYO; Far Eastern Book-Sellers, Kanda, P. O. B. 72, TOKYO; Nisso Tosho Ltd., c/o Masumoto Bldg., 1-5-16, Suido. Bunkyo-ku, TOKYO.
<u>Ghana</u>	Science Spot Book Shop, P. O. Box 10698, ACCRA North.	<u>Jordan</u>	Jordan Distribution Agency, P. O. Box 375, AMMAN.
<u>Greece</u>	Planet Publishers, Athens, Greece	<u>Kuwait</u>	Farajalla Press Agency, P. O. Box 4541, KUWAIT, Arabia.
<u>Guyana</u>	The Michael Forde Bookshop, 41, Robb Str., GEORGETOWN.	<u>Malta</u>	Polcar, 7 Market St., FLORIANA.
<u>Hong Kong</u>	Apollo Book Co., P. O. Box 5710, Kowloon; Great Eastern Book Co., 38-46 Henessy Road, 2/F, P. O. Box 20005, HONG KONG.	<u>Nepal</u>	Baje Ko Pasal, Bank Road, Biratnagar, P. O. 1, BIRATHAGAR; International Book House, 6/194, Pako-Pokhaldyang, Post Box 32, KATHMANDU
<u>Iceland</u>	Foreign Magazines, Hverfisgata 50, P. O. B. 1175, REYKJAVIK.	<u>Netherlands</u>	"Pegasus" Boekhandel, Leidsestraat 25, AMSTERDAM; Ster-boek, Visserstraat 23, GRONINGEN
<u>India</u>	People's Publishing House (P) Ltd., Rani Jhansi Road, NEW DELHI-55; Magazine Centre, F-82, 1st Floor, Ghaffar Market, Karol Bagh, NEW DELHI-5; People's Literary Centre, 9895, Nawab Ganj., Pulbangesh, DELHI-6; Lok Vangmay Griha, Khetwadi Main Road, BOMBAY-4; People's Book House, Piramshah Manzil, Relief Road, AHMEDABAD; Vijay Stores, Commissariat Bldg. 1st floor, 231, D. N. Road, BOMBAY-1 Navakarnataka Publications (P) Ltd., Sarpabhusana Mutt Compound, Kempegowda Circle, BANGALORE-9; Magazine Centre, 2nd Floor, Ganapathi Bldgs, B. V. K. Luengar Road, BANGALORE-53; People's Book House, Opp. Patna College, Asok Raj Path, PATNA-4; Manisha Granthalaya (P) Ltd., 4/3B, Bankim Chatterjee Street, CALCUTTA-12; National Book Agency (P) Ltd., 12, Bankim Chatterjee Street, CALCUTTA-12; Bingsha Shatabdi, 22/A, Arabinda Sarani, CALCUTTA-5; Visalaandhra Publishing House, Eluru Road, VIJAYAWADA-2; New Century Book House (P) Ltd., 6 Nallathambi Chetty Street MADRAS-2; Prabhath Book House, Head Office Prabhath Bldg. T. C. 22/306, Vanchiyoor, TRIVANDRUM-24; Vijay Stores, 62, Kalyan Bhuvan, AHMEDABAD-1; Vijay Stores, Station Road, ANAND (W. Rly); Vijay Stores, Rajni, 1st Floor, Bhupendra Road, RAJKOT-1;	<u>New Zealand</u>	Progressive Books, 14-16, Darby Str., AUCKLAND C. I., Technical Books, Ltd., 262 Lambton Quay, WELLINGTON; New Zealand Tribune, P. O. Box 19-114, AUCKLAND.
<u>Iraq</u>	State Advertising Bureau, Ministry of Information, Al-Numan Building, Al-Jamhoria Street, BAHDAD.	<u>Nigeria</u>	Niger Commercial Service, 18 Annang Street, Umuahia, E. C. S.
		<u>Norway</u>	A/S Narvesens Literaturjeneste, Bertrand Narvesens vei 2, Postbooks 6140, OSLO 6; Tanum-Cammermeyer Subscription Centre, Karl Johansgt. 43, OSLO 1; Norsk-Sovjetrussisk Samband, Radhusgt. 8-V, OSLO; A/S Norsk Forlag NY DAG, Books 3634 GB, OSLO; Universitetsforlaget, Box 307, Blindern, OSLO 3.
		<u>Pakistan</u>	Publishing House, 26, Sharah-E-Quaid-E-Azam, P. O. Box 862, LAHORE; Paradise Subscription Agency, Fatima Jinnah Road, KARACHI-4; Standard Publishing House, Marina Hotel, Bonus Road, KARACHI-4.
		<u>P. D. R. Y.</u>	The 14th October Printing Publication, Distribution and Advertising Corporation, P. O. Box 4227, ADEN.
		<u>Singapore</u>	Book Associated International Shop 117, Show Center, SINGAPORE 9.
		<u>Somalia</u>	Samater's, P. O. Box 936, MOGADISCIO.

Sri Lanka

People's Publishing House, 124, Kumaren Ratnam Road, COLOMBO-2.

Sudan

Gamahier Bookshop, P. O. Box 151, Khartoum
Central "El-Fajr Bookshop" P. O. Box 351,
WADMEDANI.

Sweden

Wennergren-Williams AB, Fack, S-104 25 STOC-
KHOLM 30; A. B. C. E. Fritzes Kungl. Hov-
bokhandel, Fredsgatan 2, STOCKHOLM, 16; Nor-
diska Bokhandeln AB., Subscription Department,
Fack, S-101 10 STOCKHOLM 1; Forlags AB
Arbetarkultur Kingsgatan, 84, 112 27 STOC-
KHOLM; Gumperts Bokhandel AB, Sodra Hamn-
gatan 35, GOTEBOURG; Almaqvist & Wiksell, 26,
Gamla Brogatan, Box 62 S-101 20 STOCKHOLM;
Gleerupska Universitetsbokhandel LUND; For-
bundet Sverige-Sovjetunionen, Katarinavagen 20, 1
tr. 116 45 STOCKHOLM.

Syria

Dar Dimachq, Editeurs-Distributeurs, Adib Toun-
bakji, Share Port Said, DAMAS; Dar-Al-Fajr
Edition et Distribution, Rue Al-Kouatly, En Face
du Cercle des Officiers, ALEP; Al-Zahra New
Bookshop, P. O. Box 2858, DAMAS.

Tanzania

African Bookshop, P. O. Box 20837, DAR ES
SALAAM.

Thailand

Praepittaya Limited Partnership, 716-718 Burapa
Palace, P. O. Box 194, BANGKOK-2.

United Kingdom

Central Books Ltd., 37, Grays Inn Road, LON-
DON W. C. 1; Collet's Holdings, Ltd., Denington
Estate, WELLINGBOROUGH Northants.

USA

Four Continent Book Corporation, 156 Fifth Ave.,
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10010; Imported Publications
Inc., 320 West Ohio Street, CHICAGO, Illinois
60610. Stechert-Macmillan, Inc., 7250 Westfield
Ave., Pennsauken, N. J. 08110; EBSCO Subscrip-
tion Services, 17-19 Washington Avenue, TENAF-
LY, New Jersey 07670. Victor Kamkin, Inc. 12224
Parklawn Drive, ROCKVILLE, Md. 20852; Znanie
Book Store, 5237 Geary Boulevard, SAN FRAN-
CISCO, Ca. 94118.

Y. A. R.

Dar Al-Kalam, Ali Abdul Mugni Street, P. O. Box
1107, SANAA.

«ОБЩЕСТВЕННЫЕ НАУКИ» № 1, 1976 г.
на английском языке

The FOREIGN TRADE Journal

*Is an Indispensable Source of Information
for Businessmen*

In order to trade successfully and to maintain good business relations with one's trading partner, one need obtain as much information about him as possible.

You will be greatly helped in this respect by the FOREIGN TRADE journal, the official organ of the USSR Foreign Trade Ministry, one of the oldest Soviet publications. The journal is published in Russian, English, French, German and Spanish and well known to businessmen in many countries.

The subscriber to the FOREIGN TRADE monthly will find in it numerous articles and a wealth of material on both the theory and practice of the USSR's trade and economic relations with other countries, Soviet trade policy, problems of foreign trade and other forms of economic cooperation, questions relating to the international division of labour and the activities of international economic organisations, credit and currency relations, the present-day situation on world commodity markets, and so on.

The journal carries as a supplement an annual statistical survey of Soviet foreign trade (only in Russian), which is the most exhaustive source of statistical information about Soviet foreign trade.

A special section in the journal carries biographical notes about leading Soviet foreign trade workers, USSR trade representatives abroad and foreign trade representatives in the Soviet Union.

We are sure that the FOREIGN TRADE journal will be a good helper in your practical work.

Subscriptions to the journal (with the statistical survey supplement) from any month of the year are taken by firms dealing in Soviet periodical publications.

Our address: FOREIGN TRADE,
4, Pudovkin Str.,
Moscow, 119285, USSR

**IN OUR
NEXT ISSUE:**

**Science and Socialism
Socialist Democracy**

**Geographical
Sciences Today**

**Quantitative Methods
in Historical Studies**

"Artificial Intellect"

**Unique Experiment of
Soviet Psychologists**

*Issued
by the
"Social
Sciences
Today"
Editorial
Board*

*Printed
by Nauka
Publishers*

