

\$150

The
Soviet
Review

A Journal of Translations

FALL 1963/VOL. IV, NO. 3

On the Problem of Conflict in Socialist Society

Problems of the Movement for Communist Labor in the USSR

State-Monopoly Capitalism and Bourgeois Political Economy

Specific Features of Reproduction in the United States

The New Codification of Civil Law and Protection of the
Honor and Dignity of the Citizen

the soviet review

FALL 1963/VOL. IV, NO. 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

G. M. SHTRAKS: On the Problem of Conflict in Socialist Society (Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta, seriia ekonomiki, filosofii, 1962, No. 5)	3
B. A. GRUSHIN and V. V. CHIKIN: Problems of the Movement for Communist Labor in the USSR (Istoriia SSSR, 1962, No. 5)	10
V. CHEPRAKOV: State-Monopoly Capitalism and Bourgeois Political Economy (Voprosy ekonomiki, 1962, No. 7)	32
A. BECHIN: Specific Features of Reproduction in the United States (Mirovaia ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1962, No. 10)	44
O. S. IOFFE: The New Codification of Civil Law and Protection of the Honor and Dignity of the Citizen (Sovetskoe gosudarstvo i pravo, 1962, No. 7)	54

the soviet review

A JOURNAL OF TRANSLATIONS

THE SOVIET REVIEW contains translations from the following Soviet publications:

Voprosy ekonomiki (Problems of Economics)
Planovoe khoziaistvo (Planned Economy)
Mirovaia ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia
(World Economy and International Relations)
Sovetskaia pedagogika (Soviet Pedagogy)
Narodnoe obrazovanie (Public Education)
Sovetskoe gosudarstvo i pravo (Soviet State and Law)
Kommunist (Communist)
Voprosy istorii (Problems of History)
Novaia i noveishaia istoriia
(Modern and Contemporary History)
Voprosy filosofii (Problems of Philosophy)
Filosofskie nauki (Philosophical Sciences)
Voprosy psikhologii (Problems of Psychology)
Voprosy literatury (Problems of Literature)
Novyi mir (New World)

Articles from other publications are included from time to time if they are considered of sufficient interest.

INTERNATIONAL

ARTS

AND

SCIENCES

PRESS

156 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10010

The purpose of THE SOVIET REVIEW is to provide readers with a cross-section of significant articles published in Soviet periodicals in the social sciences and the field of literary criticism. THE SOVIET REVIEW makes these translations available for information and research, and the publication of an article implies neither approval nor disapproval of its contents.

THE SOVIET REVIEW is published quarterly by International Arts and Sciences Press. Editor and Publisher: M. E. Sharpe. Business offices: 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y. Printed at Cushing-Malloy, Inc., 1350 North Main Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Subscriptions \$6.00 per year, single copies \$1.50. Second class postage paid at Ann Arbor, Michigan.

© 1963 by International Arts and Sciences Press.
Printed in the U.S.A.

G. M. Shtraks

ON THE PROBLEM OF CONFLICT IN SOCIALIST SOCIETY

The Nature and Conditions of Origin of Conflicts Under Socialism

Conflict is a special phase of development, an intensification of certain contradictions in social life, characterized, generally speaking, by the fact that the contradiction has already become ripe for solution but under such circumstances that particular forces (internal or external in nature), constituting one of the conflicting aspects, interfere with its solution in one way or another. It is clear that because of its general nature this characteristic does not and cannot embrace the entire range of possible conflicts. The concept of conflict is not identical with that of antagonism. The latter term describes a type of contradiction, while the former has to do with the degree of acuteness. A conflict may be antagonistic or nonantagonistic in nature.

Every social order is characterized by its qualitatively distinctive conflicts. Depending upon the nature of the objective laws and upon the level and concrete conditions of development of the social order, the range of their effects may differ greatly.

In all pre-socialist social systems, a point was inevitably reached at which the relations of production ceased to correspond to the further development of the productive forces and came into conflict with them. Such conflict was inevitable inasmuch as the ruling class did everything in its power to preserve the outdated relations of production, for its own interests were intimately bound up with them. The conflict that set in was expressed in the exacerbation of the class struggle and, sooner or later, in a crisis of the entire obsolete social system. For capitalism, the general crisis began with the First World War and the October Revolution. Today the third stage in this crisis is under way. "Imperialism has entered the period of dusk and downfall. An inevitable process of decay has engulfed capitalism from top to bottom: its economic and governmental system, its politics and ideology."⁽¹⁾

The appearance and exacerbation of conflicts in capitalist society signify the establishment and

development of the prerequisites — both objective and subjective — for the triumph of the socialist revolution. On the other hand, the socialist revolution is the sole means of resolving the social conflicts that are rending capitalist society and condemning millions of working people to the torture of unemployment, poverty, hunger, and wars of extermination for conquest.

In addition to the conflicts that arise only at a particular stage in the development of capitalist society, that society is also permeated by those which accompany it from its very birth to its death. Here we speak of acute clashes, of conflicts between individual human beings and between man and society.

A man who observes in every respect the laws and principles of capitalist society, employing them as guides to action, inevitably finds himself in conflict with them and with other human beings. Capitalist property and the competition based on it cannot but lead to conflicts not only between the worker and the capitalist, but between the capitalists themselves, and sometimes between workers themselves, and to conflicts between man and society.

A man who does not adhere to the wolfish principles of capitalism and, even more, one who rebels against them, is by this very fact in conflict with capitalist society. In capitalist society, conflicts between the anti-humanist nature of capitalism and that which is universal in all human morality inevitably arise and make themselves felt increasingly. The world's creative literature — from Dante's Divine Comedy to Balzac's The Human Comedy — is an unbroken martyrology of people crippled and destroyed in the tempests of these conflicts.

However, when capitalist society enters the period of its general crisis, conflicts between man and society attain particular force and acuteness. "Capitalism, with its exploitation of man by man, with its chauvinist and racist ideology, its inherent moral degeneracy, spate of speculation, corruption

and crime brings decay to society, the family and man." (2) This finds expression in the orgy of amorality and in the appearance of extremely decadent philosophical theories such as existentialism, which proclaims that the tortuously tragic conflict between the individual and society is eternal. It preaches complete social dissolution of society and the cult of death as man's only way out of the vale of fear and despair of which life consists, as depicted by the adepts of this philosophy.

Socialist society is characterized by the different sphere and, most important, the different nature of the conflicts in which the nonantagonistic nature of its contradictions is expressed.

As a general rule, under socialism, too, any contradiction may become a conflict. But with respect to such fundamental social relations as, for example, the interrelation between the productive forces and production relations, between base and superstructure, this possibility remains abstract. On the one hand, the objective conditions of socialism include nothing that must inevitably lead to conflicts in this sphere. On the other hand, the correct policy of the Communist Party and the socialist state guarantees that contradictions in any given sphere will be overcome in good time, without permitting them to undergo transformation into conflict.

The ideological opponents of Marxism never cease to proclaim the inevitability of conflicts between the individual and society under the conditions of socialism. This is heaping the ills of the sick upon the healthy: ascribing the faults of capitalism to socialism.

Socialist production has the purpose of achieving the fullest possible satisfaction of human needs. The socialist state is a state of the entire people. "Everything in the name of man and for the welfare of man" is the slogan of the Communist Party. All this testifies to the fact that the nature of socialism and the character of its objective laws contain the basis for organic unity between the individual and society, not for conflicts between them. This foundation is public ownership of the means of production, the socio-political and ideological unity which is inherent in socialist society as a whole, and the absence of conflicts between the productive forces and relations of production or between classes.

Thanks to this combination of objective and subjective conditions, conflicts under socialism are completely different in social character and incomparably narrower in their sphere of activity than under capitalism. They arise, under special circumstances, solely between society and individual persons, and also between individuals.

To understand the specific nature of conflicts and how they are overcome under the conditions of

socialism, it is important to take into consideration the fact that what is new here is the dominant and leading force in society as a whole. This does not mean, however, that under these circumstances the new is automatically guaranteed victory in each individual case. The struggle between the new and the old in various specific areas may pass through different stages and achieve different levels of acuteness, sometimes reaching the level of conflict.

Conflicts in socialist society are in one way or another related to its objective contradictions in general, and are echoes of these contradictions, a peculiar form of their expression in certain relationships among human beings and between man and the group.

Thus, the mighty technological revolution now under way in socialist production is a form of solution of an entire complex of contradictions: between the old and the new technology, between new high production parameters (high velocities, very high temperatures, etc.) and the old methods of controlling production processes, etc.

Movement, the solution of such contradictions, is achieved through the activities of the human beings who are participants in production. Depending upon circumstances and upon the character of men and their paths in life, some may and do become active proponents of the revolution in technology and production, and others may and sometimes do become obstacles in its path, coming into conflict with the former. In such cases, the conflict between human beings expresses a more profound and not immediately visible process of the development of contradictions in production which need solution.

When something new appears and matures (a new construction design, a new production process, a new method of organizing production, etc.) somewhere (at an enterprise, in an office, in a research institution, etc.), it does not always gain recognition and find application. It is not uncommon for partisans of the old to defend it in every possible way when the time for the new to take over in the given field is clearly at hand. This is one of the signs of conflict between men, between the group and individuals in socialist society.

Another characteristic is to be found in the fact that the old seeks to capture or actually does recapture dominant positions which it has previously lost, driving out the new in the given field or phenomenon. This is the case, for example, when a man who at one time was, it appeared, devoted to the ideas of socialism for some reason begins to be possessed with a greed for property.

Within reasonable limits, the personal property of a working man is a form of personal consump-

tion. Beyond these limits it begins to do harm to society and to the person who possesses it. This circumstance was taken particular note of at the 22nd Congress of the Party. Said Khrushchev at that Congress: "Under given circumstances, excessive personal property may be transformed, and frequently is transformed, into a brake upon the social process, into a propagator of private-ownership habits, and may result in petty bourgeois degeneration. It happens that the possession of things enslaves a man, and he becomes the slave of things." (3)

A man who has become the slave of things is a petty bourgeois degenerate and is thereby in conflict with socialist society.

Conflicts under the conditions of socialism are usually related to violation of various norms and principles of socialist society. This causes the struggle between the new and the old to take on special acuteness.

The most acute conflicts, which acquire the nature of antagonistic contradiction, occur in those cases where crimes against the foundations of socialist society are committed.

The exacerbation of certain contradictions to the level of conflicts under the conditions of socialism is explained by both objective and subjective conditions. In the former category we find the objective difficulties involved in the development of socialist society and the overcoming of its contradictions. In the latter we find the survivals of capitalism, improper methods of leadership at certain levels, cases still occurring of poor upbringing of the rising generation, and certain other phenomena.

Society's advance on the road to communism involves overcoming difficulties of an objective nature. Our party has always drawn attention to such difficulties. Thus, vast new efforts have been required in recent years to bring about a further accelerated growth of heavy industry, which is the base of the economy, and simultaneously to assure a rise in agriculture. We still have certain difficulties in providing housing to the people, in supplying certain types of consumer goods, etc.

These difficulties are difficulties of rapid growth, marking the solution of the stupendous tasks involved in the advance to communism. To overcome them always requires a considerable intensification of the efforts of the working population, the party and the state.

Such difficulties and the pressures in the struggle related to them create the possibility of certain conflicts.

The vast mass of the working population meets these difficulties head-on and overcomes them by

increasing their creative contribution of labor to the common cause, by revealing new and as yet unutilized capabilities and resources at socialist enterprises, increasing labor productivity, introducing new methods of organizing production, fighting for economy in raw materials, and so forth. However, there also exist in socialist society people who strive, under the influence of bourgeois survivals, to transfer their difficulties onto the shoulders of others and, furthermore, to make use of existing difficulties to get rich at the expense of society. Under such circumstances a conflict arises between such elements and society.

However, this does not mean that objective difficulties must inevitably be accompanied by conflicts or that conflict cannot appear where no serious objective difficulties exist, in which case they appear for purely subjective reasons.

As one such situation we may cite the inability or unwillingness of some people to consider and to adjust to that which is new in life and which always causes trouble, concern and excitement.

Among the circumstances that shape a man and his character are the characteristics of those who constitute his immediate environment at work, in public affairs, in social contacts and in the family. A lack of organization and firmness of the part of a superior may produce lax individuals, lacking any feeling of responsibility for the matter assigned to them, and therefore capable of ignoring fundamental social interests, and thus of coming into conflict with the group and with all of socialist society.

No small role in the appearance of conflicts is played by bureaucracy, careerism and other survivals of capitalism in the consciousness and behavior of men. When some careerist prettifies a situation and, so as to "distinguish himself," adds nonexistent output to his report, etc., he does serious damage to society and comes into acute conflict with it. Moral delinquency on the part of either parent may leave a serious imprint upon the character of children. True, bad parents may have morally healthy children, but this happens despite their influence, which acts to create prerequisites for the appearance of moral shortcomings in children and consequently of conflicts between them and socialist society.

The conflicts that emerge into the foreground and acquire greatest importance differ in the various periods of the development of socialist society. This is not the result of anyone's desire or choice, but derives from the objective course of things. Socialist society concentrates its attention upon the solution of specific problems and, encountering the resistance of some individuals in that respect, may prove to be in conflict with them. Thus, in a period

of rapid transition from old to new technology, conflicts between society and technological conservatives attract attention. Today, when problems of education for a life of useful work and of bringing the entire employable population into a life of socially productive activity have acquired primary significance as a major condition for the transition to communism, conflicts with loafers and with those who have chosen for themselves the role of spongers, or parasites on the body of society, are particularly sharply felt.

The fact that conflicts with such elements have recently become more frequent is no accident. This fact does not at all mean that larger numbers of parasitic elements have appeared or are appearing. Quite the opposite is the case: they are diminishing in number. But under conditions of an ever-increasing rise in creative labor enthusiasm, embracing the entire working population, the activities of such elements become particularly intolerable and call forth the wrath of the working population. Under these conditions the role of the people as a collective educator and as a mighty force reeducating those elements that interfere with its advance to communism is felt to an ever-increasing degree.

The assertion that conflict is the most acute form of contradiction does not at all mean that every contradiction (in that sphere in which conflicts occur under communism) must essentially reach that stage and cannot be resolved without it.

The socio-political and ideological unity of society makes it possible to overcome many such contradictions without permitting them to lead to conflict.

The conflict between new and old is always under way. But this struggle does not always result in fierce resistance at all stages and levels of production and administration, attaining the level of conflict. This kind of fierce resistance is not inevitable under socialism, despite the attempts of some writers to assert the opposite, and socialist society is, as a general rule, interested in preventing such conflicts and takes active measures in that direction.

As the socialist economy, the living standard and the communist consciousness of people develop, the sphere of conflicts in socialist society will narrow. However, the possibility of conflicts must be taken into consideration so long as prerequisites for them exist.

The content and forms of conflicts in socialist society are quite varied. It would be an oversimplification of reality to contend that in our society conflicts consist solely of clashes between pioneers and conservatives, or of the struggle against various manifestations of the survivals of capitalist ideology,

including the fight against various kinds of crimes. If this were the case, the transition from socialism to communism would bring an end to conflicts in general, and life would acquire a character wholly free of conflict. But the fact is that even under the conditions of communism, with all its harmony, human life will be only relatively harmonious, inasmuch as absolute harmony and absolute "fit" among phenomena is an impossibility. Differences in human character and ambitions, searchings for the new, and the inevitable difficulties associated with it, the struggle with nature, exploration of unknown worlds in space, and other situations will always give rise to certain conflicts in relations among men. These will not be the everyday contradictions without which development is impossible under any conditions, but a situation in which maximum efforts of strength, intensity of feelings and thought, and the greatest possible mobilization of human potential are required to find a way out of the collisions occurring. (4)

Such situations occur, of course, in socialist society as well. The search for the new by a scientist or a pioneer in production is a vast labor in which failures are common and conflicts on the way to the goal are possible. He who wishes to create must be prepared not only for the joys but for the sorrows of creation.

A real conflict is always a complex knot of contradictions, differing in depth, acuteness and degree of importance. A correct understanding of a conflict in life therefore requires one not to confuse superficial encounters with true conflict, but to seek out major lines of development. It is clashes among these that constitute the content of conflicts and impart to them their characteristic acuteness. However, no matter what the content may be, what is most important in them is the struggle between old and new in their various manifestations.

The question as to the form of conflict is another one which must not be schematically interpreted. Here the widest range of nuances are possible, from a hidden struggle not visible at the surface, involving apparently smooth relationships between the conflicting parties, to open sharp clashes. But a direct clash between parties is certainly not always an expression of conflict between them. Conflict is therefore to be judged primarily by its content.

Conflict as an Ethical Category

Conflict is not only a social, but also an esthetic and ethical category. Conflict as an esthetic category has been examined in a considerable number of articles and monographs. Conflict as an ethical

category has had less research devoted to it. Yet if conflict is a knot of specific human relationships and demands great intensity of intellect and will from both the parties involved, it must also be regarded as a manifestation of the ethical principles to which the opposed parties adhere as well as from the point of view of the influence which conflict exercises upon their morality.

In considering conflict under the conditions of socialism from an ethical point of view, it is important to identify the moral characteristics most significant for avoiding undesirable conflicts and for overcoming those that have already come into existence. These are primarily idealism, courage, the ability to resist hostile influences, and a rational faith in man.

If a man reaches the point of being in a state of conflict with the socialist group and society as a whole, this has become possible primarily because this man lacks the motivation of ideas. This motivation is not merely the sum of knowledge of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. It is a wonderful alloy of Marxist theory and revolutionary practice. This alloy appears only when the ideas of Marxism-Leninism become the profound personal convictions of a man and, as a consequence, find their practical embodiment in his daily deeds. The CPSU Program emphasizes that communist ideas must be combined with communist deeds in the behavior of each human being, in the activity of each group and each organization. For a person truly motivated by ideas, it is just as impossible to find himself in conflict with socialist society as it is to cease to be a human being.

There are cases in which individuals who have passed through the Soviet school system and belonged to the Komsomol become philistines or take the path of crime.

Every such case is a defeat in a given sector of our work of character-building; it is spoilage in our ideological work. How is this phenomenon to be explained?

To a considerable degree by the fact that those who bore the responsibility for this work were unable to temper this individual's ideals at the proper time.

It is only when a person lacks ideals that it is possible for his character to be invaded by factors that bring him into conflict with society and with communist morality: egotism, lack of principle, money-grubbing, and so forth. On the other hand, once a conflict has arisen, it is specifically communist idealism that is the main weapon of the progressive, the right side, in its struggle to triumph. In this situation, idealism is manifested in a profound conviction of the justice of our great cause

and in an understanding of the fact that in the given conflict the struggle for the new is a component of the people's overall struggle for communism and, finally, in the passionate desire, striving and ability in practice to do everything to make it possible for the new, the progressive and the advanced to triumph in the conflict.

"In the course of the establishment of communist forms of social organization, communist ideals will take deeper and deeper root in life, labor and the relationships among men..." (5)

Of primary significance in the solution of this problem is the establishment of a scientific world view among all the working population of Soviet society, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

Under present conditions, the development of a communist attitude toward work on the part of all members of society is central to all educational activity. In this connection a struggle is essential for undeviating adherence to the principle of "he who does not work, neither shall he eat," and against loafers and the remnants of parasitic elements who wish to live at the expense of society, giving it nothing and avoiding participation in socially useful labor.

Another most important moral characteristic, which ranks in significance with idealism in preventing undesirable conflicts and overcoming those that may arise, is courage. Lack of courage and weakness of will frequently result in a person's beginning to stray from the straight and narrow path. Character-building and self-education must be so conducted that courage as a trait of character is developed not only on the example of particularly outstanding acts of heroism, but also on the basis of man's everyday activity and in the ordinary environment of his life. It is in the need to manifest restraint, patience, to speak frankly in criticism, to withstand certain deprivations if conditions require this, to display boldness and initiative in solving a problem or some practical task, that courage is developed as a trait of character and that a man is tempered for the more serious tests he may face. (6)

Situations exist in which it is in the interests of further progress in a given field that particular partial contradictions be consciously brought to the level of conflict and the acute struggle related thereto. This requires courage. Sometimes a group contains partisans of the new and supporters of the old, while the former are timid and indecisive, with the consequence that the latter do not take an open stand and thus inhibit the introduction of the new. When a contradiction is thus indefinite and undeveloped, the matter at hand suffers. The new cannot win out, and conservatism cannot be elim-

inated. When an innovator of decisive character appears in this group — one who understands the significance of the new and introduces it in practice, boldly attacking the positions of the conservatives — all those who are attracted by the new tend to group themselves around him. A polarization of the parties occurs, the indeterminate situation disappears, a fresh breeze purifies the stale atmosphere, and an acute struggle breaks out that finally leads to triumph by the innovators over those who take a routine approach. Conflict of this type provides a powerful impetus for solution of practical problems that have become mature for solution and plays a major educative role. It tempers the decisive, emboldens the timid adherents of the new, and cuts the ground from beneath the upholders of the old, those who prefer an untroubled existence.

This does not mean, of course, that triumph in a conflict is a simple or easy matter. In the final analysis the side that is right — the bearer of the new — will inevitably win out. This is determined by the very nature of the socialist system, which gives rise to and feeds all that is new and progressive. However, the path to this triumph is sometimes thorny. A pioneer or rationalizer in production sometimes has to expend much effort before he succeeds in having his invention adopted. He may even be defeated temporarily. In such a case, the conflict takes on an extended character. This must be borne in mind so as not to delude oneself, and one must understand that intense efforts are required to triumph in each individual case, in each individual conflict, if one has arisen. It is necessary to manifest stubbornness, persistence, resourcefulness to the bitter end, so as to carry the struggle to completion and win it.

Indissolubly related to the development of courage is the development of a man's ability to resist harmful influences. The time of communism is coming, when it will be possible to disregard this harmful factor. But under today's conditions it is still necessary to consider the inevitability of the harmful influence exercised by the propaganda of the capitalist countries and the survival of capitalist ideology. Familiarization with crimes committed as first offenses by young people shows that these crimes are usually committed under the influence of hardened habitual criminals. Recently the Moscow City Court sentenced to three years at corrective labor one Igor Zolotov, who yielded simply out of weakness of will to the importunities of two habitual criminals and agreed to take part in the robbery of a cashier which they had planned. It is very important to inculcate, particularly in the rising generation of young people, the ability actively to resist harmful influences and to instill immunity,

as it were, against this harmful phenomenon. "Every person," wrote A. S. Makarenko, "must step out into life with the ability to resist harmful influences." (7)

Resistance to harmful influence must be understood not only on the personal plane, i.e., not only in the sense of not yielding to it, but also, what is even more important, on the broad public plane. The point is to develop in each member of socialist society the desire and ability to engage in active struggle with everything that is hostile to his world view, his morality, and that conflicts with socialism in one respect or another. The moral code of the builder of communism includes such principles as a high consciousness of public duty; intolerance toward violations of public interests; intolerance to injustice, loafing, dishonesty, careerism and money-grubbing.

Conflict as it exists among us does not include struggle against the human being with whom the forces of progress are in conflict. Under socialism, conflict is primarily the struggle for man, against the evil that has developed in him or has attached itself to him.

In this struggle for a man one must be able to make the man himself one's ally.

This is why faith in man is so important and significant when conflict occurs.

A rational faith in man is one of the important features of the struggle to overcome conflict under socialism. This feature arises from the unity inherent in socialist society and from the fact that in its nonantagonistic contradictions both sides have common basic interests and differ, struggle with each other, on matters not fundamental in nature. As applied to conflict, this means that the leading, the progressive side enjoys the opportunity of basing itself upon the best characteristics of the opposed party with which it is engaged in struggle. But this means having faith in the latter and assisting it to assemble its best forces and to shake off what is unsuitable. Under capitalism, such faith in man is impossible, as it contradicts the very nature of that antihumanist system. Under socialism, faith in a man who has gone off the road, as one of the manifestations of society's struggle for him, is a vivid expression of socialist humanism.

Faith in a man who has strayed and in his possibilities, in the best qualities of his soul, qualities that have only been temporarily suppressed and throttled, is a most powerful weapon of socialist society in the conflicts with which it has to deal.

Origin of Conflict and Methods of Overcoming It

As we have observed, conflict is a new qualitative state of a contradiction, a particular stage in

its exacerbation. But, once having arisen, a conflict may build up and become more acute if it is not immediately overcome.

Internal conflicts may occur in the individual when one aspect of his consciousness clashes sharply with one or other aspects. We observe such conflicts in cases when a man compromises his conscience. When we speak of remorse, we have in mind an internal conflict of long standing which may have two possible outcomes. Either a man is able to strengthen himself where he is weak and overcome his yielding to what contradicts his essentially socialist conscience, or he "adapts" himself to the compromise with conscience that he has made, and thereby opens the way to new compromises of the same order, becoming a man without conscience. This would signify an extremely sharp exacerbation of the conflict, making it evident from without. Such an internal conflict, developing initially in the consciousness of a single individual, thus becomes the point of departure in a conflict between this man and the collective, society as a whole.

Art is called the cultivation of man. No less should our work as educators, and our propaganda based on Marxism, be the cultivation of man. The task is to know man not in general but, at a given stage in his development, to be able to approach him correctly at critical moments, at a critical period in his life when he may be in particular need of comradely support and of the assistance of the group.

Various levels of conflict are possible. It may remain within the framework of struggle between socialist morality and an amoral act. In this case the chief force in overcoming the conflict will be public opinion in its various forms.

But conflict can emerge beyond the bounds in which public opinion alone may resolve it, and may progress to the sphere of struggle against socialist law and its violation. In this case, the major force in overcoming the conflict will be socialist administration of justice.

Experience demonstrates that it is very important to take this degree and level of development of conflict into consideration in order properly to resolve the question of the forms and methods of overcoming it. It is impossible to limit oneself solely to moral influence in cases when not only moral but legal standards have been seriously violated. Thus, there are times when organizations petition courts to parole to their care people who have committed serious crimes, and they encounter valid refusal.

A group that has accepted parole responsibility for an individual who has committed a crime thus accepts serious obligations for his reeducation.

But the individual whom the group has accepted on parole has accepted even more serious obligations. He is required to do everything possible to correct himself and to justify the faith the group has shown in him. But this is not always what happens. Sometimes the parolee resumes his antisocial behavior, with the result that the group is compelled to abandon its former decision, in which case the suspended sentence of the court goes into effect.

There are also people in our society who, committing intentional crimes, lay the groundwork for being paroled to a given group even before the crime is committed, in case they are caught. It is understandable that no parole should be extended in such cases. The full force of Soviet law must be applied to such habitual criminals. However, our judicial agencies and procuracy sometimes relax in their fight against serious crimes on the grounds of the increased role of public opinion in educational activity. However, the interference of public opinion is inadequate where the legal standards of socialist society are seriously violated.

On the other hand, legal sanctions should not be applied in cases in which purely moral influence may prove adequate to overcome conflict. To confine oneself to this in such a case means to elevate the significance of the standards of communist morality in general and its significance for overcoming conflicts in particular.

The strength of the group is manifested, among other things, in the fact that, resting upon purely moral sanctions, upon public opinion, the group proves able to resolve conflicts that have arisen in its midst. It would be wrong to underestimate the great possibilities of each group in this respect.

"The conflictual nature of a nonantagonistic contradiction," we read, "means that solution of a particular contradiction is difficult or impossible within the limits of a given group or organization, and that its solution requires that the question be transferred to a broader group or a more authoritative organization." (8)

It seems to us that this is not the case, or in any case that it is not a general and obligatory sign of conflict under socialism. Experience shows that many conflicts are resolved by the efforts of the collective in which they occur.

The period of advance to communism in all fields is witnessing an expansion of the opportunities available to society in the struggle successfully to overcome conflicts. This is one of the expressions of the rising consciousness of the masses of the working people. Socialist public opinion itself advances and makes use of new forms and methods of work directed to overcoming conflicts. They include comradely courts, the practice of group

acceptance of parolees for rehabilitation, the activities of the unarmed volunteer police, etc. The role of groups of communist labor is particularly significant. They are groups in which education in the spirit of communism really occurs, and it is not only their own members upon whom they exercise this effect. Recently a number of these groups have been undertaking tutelage of groups of people who have served time for crimes in corrective labor colonies, in order to assist them to return faster to lives of honorable labor. They have also taken responsibility for individuals who have not yet found their place in life and are acutely in need of cultivation by the group. This is a remarkable characteristic of our day, when questions of education in the spirit of communism occupy the center of attention of the Soviet public.

The moral code of the builder of communism, finding its expression in the Party Program, contains moral principles aimed at developing a morally pure person of integrated character, capable of dealing with any of the difficulties of life honorably and with dignity.

A study of the nature and conditions of origin, and of the means of overcoming conflicts under socialism, and the cultivation of those traits of character in the man of socialist society that are most important in the collisions occurring in life — all constitute one of the important links in

education for communism.

Footnotes

- 1) Programma Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza, Pravda Press, 1961, p. 25.
- 2) Ibid., p. 33.
- 3) Materialy XXII s'ezda KPSS, Gospolitizdat, 1961, p. 84.
4. "Development, forward motion, replacement of the old by the new will certainly take place under communism, too. As we know, the old does not yield to the new without struggle, and once this is the case, there will be human conflicts, and the writer of communist society, a writer not hobbled by the cords of the no-conflict theory, will write about them" (Vilis Lacis, "Literatura budushchego," Literaturnaia gazeta, December 20, 1958).
- 5) Programma Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza, p. 117.
- 6) See A. S. Makarenko, "O kommunisticheskom vospitanii," Molodaia gvardiia, 1958, p. 51.
- 7) Ibid., p. 86.
- 8) S. Ia. Kogan, "K voprosu o spetsifike proiavleniia zakonov dialektiki v razvitii sotsialisticheskogo obshchestva," Trudy Odesskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. I. I. Mechnikova, ser. obshchestvennykh nauk, 1955, Vol. 145, No. 1, pp. 238-239.

Istoriia SSSR, 1962, No. 5

B. A. Grushin and V. V. Chikin

PROBLEMS OF THE MOVEMENT FOR COMMUNIST LABOR IN THE USSR*

More than forty years ago, in speaking of the effect of socialism in transforming man, Vladimir

*This article discusses the results of a survey by Komsomol'skaia pravda's Institute of Public Opinion at the end of 1961.

Il'ich Lenin noted that the new social system for the first time opened to workers and peasants the possibility of "revealing themselves, of developing their abilities, of displaying their talents," of which the people constitute "an as-yet untouched... source of infinite wealth." (1)

Socialism actually has created previously non-existent conditions for the development of the human personality and its improvement in all respects. But the matter at issue is not that of separate individuals or of individual social strata, but of the very broadest millions of the masses who have developed fundamentally new attitudes toward labor.

The first heralds of communist labor — the Communist Saturday workers who donated their labor — appeared at the very dawn of the Soviet period, during the years of economic devastation and violent battles at the fronts of the Civil War. This new form of civic activity demonstrated the creativity, conscientiousness and voluntary initiative of the proletariat. At that time these earliest signs found embodiment in the heroic labor of the workers, peasants and intellectuals and in the vast scope of the socialist competition involving the entire people, which proved to be a splendid technique for the building of a new world. The Communist Saturday workers, the shock-brigade movement, the Stakhanovite movement, the numerous acts of initiative at work, all took their origin from the initiative of the masses themselves and constituted a unique preface to the higher form of organization of labor and mode of life now developing under the slogan "learn to work and live as Communists." The movement for communist work brigades appeared four years ago at the Moscow Railway Marshaling Yards, where the Communist Saturday worker movement had originated, and has now become a powerful movement of the day. As the "scouts of the future" justly observed in their appeal to the people, "it has embodied all the best that has been developed during the many years of experience in socialist competition; it develops a communist attitude toward work, promotes the implanting of communist morality in everyday life and the shaping of a new type of man free of survivals from the past." It was this that predetermined the unprecedented success of the movement.

By the end of 1961 the movement took on a truly nationwide character. More than 20,000,000 persons were participating in the contest for the honorable designation of communist work brigades, and 800 enterprises and 187,000 brigades had already gained it. More than 3,000,000 workers, engineers and technical personnel had become shock-workers of communist labor.

The long period of development of the movement and, even more, its scope naturally posed the question of the need to draw conclusions in all respects, to look back over the road traversed, to weigh what had been achieved, and to evaluate omissions and imperfections. At the Institute of Public Opinion of Komsomol'skaia pravda, established to study the

views of Soviet citizens on the most pressing problems of USSR domestic and foreign policy and of preparing the people for communism, the idea arose of a special survey on the principal problems of development of new forms of communist labor. We were particularly interested in the unresolved problems of the movement and in shortcomings in its organization and spread. Therefore, in programming the survey, primary attention was given to this aspect of the matter. The Institute was guided by the consideration that the positive aspects of the movement for communist labor had been presented rather broadly in our periodical press, while the problems that constantly arise before participants in the movement had hitherto been given unjustifiably little attention.

In connection with the general objectives of the survey, the Institute of Public Opinion distributed two questionnaires: one among both persons competing for the title and those not participating in the movement, and the other among communist work groups as such. The first was published in the pages of Komsomol'skaia pravda and directed to the readers of the paper. It included the following questions:

1. What do you regard as the most positive aspects of the life of communist work groups (on the job, in human relations, culture, everyday life, etc.)?

2. What forms of development of the movement do you regard as offering the best prospects?

3. To which of the following problems do you ascribe prime importance in the further development of the movement (underline): introduction of the latest in technology; improvement in education and level of culture; improvement in skill at one's job; improvement in conscientiousness of attitude? Or some other problem?

4. In your opinion, what shortcomings exist in the competition for communist labor?

5. What is your opinion with respect to the present procedure for granting this honorable title to groups? Does this procedure require changes of any kind?

6. In what way should the broad public participate in the procedure for granting the title? Who, in your opinion, should be given the deciding voice?

7. In your opinion, should it be possible to deprive an individual (or group) of this title of honor? If so, then under what conditions?

The second questionnaire addressed to the groups substituted the following four questions for the first:

1. What presented the greatest difficulty in the struggle for the title of communist work group? What do you regard as your major achievement?

2. What new characteristics do you see in the work of your group (with respect to labor productivity, creativity, conscientiousness, willingness to do things without specific remuneration, etc.)?

3. What changes have occurred in your life (culture, daily life, human relations, etc.) since you chose as your commandment "to live as Communists"?

4. To what degree and in what manner does your group influence the lives of other people (tutelage over other groups, character-building activities, assistance to others in their work, etc.)? In your opinion, what in this experience deserves wide dissemination?

In order to achieve the most rounded picture both of the strong sides of the movement and its shortcomings, the second questionnaire was sent by mail to the best communist labor groups. Of course, the term "best" is quite relative, but this was the evaluation of the addresses that the Institute was given by staff members of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and the Central Committee of the Komsomol. It was then checked out on the spot, in the regional committees of the Komsomol.

What was the general picture of the groups participating in the survey? The first two groups are described in Table 1, showing the distribution of participants in the survey by occupation, age and education. The first group in the table consists of persons not participating in the movement (834 individuals). The second group consists of persons competing (individually or as parts of groups) for this title of distinction (461 persons).

The third group consisted of 367 communist work groups, among which the public sector was represented by 342, and the collective-farm sector by 25. One hundred ninety-one groups had been awarded the title in 1958-1958, and 176 in 1960-1961. This group should be regarded not only as the most competent to deal with the questions, but as the most representative in the survey. The groups questioned, which totaled some 44,000 persons, differed widely in nature, from tiny brigades of two persons to immense entities such as the Lenin Combined Leather and Footwear Plant in Kirov Oblast, the October Revolution Chemical Works in Rostov, the Aliev State Farm in Dagestan. These places employ 1,000 to 3,000 and even more. The groups surveyed represent various branches of industry: 109 in machine-building and metal-processing, 72 in light and textile industry, 31 in mining and other primary raw materials industries, 28 in construction, 25 in agriculture, 19 in transport, 18 in the chemicals industry, 12 each in metallurgy and power, etc. Finally, they represent quite fully all the country's economic districts without exception,

and a majority of the administrative districts. Of 367 groups, 203 are in the RSFSR (5 territories, 9 autonomous republics and 42 oblasts), 11 each in Belorussia and Uzbekistan, 10 in Moscow, 8 in Azerbaidjan, 7 each in Moldavia and Kazakhstan, 6 in Armenia, 5 each in Georgia, Latvia, Kirgizia and Turkmenia.

Table 1

Groups Surveyed		I	II
Occupations	Workers	237	228
	Technical personnel	60	64
	Engineers	69	46
	Plant superintendents	32	13
	Collective farmers	10	3
	Office personnel	167	39
	Students	47	7
	Military	157	61
	Not working	55	—
Ages	Under 26 years of age	464	267
	27 to 55	306	188
	56 and over	64	6
Education	Incomplete secondary schooling	188	119
	Completed secondary school	450	259
	Higher education	196	83

The first two groups may also be regarded as satisfactorily representative on the whole. (An exception to this is the number of collective farmers and students in both groups, and plant superintendents and persons over 56 in the second. Because the numbers in these categories are not significant, one cannot draw serious conclusions from the opinions of these subgroups.) The composition of both groups is distinguished by, if one may use the term, rather broad "geography": 150 Muscovites, nearly as many more from the Northwestern Economic District, about 100 each from the Ural and the Donets-Dnieper districts, 60 to 85 from the Southwestern District and the regions in the center of the country and along the Volga, 40 to 60 from Western Siberia, Eastern Siberia, Central Asia, Kazakhstan, the Far East, the Trans-Caucasus, etc.

However, if we speak of the competence of judgment of the participants in the survey, their degree of familiarity with the problem and the specific state of affairs, the persons participating in the second group are beyond doubt. In this sense they hardly differ from members of communist labor groups. In considering the first group of persons

surveyed, it is very important to remember the fact that the questionnaire was conducted not by survey-takers, who might have included any person, including those having no concept of the problem whatever, but through a newspaper, to which reply was made primarily by those who had something to say on the matter in question and who already had formed certain ideas and observations on the matter. This has doubtless increased the degree of expertise of the opinions held by the persons in the first group and, therefore, the general value of the opinion.

What did the survey demonstrate? What problems of the movement were revealed? What shortcomings in its organization were disclosed?

Basic Formula of the Movement

Even the first acquaintance with the results of the survey revealed that many fundamental questions in the life and activity of shock-workers and communist labor brigades have not yet been resolved.

Let us begin with the question that defines the essence of the new movement: who is it that we are calling "scouts of the future," and for what reason? Even here the survey shows an inadequately precise and, what is most important, an insufficiently unified concept.

From the moment of the founding of the movement, it was decided to award the designation "communist" for a combination of communist characteristics: new and higher forms of labor, plus higher morality, plus new and higher forms of daily life. In defining the essence of the new movement, the CPSU Central Committee emphasized that its chief feature would be harmonious combination of the struggle for maximum labor productivity on the latest scientific and technical basis, and education of the new man — the combination of labor, study and mode of life.

With respect to work, the question is more or less clear. This aspect of the matter is easily expressed in the specific requirements: "higher labor productivity" (a definite level), "efficient methods of work" (expressed in specific things), "creative nature of work" (number of suggestions offered), etc. Serious confusion begins at the point of discussion of concrete criteria of communist attitudes as applied to morality, to relationships among human beings and to questions of mode of life. The fact that such criteria have not been sufficiently worked out often results, in practice, in the evaluation of the activity of a given person or group competing for the title without regard for these aspects of life. And all that remains of the multi-faceted formula is merely "to work like

a Communist."

The fact that the award of the title is often governed exclusively by production factors was remarked upon by 24.2% of those in the first group, 25.3% in the second, and 27.2% in the third. Moreover, people frequently speak of violation of the principle of multiple criteria not for some "evil" reason, but due to the lack of precise criteria making it possible to readily subject to analysis those aspects of the life of the group (or the individuals) that lie outside the sphere of labor.

Here is a typical example taken from the questionnaire returned by V. Sheiko (2), an equipment maintenance man in Nikolaev: "On April 22, 1960, a meeting of the conductor group at Dogotop Station, where I was chief conductor, awarded me the title 'Shock-worker of Communist Labor,' and the pin 'Distinguished in Socialist Competition in Railway Transport.' But see for yourself: they gave me these awards only for good work. And what about everyday life, culture, human relationships? This wasn't considered. And it isn't considered today. I don't deny that the most positive sides of the life of communist work brigades are seen on the job. But you mustn't leave out the levels of ideals and culture of these groups! Groups are often given this title of honor only for their work, and this, it seems to me, is the essence not of communist, but of socialist competition. Under these conditions the further development of the movement depends primarily upon a clear understanding of the problems facing the scouts of the future."

In the opinion of many of those surveyed, not only the concept "to live as Communists" but also, in some sense, the concept "to work as Communists" is insufficiently clear. It is true that the latter concept finds rather precise expression in the formal criteria required for organization of competition when the question is that of work producing material values. But what about other forms of work? The work of a designer or physician, a bookkeeper or librarian, an office worker or scientific researcher? For the time being all these categories, although they are active participants in the building of communism, have proved essentially — and not at all by their own fault — to be outside the scope of the movement.

"A shortcoming of the movement," writes engineer N. I. Mikhailov of Zagorsk, "is the fact that brigades of communist labor are organized only for a narrow group of skills. In our factory, for example, they include machinists, mechanics, turret-lathe operators and equipment installers. Now I, for example, work in the inspection service. The result is that no matter how hard I try in my

work, I cannot, under the present rules, become a shock worker of communist labor. Of course, it is true that the volume of my work is not susceptible to measurement in concrete units and that our personnel include few who could be organized as a brigade into which I would fit. But it is wrong to limit my opportunities to work for the good of society. For example, I could give time without charge in a civic engineering-design bureau, in a volunteer police squad, in planting greenery in our town, if this work were regarded as communist and received moral encouragement." Similar opinions were expressed by 2.8% of those in Group I, 2.6% in Group II, and 5.7% in Group III. (3) Naturally, those who most vigorously criticized this shortcoming were members of the "downgraded" occupations (in the first group, for example, 6.6% of the technicians, 3.0% of the office workers, 4.2% of the students). But the same applies to workers (2.9% in the first group and 3.5% in the second). The degree of activity here also increased with the ages of the persons questioned (in group I: 1.1% up to 26, 3.9% from 27 to 55 and 10.9% from 56 and over; in Group II, 0.7% up to 26 and 5.3% from 27 to 56).

It may be that this limitation upon the scope of the movement is quite justified during its first stage. But it may also be that this is the consequence of some failure of development, although certain difficulties, for example, for temporary groups in highly distinctive occupations, such as educational institutions and military units, will probably always exist. Whichever is the case, this problem had today become pressing and demands solution.

Another unresolved problem is formulated as follows by the persons surveyed: "The movement is lacking in stimulus to further development in the majority of cases, and ceases to progress once the title has been awarded" (from reply of G. Nozdarcheva, design engineer, age 24, of Riga).

The newspaperman Anatolii Spiridonov, from the industrial settlement of Tetiukha, who works on the Sikhote-Alinskii rabochii, describes in detail the course of the competition and the lives of communist work groups at the ore mines of his district; he centers attention sharply on this problem: "A group gains the title: splendid! But then? What is there to struggle for beyond this? The brigades don't know. Some suffer dizziness from success, go into a dead end, and yield what they have gained. And civic organizations do not seek to aid them."

This problem is conceived of in the same manner by the communist labor groups themselves. Z. A. Shirshikova's brigade of filter-assemblers at the Chirchik Chemical Works writes: "We consider an important shortcoming to be the fact that, after they have gained the title, the brigades, as it were,

freeze at the level they have attained, while this should not be the case; new and higher responsibilities should be undertaken." This view is expressed by 2.7% of those queried in Group I, 3.6% in Group II and 2.7% in Group III. It is important to note that in the first two groups, this point is advanced more sharply by plant superintendents (6.2% and 7.6% respectively) and by the middle ranks of management-technical people (5.0% and 10.9% respectively), while in the third group it is the "old" groups (4.7%) who hold this view.

These problems are directly related to the inadequate clarification of content both of the basic formula of the movement and of the principles deriving from it. This leads to the conclusion that it is necessary to reveal the precise content of the concept of "living as Communists," and "working as Communists," which are the chief precepts of the movement.

There are even some who propose reexamination of the validity of the very term "communist" for the present stage of the competition, for example, S. Sukhonosov, senior instructor in a department of Marxism-Leninism at Drogobych. "It would be useful to exchange opinions as to the validity of the title, 'communist work team,'" he writes. "For we know that we do not yet have the objective and subjective conditions for communist labor in the strict sense of the word. It is not an accident that a number of brigades that have gained this title rest on their laurels in the erroneous belief that they have already achieved the standards of a communist human community. It seems to me that it would be desirable to think of a more precise designation for groups of a socialist nature which have successfully carried out the undertakings now facing our society (let us call them, for example: 'teams of pioneers in the building of communism')."

However, no more than a few individuals expressing such an outlook were encountered. The majority actively support the form of the movement, which has already become a tradition and has taken deep root in the masses. To arrive at a more circumstantial conception of the content of the movement and, so to speak, to "codify" the organizational forms of the movement, is another matter.

A great many offered an opinion put forth in the following words by I. Rachev, 38-year-old assistant steam-turbine operator at the Novokuznetsk Thermal Power Plant in Kemerovo oblast, which is competing for the title: "There is no special code for the lives of communist work brigades, and therefore people act in a different way at each enterprise. Yet it is necessary to work out basic

rules common to all, which would be adhered to by all, and the fulfillment of which would yield the right to acquire this title of honor."

It must be recognized as abnormal and impermissible that workers and engineers, collective farmers and office workers who enroll in the movement, participate in it and even gain this high title, do not today have a sufficiently clear idea of what this movement actually is, its major content and the specific meaning of its principles.

The first stage in the development of the movement for communist labor has, alas, been a clear illustration of the lag of theory behind practice. Life has put forward a new form of competition of the masses and secured its rapid development, but no theoretical interpretation has been advanced. From the beginning of the movement and virtually to this day, theoreticians differ even in their interpretation of the basic formula of the movement. Some authors assert that the formula is: "work, study and live in communist fashion," and others, "to learn to work and live in communist fashion," which, as we see, is not the same thing. At the same time, an understanding of the meaning of "to work and live in communist fashion" is always actually present in reality in the practical activity of these teams. In this sense, the experience of the best teams is extraordinarily valuable. It must be studied and generalized.

What Does "To Work in Communist Fashion" Mean?

The point of view that reduces the meaning of the new movement primarily, or even exclusively, to an affirmation of new relationships among people and new forms of morality is rather widely held. Its proponents hold that what is called the job aspect of the matter may be disregarded, inasmuch as under the conditions of progress toward communism in all fields and of labor heroism embracing the entire people, a new, communist character of labor should be regarded as self-evident. The fact is that the so-called "ordinary" socialist labor, which is taken for granted and found everywhere, is work that is of exceptionally high order in its nature and conditions. It became established with the triumph of socialist relations of production, which constituted an exceptional historical advance on the part of the Soviet people. However this labor, which is characteristic of the first phase of communism, cannot but be differentiated from that which is characteristic of the higher phase of the new society. The new, specific characteristics and signs of communist labor are manifested with particular clarity in the lives of the best groups, and are rather completely revealed in the survey.

What is meant by working in communist fashion?

The participants in the survey list several significant characteristics of this kind of work.

a) Listed more frequently than any other characteristic by all the groups queried is the conscious nature of this work, the transformation of labor into a natural need. This characteristic is emphasized by 66.7% of the communist labor groups surveyed, 12.0% of those competing for the designation and 12.0% of those not participating in the movement. (4)

This criterion of communist labor finds expression in many specific phenomena. First among them is unexceptionable work discipline based upon the individual's conscientiousness, his internal conviction and elimination of all types of special monitoring bodies.

"The high conscientiousness of the workers at our plant is perhaps best described by the following facts: 1) the post of examiner has been abolished at all work stations and shops, and all output is released with the personal stamp of highly skilled workers; 2) the number of assessors and quota-setters has been cut at the work stations and shops, and the workers themselves have been entrusted with keeping the accounts on piece-work jobs; essentially this amounts to setting their own wages; 3) all locks have been removed from lockers and shops at the service facilities, substantially facilitating transition from individual to group utilization of tools" (Baku Rolling Stock Shops).

Exceptionally important in this respect is the struggle of the groups for production of high quality goods, without inspection. "A new characteristic distinguishing our group," we read in the questionnaire of L'vov Knitgoods Factory No. 2, "is the introduction by each worker of self-inspection of the quality of her work. As a consequence, the factory is now producing no less than 96 to 97% of first-grade products. Since March 1960 the products of our factory have, by order of the Minister of Trade of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, been freed of inspection for rejection at the wholesale warehouses of the merchandising organizations. All workers have been released from search upon leaving the factory, pay is picked up with no cashier present, the buffet is on a self-service basis, etc."

b) A most important characteristic of the Soviet working population — collectivism — derives from the very essence of socialist relations of production, which are relations of comradely mutual aid and collaboration. In the communist labor groups this characteristic finds further development and specific forms of expression. This is no longer the simple feeling of mutual help so familiar to

and understood by every Soviet person. The slogan of the communist teams, "One for all, all for one," is descriptive of the relations among people in the very process of work and is also refracted through such widespread and fundamentally significant phenomena as transmission of the experience of the best to all team members, learning immediately-related skills, the interchangeability of workers, etc.

Here is an excerpt from the questionnaire of the "I" shift (49 members, foreman: E. I. Shekhmeister) of Department 2, Moscow Electric Light Bulb Works: "We regard our major achievement to be the establishment of a unified, tightly knit, friendly group, in which each bears not only and not so much a material responsibility for the quality of the operation he performs, as a moral responsibility to his comrades at work. Under our specific conditions of work, this is the only means of reducing spoilage and increasing labor productivity. Before the products move on to the next department, they go through 15 different operations, in which the quality of each successive operation is strongly dependent upon the manner in which the former were performed (although it is impossible to inspect this directly as a practical matter). Therefore, for us an important measure of a communist attitude toward labor is the moral responsibility of each working girl for the successful work of the entire group."

"We have come to have a true respect not only for our own labor, but for that of our comrades," one reads in the answer of the communist labor shop of an enterprise in Dzerzhinsk (chief: N. E. Gudovichev). "Working in accordance with the slogan, 'One for all, all for one,' the members of our group have striven to learn how to handle every job in the department, and have succeeded in doing this. Now, when there is a free minute in their work (and this happens in the case of apparatus men in chemical production), we do other jobs — repair plate floors, paint the equipment, and so forth, thus making it possible to dispense with auxiliary personnel." Statements of this type are encountered in the overwhelming majority of questionnaires.

c) Communist labor is highly technical, is based on employment of the latest in equipment, and presupposes exceptionally high efficiency in its use.

d) Another feature of communist work, described by participants in the survey and directly related to its high level of technical equipment and transformation into a natural need, is its creative nature, the combination of labor and science. This characteristic is regarded as the most important by 1.8% of those in Group I and 1.3% in Group II. But its particular significance is emphasized by those

groups that have already been awarded their designations: 37.3% of those questioned in this group and, among these, predominantly young groups (42.6%).

A most important precept of the communist movement, bequeathed to us by the great Lenin — study, study, and study some more — is related specifically to the job and to the needs of its development. This accelerates the process of eliminating the boundaries between physical and mental work; thanks to this a man, no matter what work station he is at, is converted into a creator seeing the meaning of his activity in creation. Here, for example, is the questionnaire filled out by the passenger car personnel at the Khar'kov Marshaling Yards (chief: V. M. Kanishchev). It presents a characteristic picture: "For us the greatest difficulty was presented by developing in each person the striving consciously to give all his efforts and abilities to the work. What did we accomplish? In 1959, 40 rationalization proposals were introduced at this yard, which produced economies of 10,000 rubles; in 1960, 49 totaling over 14,000 rubles, and in 7 months of 1961, 51 totaling 8,500 rubles. In the past year 575 persons took special courses to improve their skills; many are studying in schools for working youth, trade schools and institutes."

The highest manifestation of the creative nature of communist labor is doubtless the collective creativity of the immediate producers, which is developing spontaneously today in various groups and which has a great future. "All the members of our team," write the workers in Comrade Glazova's team in the candy department of the Babaev Confectionary Factory at Moscow, "are trying to take a creative attitude toward our labor, and are seeking new means of improving labor productivity. Collectively, as a team, we have introduced a number of rationalization proposals. One of them yielded a saving of 12,600 rubles and made it possible to improve labor productivity by 30%."

e) "Communism," wrote Lenin, "begins where self-sacrificing, heavy labor, labor that overcomes difficulties, makes its appearance, along with a concern by rank-and-file workers for an increase in labor productivity and for the saving of every pood of grain, coal, iron and other products, not going to the workers themselves or to those 'close' to them, but to those 'distant,' i.e., to society as a whole, to tens and hundreds of millions of people combined...in a single socialist state...." (5) The directly social nature of labor, in the sense of work done consciously for society as a whole, is clearly manifested in the activity of the communist work groups and shock brigades, in their struggle for economy, for cutting costs, and so forth. Here

we see an unqualified triumph of man's new attitude toward social property, and a final reexamination of the eternal problem of "I" and "we."

f) Of course, the alpha and omega of communist labor is high labor productivity (this was emphasized by 7% of the people in Group I, 8.4% in Group II and 62.4% in Group III). This is the most important characteristic of all and we discuss it last only because it is in a certain sense the result of the dialectical development of conscientious discipline and the latest equipment, creativity and concern for the common cause.

In the life of any given group or individual, all these aspects of communist labor may have different levels of development — some greater, others less. But an obligatory condition, the majority of the participants in the survey insist, must be consideration of these aspects in their entirety. The term "communist" must not be applied to a group which works (even if not due to its own fault) with outdated equipment, using heavy techniques, whose work displays little that is creative and where job discipline is violated. Such a designation would not be in place even if the persons concerned achieve very high labor productivity and particularly if their work is not more productive than that of others.

The best groups to have been awarded this honorable designation do demonstrate the multiformity of the new qualities in labor. Here, for example, is the questionnaire of the Sverdlovsk Drug Works (plant superintendent: Ia. I. Izakov): "This factory systematically fulfills its plans and its voluntary obligations. For 1960 the plan was exceeded by 18%, while the labor productivity goal was exceeded by 13.5%; the cost of production was reduced by 1.8%. For the first 8 months of 1961 the plan was overfulfilled by 6.7%, and by 3.7% in labor productivity, while cost of production was reduced by 5.2%. By 1960 the plant had fulfilled its goal for rationalization proposals for the seven-year period ending 1965.

"The degree of conscientiousness in labor is testified to by the sharp reduction in violations of labor discipline. Whereas in 1959 there were 37 absences without leave for a total of 108 man-days, in 1960 there were 11 totaling 18 man-days, and only 4 for a total of 5 man-days in 8 months of 1961. For 14 months now payment of wages in all departments has been effected by the workers taking the amount of money due them, with no cashier present; time-boards have been eliminated.

"Never before has such a drive for study been manifested at this plant as now. Four out of every five are taking courses. Approximately half the workers know two, three or more associated skills.

"Never before has there been at this plant such a feeling of responsibility for your comrade, your team, your shift, your department and the entire plant. 'One for all, all for one' is our motto."

The discovery of the content of the concept "communist labor" makes it possible to make a reply specifically to the question as to the scope and limits of this new movement. A phenomenon must be considered as the sum of its aspects, and therefore there is no basis for depriving either the engineer of an office for promoting industrial efficiency and inventions, or an agricultural expert, a librarian or bookkeeper, of the right to this high title. The work of virtually every occupation involves some possibility of creativeness, conscious discipline, high efficiency, and genuine mutual aid. In any case there is certainly no problem in this regard for relatively large places of employment, where the labor force includes both people engaged in direct material production and those in the non-productive spheres.

Some persons and groups surveyed have posed a question of competition among participants in the movement as a criterion for communist labor. It is easy for a machinist to compete with another machinist, a team with a team. But what about a scientific researcher or a laboratory of which there is only one at a particular enterprise? Certainly there is a problem here. But on the other hand it seems to us that they are right who hold that competition for communist labor has, among other things, the specific feature that this competition is not only between someone and someone else, but a competition of a group and a person with himself, a struggle for effectuation of the principles that have been put forth as the precepts of the movement. Under these conditions, competition "between" does constitute an important form of advancement of the movement, but no longer the only one possible.

What About Unremunerated Work?

In describing communist labor, Lenin repeatedly defined as its most important feature that it would be gratis, that calculated reward would be lacking. He wrote in 1920: "Communist labor in the narrowest and strictest sense of the word is unpaid labor for the good of society, labor performed not to fulfill a fixed obligation, not to acquire the right to specific goods, not on the basis of preestablished and regulated standards, but voluntary work without a quota, work performed without expectation of reward, without conditions of reward, work in accordance with the habit of working for the common weal and on the basis of a conscious attitude (which

has become a habit) involving the need to work for the common good, work as a need of a healthy organism." (6)

It has developed that all the propaganda and organizing activity with respect to the movement for communist labor has, from the very outset, given this aspect of the matter considerably less attention than others. Unpaid labor for the common good has been pushed back into the shadows, inasmuch as a "contradiction" was seen between the principle of unpaid services and that of material incentive, which prevails under socialism. And the result is that the first two groups of persons responding to the questionnaire have virtually left this factor out of consideration. It is cited by only 1.3% of those not participating in the movement and only 0.6% of those striving for the designation.

On the other hand, this problem is of great interest to those who have already gained the designation. The groups questioned are widely discussing possible forms of unpaid work, and 17.4% of them (14.8% of the groups in the public sector and 4.0% of those on collective farms, 17.8% of the "old" groups and 17.0% of the "young") consider the realization of this precept their most important accomplishment. But here we encounter very widely differing interpretations of the very concept of "work without reward" and a great variety of forms in which it has appeared.

As far as the survey enables us to judge, the following forms have become the most widely disseminated:

Work in various types of organizations functioning on a volunteer basis (civic design bureaus, civic inspectors, volunteer police, etc.); similar to this is instruction by skilled personnel of less skilled and lagging individuals. "In the past money was paid for this sort of instruction," writes the brigade of L. N. Shokina at the Lakin Spinning Mills in Vladimir oblast. "Today this is done free of charge in our brigade."

Occasional work in the form of donated Saturdays, Sundays and so forth, not directly related to the major productivity activity of the given group, is described in a very large number of questionnaires. "A characteristic feature of communist labor brigades in these past years has been their participation after hours in unpaid building bees (service facilities, clubhouses, gymnasiums), and in work for improving the appearance of their plant, under the slogan: "Make our plant the best planted and most beautiful in the republic" (Baku Rolling Stock Repair Works).

Various types of sponsorship and assistance to the sponsored bodies. For example, unpaid work on Sundays (28 hours per person) in the sponsored

collective farm is reported by a team of grinders at the Red May Glass Works in Kalinin (12 persons, brigade leader: G. Pushkova).

Unpaid overtime at the regular job. This is reported, for example, by the brigade under Comrade Glazova at the Babaev Works: "We undertook to and did contribute 51 man-hours without pay in our shop when a bottleneck appeared in the packing of the finished product. On the day that Comrade Titov made his heroic flight we worked one hour without pay."

The performance of various types of associated or subsidiary production jobs, serving to eliminate the need for special work personnel for this purpose and to save wages. "The further development of the movement is progressing along the lines of eliminating the jobs not directly involved with production of actual goods," writes the shift headed by E. I. Shekhmeister at the Moscow Electric Bulb Works. "By this we mean work-record maintainers, checkers, inspectors, charwomen, etc. There are working women now in our brigade (N. Guseva, N. Rodionova, B. Klimanova, T. R. Gorokhova, Z. Krivtseva and others) who are performing successfully, without pay, many of the functions of brigade-leaders, foremen and technicians — assignment of work, recording of spoilage, technical calculations. The women in our brigade have given many hours, without pay, after working time to painting the equipment; they have dispensed with the services of charwomen and have taken upon themselves the cleaning of all their area; they themselves keep account of spoilage, so that we will soon be able to dispense with inspectors, and so forth."

Reduction in wages, occurring as a consequence of equalization of the pay rates of more and less skilled and more and less productive types of work. The specific means whereby this reduction in payment occurs vary widely. A. Spiridonov writes: "At Soviet Mine No. 1 of the Sikhali Mining and Refining Enterprise, we have a communist labor brigade of drillers; it is headed by I. Ia. Kniazev. In accordance with its precepts, the brigade had decided to divide all earnings (and they are not small, averaging 300 to 350 rubles per man) equally, despite some difference in the grade classifications of the individual workers. I believe that this is testimony to improvement in the conscious attitude of the miners and their striving actually to live in communist fashion."

Somewhat similar to this instance, in which we have people getting less than they earn, is that under which, with the same equipment as before, and with standard conditions of labor, the brigade undertakes to increase output quotas for the same wage as before (the brigade of mechanic assemblers

under V. A. Spasskii, 6 person, Lugansk Diesel Engine Plant).

The forms we have listed clearly differ in weight and in significance as communist labor, as well as in their function of developing the characteristics of communist morality and, finally, in their very nature. Some of them contain elements of wage equalization and clearly contradict the principle of socialist distribution in accordance with labor performed, and can do nought but harm. Also highly dubious are so-called "shock" overtime hours, when the enthusiasm and energy of young workers are employed by poor executives to patch holes in badly-managed production, and when this enthusiasm is employed to cover up impermissible rush methods.

But on the other hand, forms such as unpaid work in civic organizations, the activity of sponsoring groups, and combinations of skills involving unpaid performance of associated and subsidiary operations are doubtless very interesting, offer good prospects, and should play a major role in the process of the communist education of working people.

To hold that all unpaid labor contradicts the principle of material incentive is untrue. It is equally false to underestimate Lenin's postulate that communist labor "in the narrower and stricter sense of the word is unpaid labor for the good of society." (7) The more so as the matter at issue is not a phrase dropped at random, but a guiding thought that may be followed like a red thread through most of Lenin's writings on the subject of communist work. The problem is merely that of revealing the sense and finding the best forms of this kind of work as it applies to today's conditions.

"Before replying to your questionnaire, I repeatedly read Lenin's 'The Great Initiative,'" writes engineer N. I. Mikhailov of Zagorsk. "It is quite evident that in the view of Vladimir Il'ich, communist labor is above all unpaid work for the good of society as a whole. Therefore I believe that the communist work brigades existing at our plant do not have a significant future and will disappear with the building of communism. Why? Because this work does not develop the principal quality of the working member of communist society — the desire to work for the good of society without calculating the reward to be received. On the contrary, members of such brigades are put in circumstances that enable them to earn more. However, if we proceed from Lenin's concept, those forms of communist work that would seem to have the most lasting value, I think, are the unpaid civic designing offices, the volunteer police, organizations for public control, provision for unpaid instruction in technical and

trade skills, agitation brigades, and other volunteer activity."

Obviously, any given specific form may be evaluated in different ways: one may object to some, support others. But the very fact that money must not be the sole stimulus in labor for the participant in the communist movement is indubitable. This is testified to by a very large number of the persons surveyed, including both participants and nonparticipants in the movement. Yet the fact is that instances have occurred of the awarding of that honorable designation contrary to this principle, and this is in direct contradiction to communist conscience.

What Does "To Live in Communist Fashion" Mean?

The most varied responses have been given to the question: what does "to live in communist fashion" mean? The variety is in direct proportion to the concreteness of the responses.

Nevertheless the overall picture characterizing the objective achievements of the movement is more or less clear. Basing themselves upon the general concept of "communist conduct of life," as it has taken shape in terms of the experience of the existing communist labor groups, the participants in the survey (in percent) see the meaning of this precept in the following (see Table 2).

The difficulties arise when one attempts to interpret these very general categories and conceive of them in the form of specific and precise phenomena, readily identified and monitored in practice. For example, the clearest concept is "rising culture"; by this, as a general rule, is meant a fixed range of phenomena: improvement in level of general or special education, interest in art (group attendance at movies, theaters, concerts, discussion of books read, plays seen, participation in amateur art activities, etc.).

All these phenomena are expressed directly in objective indices (number of individuals studying, number of group reviews of cultural events attended) and are therefore comparatively easily checked. The same should be said of "intensification of civic activity."

The situation is much more complex with respect to a category such as "improvement in mode of life." This is not only because this category is less specific as to content in practical and theoretical activity, but also because the behavior of a human being in his everyday life is much harder to define in precise, objective indices. It is of interest that the questionnaires continue thus far to indicate, predominantly, a purely negative approach to evaluation of this aspect of the activity of the partici-

Table 2

Groups surveyed	Change in human relations	Rising culture	Improvement in mode of life	Greater civic activity
Group I	51.4	24.3	14.2	0.8
Group II	56.4	18.4	17.7	1.08
Group III				
as a whole	73.2	66.2	24.0	28.3
public sector	72.8	66.0	25.1	26.6
collective-farm sector	80.0	60.0	8.0	52.0
"old" communist labor groups	79.6	65.4	19.8	31.4
"new" communist labor groups	66.4	67.0	28.4	25.0

pants in the movement: the "plus" column lists such things as "doesn't drink," "isn't a hooligan," (a) etc.

Here is a typical reply, provided by a group at the Kherguchinsk Placer Mining Administration (721 persons; K. E. Sudakov, acting chief): "There has been a sharp drop in hooliganism in the settlements (among the personnel of our undertaking); no crime whatever has occurred in the past two years; cases of drunkenness, family scandal, use of foul language, etc., have become rarities." Doubtless, such results must be regarded as highly significant and testifying to the high moral qualities of the group that had decided "to live in communist fashion." But on the other hand, it is clear that a shortcoming of the stage in the movement reflected in the survey is the lack of any comprehensive, constructive concept of a communist mode of life.

Even greater haziness and indefiniteness, from the viewpoint of specificity of obligations and monitoring of adherence thereto, is seen when we speak of "changes in human relations." As a rule, participants in the survey speak of this in extremely general terms. They define it as "strengthening of friendship," "carrying out the slogan 'one for all, all for one,'" "increasing concern for each other," etc.

Unfortunately, it is in this respect that the questionnaires demonstrate the greatest number of instances of a highly oversimplified and even primitive approach to the matter. This is also true in the questionnaires of very strong groups that are, on the whole, admirable. Here are examples in which these simplified views emerge:

"During the period of participation in the competition, relations among members of the brigade have changed considerably. It has become the custom to mark people's birthdays, to congratulate mothers on the birth of their children, to visit sick girls at home and in the hospital, to provide material aid in home life. Often we go to the movies and performances together, organize excursions,

take our recreation together; the whole brigade attended classes in economics; we have become regular newspaper readers" (Birobidjan Textile and Clothing Factory, foreman T. P. Tarasova's brigade, 43 persons).

"Twice or more each month, the whole brigade goes to the theater together; we frequently visit museums. We have a 'brigade cash-box' in which we save so that the whole brigade may celebrate birthdays, housewarmings, and may go on trips out of town together. Many of the fellows in the brigade have quit smoking and drinking" (Plasterers' brigade SU-71 of Trust No. 7 of the Azerbaidjan Economic Council, brigade leader: N. Mekhtiev).

The true road to the resolution of the problem of "living in communist fashion" is realization of the moral code of the builder of communism. The CPSU Program has placed an accurate compass in the hands of the participants of the movement for communist labor by formulating the highest moral principles of communism:

devotion to the cause of communism; love for the socialist Motherland and for the countries of socialism;

conscientious labor for the good of society: he who does not work, neither shall he eat;

concern on the part of each for the preservation and increase of the public wealth;

high consciousness of social duty and intolerance toward violation of public interests;

collectivism and comradesly mutual aid; one for all, all for one;

humane attitudes and mutual respect among human beings: man is to man a friend, comrade and brother;

honesty and justice, moral purity, simplicity and modesty in public and personal life;

mutual respect in the family and concern for the upbringing of the children;

irreconcilability toward injustice, parasitism, dishonesty, careerism and money-grubbing;

friendship and brotherhood among all the peoples of the USSR, intolerance toward national and racial hostility;

irreconcilability toward enemies of communism and the cause of peace and freedom for the nations;

brotherly solidarity with the working people of all countries and with all peoples.

If they employ this compass, the scouts of the future will develop in themselves the entire complex of characteristics of the new, communist morality.

The Gains You Make Today
Must Be Passed on Tomorrow to Others

Two years ago, speaking before the participants in the movement for communist labor in the Kremlin, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev said to them: "Your service would not be very great if you walled yourselves off in your groups and said: we are pure, we are good, and what others are like is none of our business. The party and the people see you as innovators because all that you have accomplished today, all the new horizons you have gained, you are striving to transmit to others on the morrow. This is your strength...." (8) This is the key to understanding the special mission borne by the shock-workers and groups of communist labor. They are not only scouts, but propagandists of the future. Today this mission can be performed with particular success, first of all, because the 22nd CPSU Congress, which has defined a practical program of struggle to realize the beautiful ideals of mankind, has created the most favorable conditions for the manifestation of the finest of spiritual qualities; secondly, because the groups of communist labor have already developed no small number of effective forms of influencing those around them. The survey pursued the goal of discovering those forms and of establishing which of them are employed most successfully and what, in the opinion of the participants in the movement, should be given preference.

The system of tutelary aid, cited by 43.5% of the groups queried, is rather widespread. Among these we find best represented the "old" industrial groups: about 46%. As the results of the survey demonstrate, tutelary aid is given primarily in two directions: the upbringing of the rising generation and the advancement of collective-farm production.

The former is employed most fruitfully; 38.4% of the groups surveyed provide detailed information in this field. The second trend is considerably less pronounced; only 13.3% of the groups report experiences of this type. Moreover, it still suffers from onesidedness. Often this sponsorship consists of nothing but material aid and participation by the

scouts of the future in ordinary agricultural work, which for various reasons, including some that are by no means commendable, is not being done by the collective farmers themselves. Is this form of sponsorship justified? Is there not a danger here that the sponsored unit will become a subsidiary farm, rather in the nature of a truck garden serving the particular factory? In such cases, are not the sponsors acting rather in the role of the "rich uncles" of whom Khrushchev spoke in his closing remarks at the March Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee? Thought should be given to this by some organizers of the movement for communist labor and by all those who employ only levers such as these in their activity as sponsors.

There is a need for special consideration of such a form of dissemination of the influence of the scouts of the future as practical character-building work, which is conducted by one in seven of the groups queried. Most frequently they take backward workers into their groups so as "to cook them in the communist pot." This is more common among experienced groups, and the results are very pleasant to record. Less common is purposeful educational activity by communist brigades in hostels for young workers and among the general public in their districts. Yet these forms could yield substantial results.

Finally, the principal and most effective form of propaganda for the best aspects of the new movement is that of communist help in one's work, which is manifested primarily in all-round exchange of experience and in the Gaganova movement. According to the survey, this form is employed by 59.6% of all the groups, 28.0% of the groups in the public sector, 92.0% in the collective farm sector, 59.1% of the "old" groups and 60.2% of the "new."

It is not by accident that we have termed aid in work "communist." It differs fundamentally from the "aid to one's neighbor" that has existed from time immemorial. Communist aid in one's work at a Soviet enterprise, in the collective farm or state farm is not merely unselfish help to the worker alongside you, which aids him in working better and earning more, but through the instruction given to him, through one's character-building efforts with him, it is selfless aid to society as a whole. This is how it looks in practice.

"We undertook the obligation," report the members of the forming-machine operators' brigade under N. Misiagin at the Novo-Kramatorsk Works in Donetsk oblast, "to transmit our work experience to the forming-machine operating brigade headed by Nikolai Soloshchenko. That brigade had down time due to jigs and fixtures not being ready and not all its members knew the associated trades.

We taught the work process to Soloshchenko's brigade, showed them unutilized possibilities, and demonstrated in practice how we prepared to fill orders, and particularly how we prepared jigs. We advised the management of the shop to hire an engineer to help Soloshchenko's brigade and ourselves undertook to teach related trades to the forming-machine operators. We taught I. Z. Dremov's team advanced methods of forging crankshafts. To another team we transmitted our experience in forging shafts for the hydraulic pump." This everyday phenomenon of transmitting production experience includes yet another important factor. The exchange of experience is done on the initiative of the workers themselves, consciously and unselfishly, inasmuch as an advanced group regards this as its duty, its responsibility. Thus, one group gradually draws another onto the road of struggle for communist labor and, in the course of its practical experience, convinces the other of its advantages. Moreover, these groups are thoroughly aware of their role in doing this. The communist labor brigade of S. Chaevskii, in Krasnoiarsk, states it as follows: "We strive to transmit our work experience to others, thereby assisting our comrades in convincing themselves, with the aid of a living example, of the reality of a mass movement for communist labor."

The communist nature of the type of assistance on the job that is offered by the followers of Valentina Gaganova hardly has to be proved. Every fifth questionnaire filled out by the groups and two out of five filled out by rural people testify to that type of assistance.

In explaining the exceptional significance of the social feat of valor of Valentina Gaganova, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev has emphasized: "Why did the party give such enthusiastic support to this noble initiative, which originated in the first year of our Seven-Year Plan? Because, comrades, a single brigade, one factory, collective farm or state farm, or a lone district cannot arrive at communism itself. Only all working together in a broad front of struggle waged by the people as a whole will make it possible for us to conquer the heights of communism." (9)

Basic Conditions for Spread of the Movement

A most important criterion for the social value of the entire movement is undoubtedly the dynamism of communist forms of life. The greater the number of people who actually master the new forms of work and way of life, the closer we will be to our promised goal. But the process of disseminating these forms is extremely complex. Without knowing

all the conditions of development of the movement and without having a clear picture of the difficulties that naturally arise in its path, it is impossible to wage a struggle for communism that will have any degree of success. It is no accident that out of those which answered the questionnaire only one (!) group in a hundred responded to the question: "What was your greatest difficulty in the struggle for the title of communist labor group?" with the phrase: "There were no difficulties."

What were the major difficulties in the struggle to establish the new forms of labor? Which of these problems is the one whose solution would most strongly facilitate spread of the movement on a mass scale? The questionnaire offered the following choice: introduction of the latest equipment, a rise in education and culture, improvement of skill at one's trade, elevation of conscious attitudes. The response by all was uniquely unanimous: the primary condition is the development of conscious attitudes.

"I name a conscious attitude as the most important," writes Iurii Ustinov, a 24-year-old worker from Moscow. "A man is not a thinking robot acting according to a definite program. Any useful undertaking has to originate in his interest in this work, in his consciousness. If and only if this takes place will limitless opportunities for true creativeness and a change to communism open up." Three-quarters of the persons who do not participate in the movement hold this view, as do 71.3% of those competing for the designation and 69.4% of the groups of communist labor.

Generalizing from the first experience with Communist Saturdays of unpaid labor, Lenin warned that it is difficult in the extreme to remold man and that the struggle with force of habit is the most difficult of struggles: "...the business of remolding all existing work habits and traditions is a matter of decades." In advancing his winged, optimistic slogan: "We shall come to a triumph for the communist type of work!" Lenin simultaneously emphasized that this would require "years and decades of work to apply the principle of the donated Saturdays, to develop, spread and improve this device and to make it a matter of habit." (10)

The three years' experience of the groups of communist labor has clearly revealed that Lenin was infinitely correct in warning of the difficulties. Three out of every four of the collectives queried declared firmly: the heaviest rock in our path is the education of the new man.

Intimately related to the problem of developing conscious attitudes is that of raising the level of education and culture. It was found to be the second

most important condition for mass spread of the movement. It should be noted that voices in support of this condition ring out more persistently, the more closely people are associated with the movement itself: among groups of communist labor it was supported by 51.5%, among those competing for the designation it was supported by 46.0%, and among all others by 42.2%. Particularly striking is the activity in this respect of rural people (72.0% of the groups of communist labor, 100% of those competing for the title, and 70.0% of all others).

Nearly every third individual queried, and most pronouncedly those who had already won the designation, relate the spread of the movement to the introduction of the latest equipment (30.0% in Group I, 29.9% in Group II, and 40.6% in Group III). When new knowledge has been acquired and excellent qualities of spirit have been developed, the old tools seem particularly imperfect. They hobble a person's abilities and talents and interfere with the development of high labor productivity. There is a somewhat different explanation for the fact that rural people stand out particularly in this respect (groups of communist labor: 44.0%; those fighting for the title: 33.3%). Their dissatisfaction is primarily with the conditions of work and the level of mechanization in general. One in five of the rural groups queried pointed to this difficulty in responding to the first question in our questionnaire. By way of comparison we adduce the comparable figure for industrial groups: 8.7%.

The attitude of various groups among those questioned toward the problem of improvement of skill at one's trade also shows definite regularities. The respondents understand this to include learning associated skills, mastering the latest equipment, and improving the quality of production. As ties to the movement become more solid, the understanding of the importance of this problem increases (22.6% in Group I, 26.0% in Group II, 34.6% in groups of communist labor, and 37.6% of the "old" teams).

In addition to the four major problems, solution of which has a fundamental influence upon the movement, the questionnaire asked the respondents to name other problems of social significance. In the opinion of four people in a hundred, primarily younger people, the spread of the new forms of labor is substantially dependent upon improvement in living standards.

Dissemination of progressive experience and improvement in the organization of production have proved to be rather effective devices in the struggle for communist labor. With respect to the former, votes were divided as follows: 3.3% in Group I, 6.5% in Group II, and 23.4% in Group III. The truth

is obvious: the richer one's experience, the more highly it is valued; and the more perfect the forms of labor, the more essential all kinds of new experiments. Yet the data of the survey confirm in supremely convincing fashion that actual competition among communist labor groups and mutual exchange of experience are as yet unsatisfactory. Many groups expressed themselves in a manner similar to that of S. Chaevskii's brigade from Krasnoiarsk: "The absence of any systematic summing up of the results of the competition in the various brigades significantly retards the movement for communist labor. There has been inadequate generalization of the experience of the groups, and when something new makes its appearance, it is given little dissemination."

Improvement in the organization of production is evaluated in similar fashion. This is testified to most persistently by those who have felt most keenly the effects of rush production campaigns, red tape, and supply shortages.... Specifically, communist work groups point to this problem twice as frequently as those who are struggling for this title, and three times as frequently as the first group. An even higher percentage was revealed by rural groups and by those longest in existence.

Finally, there is yet another factor inhibiting the spread of new forms of labor. This is the indifferent attitude of some economic executives to the scouts of the future. Here, for example, is the reply to our request that she fill out the questionnaire received from N. Sokolova, brigade leader at the Pioneer State Fowl Farm at Sudogda, Vladimir oblast: "We had a team of four girls raising ducks. We were famous throughout the oblast. We decided to obtain 100 eggs per laying duck in honor of the 22nd CPSU Congress. We began in a good mood. Galia Telegina, Zina Kochetkova and Liusia Efimova studied in the economic club, and I was in the 10th grade in the school for working youth. We were regarded as pretty good civic workers and participated in amateur activities in the state farm. Everything went well. But then A. A. Syrova came in as chief of our department. She had never had any previous experience with ducks. And she had no confidence in us. Instead of helping us to carry out our undertaking, she tried to ridicule us in the eyes of the other duck-raisers. But we kept our word nonetheless. During the six months preceding the 22nd Congress we obtained over 100 eggs per layer. We thought that our gift was not so much to brag about, and so we undertook to raise young birds. But Comrade Syrova said to us: 'I have enough workers for the young birds....Get out of here.' Our team fell apart. We are very hurt. But what could we do?"

More sympathy, confidence and respect for those who are trying to work and live in communist fashion! We find this demand advanced primarily by those who have only just entered the competition for the designation (3.0%) and by those who take no part in it (3.8%). This is symptomatic.

Not one of the problems posed above is incapable of solution under present conditions. And their solution will create those optimal conditions which will make possible the introduction of communism into our habits on an immense scale. Four decades ago the capitalists and their toadies contemptuously designated the first Saturdays of volunteer work "baobabs in mignonette pots." Today's signs of communism are whole plantations of mighty baobabs, and the more carefully we cultivate the soil beneath them, the deeper their roots go.

What Is Interfering with the Movement?

One of the most important questions posed in the questionnaire was this: "What, in your opinion, are the shortcomings that occur in the competition for communist labor?" None of the respondents passed this over in silence. Only two of every 100 non-participants in the movement, three of every 100 competing for the title, and five of every 100 who won the title said: "There are no shortcomings!" This type of opinion was encountered primarily among persons in military service and chiefly among the youngest individuals, those who had not yet completed secondary school.

The remaining 95 to 98% held a different opinion: the movement suffers from a number of serious maladies which have to be dealt with immediately and decisively. What are these illnesses; how dangerous are they; what are their sources and the means of dealing with them? The participants in the survey pose their irrefutable diagnosis, based upon three years of practical experience and personal observations in all directions.

In the opinion of the persons queried, one such shortcoming lies in the fact that scouting of the future is sometimes replaced, as a matter of practice, by unjustified dashing ahead, to which some organizers are impelled by dizziness from general successes and also by the desire to be "no worse than others." "The striving by all means to have 'their own' group of communist labor," writes the secretary of the Komsomol organization of the construction administration of the Krasnopresnia district of Moscow, "leads to premature awarding of the title, when a group has not carried out all the precepts. Most frequently it is only good work on the job that is taken into consideration. The result is that the movement for communist labor

differs in no way from socialist competition in these places. Let there be fewer groups of communist labor, but let them truly be examples for all and let them prompt the desire to follow their example and to emulate them."

A 25-year-old Komsomol staff member, Alexander Rubtsov, secretary of its committee for the town of Revda in Sverdlovsk oblast, developing further the thought of his associate in Moscow, believes it desirable first to strengthen the principles of communist labor at the primary levels, in the brigades, on the livestock units of the farms, and only then to extend the movement for the right to the designation "communist" to the larger group. Otherwise, noble and lofty slogans will be deflated and discredited. "An example of this is the Degtiar' Copper Mine. Here, at a time when there was not a single shock-worker and not a single brigade had been awarded the honorable title, while the movement was just coming into being at the ore mine, suddenly the mine entered the competition for the honorable title of enterprise of communist labor. In many brigades there are people who are not studying and don't wish to, who conduct themselves badly at home, and get drunk. And they are called scouts of the future. Who needs this kind of haste?"

One of the obvious symptoms of this "rushing ahead" is the onesidedness of the criteria for defining the communist nature of labor, when nothing but production indices are taken into consideration. It is not accidental that every fourth person questioned makes reference to this. Sometimes the cause of this onesidedness is lack of knowledge, and sometimes it is an unwillingness to know, unwillingness to "bother" with it for long periods and to take the trouble involved in the painstaking process of education.

"A man may work well," writes an actress, Gai, from Kishinev. "He carries out the plan and his work station is orderly. All this, of course, is very important, but it is far from being everything! Is he continuing his education? Is he improving his skill at his trade? Or is he working today as he did one or two years ago? Does he go to the theater, to concerts? How does he behave at home with his wife and children?...Only if we have answers to all these questions may we decide whether a man deserves this high honor or not."

Most frequently the fashionable disease of "running ahead" leads to undesirable cases of violation of the voluntary principle in organizing the struggle for communist labor. In the first group of persons questioned, this problem is pointed to by every fifth person and is cited more frequently than this by managerial personnel (43.8%), office workers (34.1%), technicians (26.6%), persons older than 26

and those having higher education. In the second group it is every sixth person who refers to this, with technicians (21.8%), engineers (21.7%) and workers (18.8%) predominating. In the third group, every eighth collective makes reference to this in its replies. Of course, it is by no means everyone who notes this shortcoming who has himself directly experienced it. Nevertheless, the questionnaires present no small number of cases of crude violation of the voluntary principle, and this cannot but alarm public opinion.

The most dangerous enemy of the movement for communist labor is universally regarded by the respondents to be "showing off" and the issuance of misleading reports. This disease is regarded as most serious by those who have recently entered the competition for the designation (18.0%) or are as yet entirely outside the movement (18.4%), while it is taken considerably less seriously by the groups of communist labor themselves (5.1%). And this is no accident, inasmuch as the eyewash artists (b) display most energetic "activity" when young teams are organized as new groups of shock-workers.

A 26-year-old builder from Kiev, sharing his personal observations, describes to us the pattern usually followed in setting up this "show-off" conduct. It is a phenomenon that at first glance appears to be harmless, but is very dangerous in essence. "The question is posed thus: 'Why, comrade construction chief, doesn't your operation have any brigades of communist labor? See, Ivanov even has two! You are doing very poorly.' The construction chief turns to civic organizations: 'You understand, it doesn't look good — other erection and construction bureaus have communist labor brigades, and we don't.' And they suggest a way out: okay, we'll give the title to Petrov's brigade. Thus it is decided. But then we find that Petrov's brigade isn't fulfilling the plan; it turns out a certain amount of poor-quality work; its members drink and use bad language....But now the chief and the leaders of the civic organizations are praised — they already have five communist labor brigades and all the others are competing for this title! This situation has to be overcome. One has to work with people, educate their consciences so that they can say with a pure heart: 'From today on we will live and work in communist fashion!'"

A brigade of furniture workers in Riga, headed by I. Gusev, defining ostentation in the movement for communist labor as "percentomania," rightly emphasizes that this epidemic disease markedly diminishes the popularity of the movement itself and emasculates it of its essential significance.

The other side of the medal on which the image of the eyewash artist is embossed is the establish-

ment of artificial conditions for "cultivation" of groups and shock-workers. In essence this is nothing but indirect eyewash. "For many groups," writes engineer B. V. from the mining village of Krasnyi Luch, "who are competing for the designation, superior conditions are created artificially and substitutions made in the group's personnel so as to replace people who need to be worked on, but with respect to whom no one wishes to take the trouble. In other words, those groups are guided along the line of least resistance. Sometimes the participants in the competition themselves, knowing the 'soft spots' of their superiors, undertake communist obligations only in order to obtain aid and assistance in all respects."

A similarly sharp negative opinion with respect to the false practice of establishing artificial conditions is found in one of every 15 of the groups questioned, one of every 25 competing for the title, and one of every 20 not participating in the competition. It is significant that the voices of collective farmers are heard here more loudly than any others. It would appear that misdeeds of this kind are encountered more frequently in the countryside than elsewhere. Workers, technicians and engineers are prominent in expressing this view. However, by common agreement, Enemy Number One of this remarkable, profoundly progressive, revolutionary movement is formalism, which has demonstrated the ability to choke more than one good beginning. The highest figures are accumulated under the column headed: "Chief shortcoming — formalism" (see Table 3).

The wrath with which people of the greatest variety of occupations, ages and degrees of participation in the movement come down on formalism enables one to judge how real the danger of this is, and how intolerable this spirit is in the direct struggle for the firm establishment of new principles of labor and life. Attention is drawn particularly by the figures in the second row, for behind them are the voices of those who have only just entered the competitive struggle for communist labor. It is they who most frequently come up against the barriers put up by formalism and who react to them with the greatest anguish. For when efforts to overcome these barriers are to no avail, the consequence is disillusionment.

"The fact that our shift had been listed in the struggle for this title is something we learned of almost accidentally," writes Komsomol member Anatolii Novikov, turbogenerator operator at the AVRZ Thermal Power Plant in Velikie Luki. "Our opinion wasn't asked and nothing was explained to us, despite the fact that most of us didn't know then and don't know today what is meant by

Table 3

	Groups queried		
	I	II	III
% Total	68.4	78.5	63.7
Workers	81.4	82.4	—
Technicians	93.3	70.3	—
Engineers	76.8	91.3	—
Management	87.5	76.9	—
Collective farmers	70.0	100	—
Office workers	91.0	15.8	—
Students	68.0	—	—
Military	6.3	67.2	—
Not working	72.4	—	—
Under 26	59.4	76.7	—
27-55	80	80.3	—
Over 56	74.8	100	—
Public sector	—	—	64.8
Collective-farm sector	—	—	63.7
"Old" groups	—	—	63.8
"New" groups	—	—	63.6

communist work. The 'struggle' for the designation was reduced to the collection of data: how are you doing relative to your work quota, are you helping the militia, where are you studying? If you aren't studying — go study or we'll transfer you to a lower-paid job. Then the plant committee of the trade union 'treated us to delivery service': it held a meeting right in the department and awarded us the designation of honor without wasting any words. The members of the plant committee were not stopped even by the fact that literally only a few days before this ceremony one comrade in the shift had showed up for work in a tipsy condition. And it is not surprising that a little more than a month later somebody else on the shift committed an outrageous act of hooliganism, for which he was brought to criminal trial. Things remain as they were. Nobody bothered to find out how we live, what we read or what kind of civic activity we engage in — and no one does so today. As before, members of our group get marks against them for their work and hide tools from each other under lock and key. As far as home behavior and going on drunks are concerned, the less said the better. With this situation, go ahead and be proud that you are a member of a shift of communist labor! Previously I envied those who held this honorable title; today I am pained by it."

The lover of routine measures everything with the same yardstick: a check mark in the plan. And what the further consequences are of the "steps" he has taken — good or bad — is not of interest to him. In the movement for communist labor, for-

malism reveals its Hippocratic characteristics most readily in such sins as utter lack of check-up and the adoption of amorphous, intangible obligations. While the last-named of these is referred to only in passing, in an average of two or three questionnaires per 100, the lack of check-up is mentioned frequently and with particular fear. This alarm increases all the more when the results obtained from different groups of persons queried are compared. While among those not participating in the movement, 11.1% point to the lack of check-up, the figure rises to 13.0% among those competing for it, 26.1% among the groups of communist labor themselves, and 41.4% among those of the latter which have been in existence a short time. In this respect one sees a direct relationship between the activity of the persons surveyed and the degree of harm done them by this shortcoming. The last-named are typified by the remarks of the brigade of machinists headed by Mariia Kosacheva at the Bezhetsksel'mash Works in Kalinin oblast: "The lack of check-up on observance of the precepts of the movement, irregular summing-up of the results of socialist competition, poor dissemination of the experience of the most advanced groups of communist labor, and sometimes a routine attitude on the part of management — these are the principal shortcomings of the movement."

Procedures for Awarding and Rescinding the Designation

Is there any need for changes in the procedure for awarding the designation? The response to this question is absolutely clear. "Yes, there is." This is the thinking of 60.8% of the group queried in Group I, 52.2% in Group II, and 38.1% in Group III. Here the views of those competing for the title and of those who will compete for it tomorrow are particularly important, if we are concerned with future successful development of the movement.

In the first place, the participants in the survey express views as to who should resolve the question of awarding the title, and in what manner, so as to eliminate all chances of accident and of discrediting this noble idea.

Let us first consider the proposal of V. Khaidukov, a 25-year-old forgerman of Lipetsk, member of a brigade of communist labor, whose reply to the questionnaire was one of the first published in *Komsomol'skaia pravda*. "I think," he wrote, "that the decisive word must be that of a USSR-wide council, which should include heroes like Gaganova, Gagarin, Titov and others." "Such a procedure," wrote a 29-year-old Muscovite,

M. Frenkel', developing the former idea, "should be applied only to the personnel of large factories, to mills, integrated plants, and fleets of ships. Moreover, the list of groups nominated for the title should be published in advance, so as to enable every citizen to express his opinion on the candidate for the honorable title. With respect to small groups — brigades, teams, shops — the award of the title should be by the same procedure, except that the decisive voice should be cast by the district, factory or department council for awarding the title."

However, although the idea of establishing a special center was among the first proposals advanced, it failed to gain popularity. It was supported only by 0.5% of the groups of communist labor and one out of 20 other participants in the survey. The proposal to entrust the fate of those struggling for the honorable title to those who already hold it — communist labor groups — gained no greater support.

A comparatively large number of participants in the survey expressed themselves in favor of having each group itself decide whether or not it is worthy of bearing the honorable title — decide, that is, in accordance with its conscience. Among the small number of existing groups of communist labor (2.4%), the most experienced insisted upon this most strongly. Among the 8.2% non-participants in the movement who favored this, the highest ratios were among engineers, students and collective farmers. In any event, this activity expressed the desire to see the groups adopting the designation "communist" display high standards and demands with respect to themselves.

A large number of people spoke out in favor of having this question solved in its entirety by civic organizations. The overwhelming majority, averaging three-fourths of those queried, declared that the right of decision in awarding the title should belong to the next higher group. "We should like to report our experience," writes P. I. Shiriaev on the instruction of the brigade operating an Uralets excavator at the Bakal' Ore Mine in Cheliabinsk oblast. "The title was awarded us at a joint meeting of the shop committee and the Komsomol board and then approved at the meeting. It seems to us that the decision on the award of a title should be taken at a general meeting of the workers of the entire enterprise, where the new communist brigade can be welcomed and given practical advice." This view is expressed by three out of every four receiving the designation, and seven out of every ten struggling for it.

The vitality and full-fledged development of the new-born nucleus of communism depends not only

upon who awarded it this honorable name but, to a considerable degree, upon the basis and manner of doing this.

"The awarding of the title of honor," writes M. S., a 27-year-old worker and student from Kirovograd, "is becoming an everyday affair. This is both good and bad. It is good in that this means that the movement toward the beacons of communism is embracing ever greater masses of the working people. It is bad because some leaders have begun to award the title of honor in haste."

The participants in the survey are right in naming high standards and rigorous check-up as a most powerful antidote to such things as elimination of personal responsibility and vulgarization. Before awarding the title, a satisfactorily representative commission must be established to check the fulfillment of all obligations — personal, brigade and departmental. It would present to the larger group a detailed, comprehensive analysis of the results of its check-up. In such a case it is necessary to be guided rigorously by Lenin's instruction to the effect that "such an honorable title must be won by long and stubborn efforts, must be won by demonstrated practical success in truly communist construction." (11)

Analysis of the questionnaires received gives a basis for asserting that the leadership of the movement for communist labor is as yet imperfect. Civic organizations and management, acting as stimulators of the competition for new forms of work and life, later frequently remove themselves from practical leadership of them. "One of the principal shortcomings," observe the executives of the Sverdlovsk Drug Plant, "is the low level of participation of executives, chiefs of departments and shifts, and of foremen in the leadership of their collectives. Many executives have not come to understand the entire force of the new movement. At a number of enterprises where these brigades have been organized and have even been awarded the title, they are then left to themselves. It is held that the most important thing has already been done. The fact is that awarding the title is merely the beginning. The brigades must always be under public scrutiny. They need constant assistance in everything they do." Of course, the educators, as Marx put it, must themselves be educated. The leaders of the communist movement must themselves certainly be guided by the moral principles of the Party's moral code and demonstrate examples of truly communist conscientiousness.

In replying to the question as to who should lead the movement and how, the participants in the survey agree unanimously: those who award the title.

The most effective means of guidance are constant assistance and dependable monitoring. The practical experience already accumulated in this type of guidance is very rich, but it has had little study and, worst of all, is being poorly disseminated.

Nor is everything as it should be with the monitoring of the activity of teams of communist labor which, in the opinion of those surveyed, should be omnipresent and comprehensive. Some even offer the idea that it would be desirable to "recertify" the groups in the form of annual reports on the condition of their affairs at broad meetings having the authority to act. Here, for example, is how this idea is substantiated by the young philosopher Vladimir Bakshutov: "In order for the competition to enjoy eternal youth and for its participants never to face the question: 'And what now?' the title should be awarded and confirmed annually, after the summation of results. Moreover, the title should be awarded strictly for a single year. No lifetime titles of honor should exist, except upon retirement. When that happens, titles and distinctions should be retained. It would be desirable that awarding of the title and of symbols of distinction be made at solemn gatherings of the group on the anniversary of the Soviet government. The titles granted might, for example, be: "Winner in Socialist Competition for the 45th Year of Soviet Power," "Group (or Shock-Worker) of Communist Labor for the 45th Year of Soviet Power," or "Winner of the Communist Competition for the 50th Year of Soviet Power." Of course, in actuality it may often happen that a given group or individual will be confirmed 2 to 5 or 10 times in some such title. But there's nothing wrong with this. On the contrary, the annual reporting by the group on its affairs would strengthen all forms of competition organizationally and morally, would safeguard people against self-complacency, conceit, would introduce a vital stream of criticism and self-criticism, and would involve new millions of working people in active management of production. There is nothing to be ashamed of if we envisage the young Komsomol of today telling his grandchildren with pride that in the period of all-out construction of communism, he was five times a winner in socialist competition, worked for ten years in a group of communist labor or was a shock-worker of communist labor and, at his retirement, was victor in the communist competition for the 50th year of Soviet power."

Restating Lenin's view, the participants in the survey demand: let there be more verification of the degree to which what we term "communist" is deserving of that designation. In that connection the question posed in the questionnaire "Should it be possible to deprive an individual (or group) of the

title of honor? If so, under what conditions?" is of no little interest.

The overwhelming majority of the participants in the survey begin their responses to this question with the words: "It is not only possible, but necessary, to take away the title, and this applies not only to groups but also to individuals."

"This title is not a lifetime annuity. It should be possible and it is essential to deprive holders of the title if the individual or the group does not, by his or its daily activity, make the contribution of which it is capable to building a communist society" (Personnel of Irkutsk Thermal Power Plant No. 1).

"If a person (or group), having gained the title 'communist,' has begun to violate various of its precepts, how can he (it) be termed communist? To reconcile ourselves to anything ugly in such a group means to befoul the very principles of the movement" (A. F. Shiganov, propagandist, Chernigov).

"Your question is superfluous. No bum, drunkard or hooligan must be allowed to walk our land flaunting the title 'shock-worker of communist labor.' A title of honor is not a christening in which they hang a cross on your neck and you wear it to the grave. If a man has not justified the confidence and attention of Soviet people—take away the title" (Iu. Raevskii, officer, Moscow). Sixty-eight per cent of the groups of communist labor surveyed, 68% of those not participating in the movement, and 74% of those competing for the title express themselves in approximately the same terms. They completely share the view held by Lenin: "It is necessary to strive for and to attain a situation...in which each and all who term their enterprise, office or cause 'a commune,' but who fail to demonstrate by hard work and practical success in work over a long period truly exemplary and communist organization of the matter at hand, be ridiculed mercilessly and subjected to shame as charlatans or windbags." (12)

What are the circumstances under which such an extreme measure as stripping an individual or group of this high title should be employed? The participants in the survey have expressed it as follows: for personal guilt in violation of the production plan; for retreating from one's given word; for violating the moral code of the builder of communism; for manifestations of communist conceit, boastfulness and complacency.

Many of those who have responded to the survey consider it necessary to give special attention to the last of these. "There is nothing more dangerous than bragging and complacency," writes a 27-year-old foreman at the Red Star Plant in Kirovograd. "One can never say that he has done everything he could for the triumph of communism. Any of us can find something he might have done but failed to.

The people of communist labor are restless, seeking people, and never rest upon their laurels. From this we draw the conclusion: a person who does not grow, does not strive to move forward, does not have the right to bear the honorable title."

The most rigorous supporters of the purity of the communist title insist that an entire group should be deprived of it if but a single member is at fault. "For this means that the group did not see the shortcomings in its fellow member, and did not help him free himself of them," writes E. Maraev, a student from Kiev. "Let all be responsible for each." However, there are very few persons sharing this view. The majority of those queried warn that the question of deprivation of the title must be approached cautiously, with a maximum of measures to correct matters in the group by the use of all forms of therapy. This apparently gave rise to the idea of taking away the title temporarily. The fact is that only one individual per 100 questioned favored this measure. Of course, it would be best if it would not be necessary to have recourse at all to deprivation of titles, as is stated by a 22-year-old rigger in the Murmansk shipyard, V. Kornilov, but this "requires the most extremely careful work with people before they are awarded the title. It is necessary to have a profound knowledge of their inner world, their ideals, their strivings, and not only of their production capacity on the job."

"From Shock Brigades to Shock Departments!"

Three and a half years ago the brigades were the sole form taken by the movement. As the movement progressed, its forms, too, rapidly multiplied. Shock-workers, teams, shifts, departments, plants and brigades building communism made their appearance. Each time a new form arose, many arguments in its favor were advanced, and special advantages were sought out. Then it began to be tested by life....

Today, when we speak of the prospects of communist labor, it is naturally necessary to weigh in the most careful manner the merits and shortcomings of all these forms and, perhaps, to make a choice between them. This was the goal pursued by the Institute of Public Opinion when it placed in the questionnaire the question: "What forms of development of the movement do you believe have the best prospects?"

Two trends were revealed in this regard in the opinions of all the groups queried. Some give preference to individual forms; others to group forms with all their varieties, which demand special consideration. How are these two points of view validated?

To begin with, defenders of the former position

are comparatively few in number: one in ten, on the average. They are encountered with a bit greater frequency among those who are competing for the title or who have already won it (9.1% in Group I, 12.3% in Group II, and 12.0% in Group III). The general rule is that someone who holds the title of honor advances concrete data from his experience as proof. Thus, leaders of the civic organizations in the Omsk Spinning Mills write: "At present a competition has begun in our mills for the title 'Master of the Golden Hands.' This title will be awarded to a worker not only for faultless work, but for learning several associated skills, participation in the civic life of the enterprise, rationalization, and teaching young workers their jobs."

Other groups among those queried offered arguments in favor of individual forms of competition that fell essentially into two groups of ideas: 1) in establishing groups of communist labor it is necessary to have each member of the group become a shock-worker beforehand; and 2) shock-work makes it possible for everyone, without exception, to participate in the movement.

Here, for example, is the reasoning of a 25-year-old mine foreman from Gorlovka, V. Gamaiunov, who is as yet not a participant in the struggle for communist labor, but who states that "when life in all its aspects comes to meet the demands of the moral code of the man of communist society (and this will be soon!), I will join the movement for this kind of work." "Even in a good group," writes Gamaiunov, "people are not all identical. It is the best who should get the title of shock-worker. The others should follow their example. It is when the last member of the group has become a shock-worker that the team may be called communist. Further, why can't a section or shift chief or a chief engineer become a shock-worker? All, including executives, must be involved in the struggle for communist labor."

The overwhelming majority of those who responded to the questionnaire stated that group forms of the movement for communist labor offer the best prospects, inasmuch as they contain the greatest opportunities for manifesting a communist attitude toward work. This is asserted by 42.2% of the persons queried in Group III, 37.5% in Group I, and 34.2% in Group II. This is testified to with particular persistence by the most experienced (44.5%) and the industrial workers (44.1%), while among non-participants in the movement it is advocated by the youngest (39.2%), and those with higher education (41.3%). In the opinion of the persons surveyed, two forms of development of the movement for communist labor offer the best prospects — small

groups: the brigade, shift, or department, and large groups: enterprises in their entirety. It is difficult to discern a preference among the communist labor groups themselves for either of these two forms. The two viewpoints have been given approximately equal numbers of votes: 19.8% to the first, and 18.8% to the second. This is explained by the proportion of large and small groups we surveyed, each of which expressed maximum patriotism.

However, among other groups of persons queried, the former viewpoint clearly predominates. Among non-participants in the movement, 14.6% spoke out in favor of small groups, and 9.7% in favor of large; among those competing for the title, the respective figures were 18.4% and 8.0%. "I believe the form of development of the movement which offers the best prospects is the competition for the title of communist labor brigade," writes A. Tsvetkov from Mytishchi, "and not of shock-workers or enterprises, inasmuch as small groups are always together, every person is known to the others, and it becomes easy to verify whether he is really working well, what he is interested in, and how he behaves in his everyday life."

However, in terming the group forms of the movement the most progressive, the participants in the survey do not evaluate all these forms equally. For example, the idea of self-administering production groups — sections without foremen, enterprises without managements — proved quite unpopular. No more than 1% in all the groups supported them. What is most curious about this is that those who favored the idea were exclusively technicians and office workers.

Equally low in popularity was another idea — the establishment of groups with "communist distribution" or, more accurately, with equal payment to all. It is characteristic that the most experienced groups manifested the greatest skepticism in this respect. This is a striking example of the fact that practical experience does not favor equalization of income.

However, it is necessary to say a few words about such a phenomenon as "gigantomania," when elements of communism developed by the creativity of a small group are unjustifiably blown up and mechanically transferred into completely different conditions. Here, for example, is how the future prospects of the movement are seen by a brigade of apparatus-operators at the Gorlovka Nitrogen Mineral Fertilizer Works: "The forms have already been somewhat defined: brigades, shifts, departments and enterprises in their entirety. Next it seems that the title of honor will be awarded to related enterprises in a district or city and then to the entire district, city, oblast, republic and, ultimately, to the USSR as a whole."

It is chiefly groups that show a tendency to suffer from this "gigantomania." They suggest five or six times more frequently than do others (11.4%) that communist cities, districts and republics will constitute an inevitable form of struggle for the new mode of work and life. This onesided and, one might say, utopian concept of the future is related in no small degree to the absence of a clear-cut program for self-improvement in communist goals in the collectives themselves, and with the limited nature of the objectives that some of them set for themselves.

The major conclusion from the reasoning of the majority of those queried is that it is wrong to concern oneself solely with the external aspect of the matter and to engage in unnecessary invention of forms. Now, when we are engaged in reconnaissance in depth into the future, we must make use of those forms of development of the movement that come into being most easily and function most efficiently, and which make it possible to determine best of all to what degree our mode of life and activity is communist. The small nuclei of the working collectives are just such forms; when they have achieved true communist maturity, they may be merged into a unified organism — the enterprise of communist labor.

* * *

Those who set for themselves the noble task of "learning to work and live in communist fashion" have justly been given the title "scouts of the future" by the people. Shock-brigades unifying the best representatives of the working class and the collective-farm peasantry have truly gone out to reconnoiter new forms of work and life, and have striven to develop and establish in life those qualities, those properties, those habits which will be necessary under the conditions of communism. The initiative of the most advanced has attracted the interests of millions of the working people. The considerable "service record" and scope of the movement pose the valid question: has not the time of scouting come to an end?

Certainly it has not, if one considers the ultimate goal of Soviet society. Efforts to find new and more perfect methods of transforming work and mode of life must continue. But if we bear in mind the definition and verification in practice of the basic principles and forms of the movement for communist labor, the scouting must, in that sense, be regarded as complete. Such principles are clear today, and they have won out. However, the best experiences accumulated in the struggle for communist labor have not yet become the standard of life for all participants in the movement. To achieve that, we must make a close study of the

strong points and weaknesses of the movement, thus facilitating solution of pressing problems which, judging by the survey, are not few. The data accumulated by the Institute of Public Opinion convinces us that the need has now arisen for a representative conference to be held of theoreticians, organizers and practical workers in the movement for communist labor, to resolve pressing problems of that movement and to determine its future prospects.

Editor's Notes

a) This term is applied in the Soviet Union to a variety of crimes not connected with large-scale theft, premeditated violence or serious economic offenses, but which, nevertheless, are more seriously regarded and more severely punished than is mere disorderly conduct in the West.

b) Ochkovtiratel'stvo refers to a wide range of phenomena, the common element of which is falsification.

Footnotes

1) V. I. Lenin, Soch., 4th Ed., Vol. 26, pp. 367, 370.

2) Typical answers to the questionnaire of the Institute of Public Opinion, "What Do You Think of the Scouts of the Future?" were published in Komsomol'skaia pravda on Aug. 23 and Sept. 23, 1961.

3) It would be wrong to think that these figures are insignificant. The survey did not offer a choice of responses (had that been the case, the figures would have been higher, beyond a doubt).

4) This sharp difference in the figures is explained by the nature of the questions in the different questionnaires: in the first the answers were "broken down" under various headings (work, culture, mode of life, etc.), while the second dealt solely with the nature of work.

5) V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 29, p. 394.

6) V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 30, p. 482.

7) Ibid.

8) Pravda, March 11, 1960.

9) Pravda, May 29, 1960.

10) V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 31, pp. 103, 104.

11) V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 29, p. 398.

12) Ibid., pp. 398-399.

V. Cheprakov

STATE-MONOPOLY CAPITALISM AND BOURGEOIS POLITICAL ECONOMY

The point of departure in a critical analysis of current economic theories of monopoly capitalism is the undisputed fact that they reflect objective reality and that this objective reality is distorted and often deformed in these theories because bourgeois science is inherently incapable of understanding the real essence of social development. (1)

The system of state-monopoly capitalism established in the developed capitalist countries has engendered the economic theories now prevailing there. These theories have also been engendered by the desire of the ruling class of monopoly capital to organize the defense of the capitalist system in the conditions of its general crisis, the economic competition and ideological struggle of the two systems and the historic victories of socialism.

The economic theories of present-day monopoly capitalism are designed to fulfill three basic tasks: 1) to vindicate the present form of monopoly capitalism, defined by Marxists as state-monopoly capitalism; 2) to "destroy" Marxism-Leninism, whose scientific correctness has been confirmed by the entire course of world history and whose ideas are being so successfully implemented in socialist and communist construction; 3) to seek and substantiate economic measures to save the obsolete capitalist system and secure monopoly superprofits.

In the mighty class struggle now proceeding in the world, the exposure of illusions fostered among the working masses in the capitalist countries by the theory and practice of modern capitalism is one of the most important conditions for winning the masses to the side of the revolutionary proletariat.

Vindication of State-Monopoly Capitalism

Views concerning the "end of the apologetic nature" of bourgeois political economy are widespread among revisionist-minded economists. (2) This delusion

The author is on the editorial staff of the journal Kommunist.

All quotations are retranslated from the Russian — Editor, The Soviet Review.

has two sources.

The first source. Since the 1930's modern bourgeois theoreticians have been clamoring about their renunciation of orthodox economic theory (as they called the vulgar political economy of the latter half of the 19th and the early 20th centuries). (3) This renunciation of the old, orthodox theories and the proclamation of new, different theories is by no means merely the result of ideological evolution. The old, vulgar political economy had obviously failed and to preserve their ideological influence on the broad masses of the population the ideologists of monopoly capital were compelled to alter their approach. This change of approach in bourgeois political economy is interpreted by the revisionists as the end of its apologetic nature.

The second source. Since state-monopoly capitalism now reigns in the leading capitalist countries, the predominant place in economic thought has been taken, though somewhat belatedly, by theories which recognize intervention by the bourgeois state in the economy (4) and the working out of "prescriptions" for the economic policy of the monopoly state. The appearance of such "prescriptions" has been sufficient for the revisionists to cease regarding bourgeois political economy as vulgar and apologetic.

But however economic schools may call themselves, whatever titles are used for the modern capitalist system — "people's capitalism" or "welfare state" — however the modern economy may be characterized — étatism (statism), dirigism or mixed economy — whatever may be the names and nationalities of the rulers of bourgeois economists' minds — the Englishman Keynes after World War I, the Americans Hansen and Harris, the West German Erhard and the Frenchman Monnet after World War II — the unchanged fact remains that the essence of bourgeois economic theories is to extol capitalism.

Nothing in this world remains unchanged. The forms and methods of vindicating capitalism also change. In the conditions of the economic, political and ideological struggle of the two systems, the apologetics become more subtle. The ideologists of monopoly are compelled to resort to all sorts of de-

vices because the broad masses in the capitalist countries are constantly comparing the two systems and choosing between them. Bourgeois economists may or may not recognize the competition of the two systems, but it is reflected in their theories and in their apologies for modern capitalism and, what is especially characteristic, not for capitalism in general, but for modern capitalism, that is, for state-monopoly capitalism.

The vindication of modern capitalism consists first and foremost in alleging that the nature, the essence, of capitalism has changed. Here bourgeois economists are compelled to admit that the old capitalism had numerous shortcomings and was not perfect. They have thus been forced to admit shamefacedly that Marxism was correct — a noteworthy fact. But while admitting the shortcomings of the old capitalism the apologists of modern capitalism seek all the more zealously to prove that it has been transformed into a new system that differs fundamentally from the old. (5) Only recently all, or almost all, the numerous university professors discussed at length in their voluminous treatises how the capitalist countries were countries of free enterprise and private initiative or, as they were wont to say, of “decentralized decisions.” Today it is not they who set the tone in bourgeois economic literature.

Bourgeois economists have now split into two fairly distinct groups: one speaks for the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie, the other — for those of the non-monopoly, middle and petty bourgeoisie. The first group is the dominant one. Its representatives naturally also fill the posts in the state machinery, which implements the economic policy of monopoly capital. Our article is concerned with this group. As for petty-bourgeois political economy, it should be said that it is just as utopian as before, only the utopias have changed. True, even today some of the petty-bourgeois romantics like the American economist D. Wright or the French academician Emile Mireau follow in Sismondi's footsteps in advocating “freedom of competition.” But most of the modern romantics, speaking for the interests of the non-monopoly middle and petty bourgeoisie, place their hopes on the state machinery and expect it to prevent their ruin by big monopoly capital.

The dominant group of bourgeois economists recognizes, with certain reservations, that the economic system in their countries has changed and that many of these recent changes have far-reaching consequences. (6) But while admitting this, bourgeois economists are directing all their efforts at distorting the true meaning of such changes.

It should be particularly stressed that bourgeois scholars do not understand — or rather cannot under-

stand, because of their class affiliation — the nature and trends of the processes which occur under modern capitalism and which have transformed capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism. Their theories distort these processes. They naturally also deny the very concept of “state-monopoly capitalism.”

As is usually the case with vulgar economists, the apologists of monopoly present the appearance of phenomena as their essence. (7) They do this all the more readily because this appearance permits them to camouflage the real state of affairs. As we know, the utilization of the state machinery by the monopolies outwardly manifests itself in state intervention in the country's economic life. The apologists of monopoly recognize this surface fact, but they deny the rule of monopoly and the amalgamation of the monopolies and the state, the emergence of state-monopoly capitalism. They refuse to admit that state interference is directed at securing the interests of monopoly capital, that it is a form, a phase, of monopoly capitalism.

The economists of monopoly capitalism proclaim that state interference in the economy (statism, étatism, dirigism, to use their terminology) is a “new era.” It should be noted that the range of definitions of the nature of the system in the West today is very wide, from the recognition that it is a capitalist system (8) to claims that it has “outpaced socialism.” (9)

Today the economists of monopoly capital have gone much further in their disquisitions on the changes which have occurred in the nature of capitalism since the early postwar years. At that time the prevailing views that were preached contended that “free enterprise” was the basis of the system prevailing in the West. Now it is asserted that the “structure and functioning mechanism” of capitalism has changed. (10)

Attempts are being made in bourgeois economic literature to portray state-monopoly capitalism as a “new form of socialism.” The argument goes something like this: socialism does not have the same meaning that it had in the 19th century. In those days socialism implied state ownership and operation of enterprises. Today socialism means state control of the entire economy. People are nominally allowed to own property. But it is the state which directs the economy: it decides on the distribution of incomes, the amount of capital investment and the level of prices. And it is this type of 20th-century “socialism,” it is alleged, that is being rapidly introduced in the Western countries. The proponents of the economic theories of state-monopoly capitalism describe the interference of the bourgeois government into the economy as a

“revolution” which has laid the foundation for the “welfare state.” (11)

Quite popular in the West are theories about the transformation of capitalism and the emergence of a “collective” economic system. A. Berle, claiming priority in the discovery of a “new phase in American political economy,” seeks to prove that the United States has gone through a “capitalist revolution” in this century. He admits that a small group of large corporations based on the joint-stock principle have concentrated colossal economic power in their hands. But the conclusion he draws from this fact is that the US economy has allegedly acquired a “collectivistic character” and that it is only out of old, obsolete habits that such concepts as “private initiative,” “private property” and property in general are used in describing the American economic system. (12)

Modern bourgeois political economy defines the present-day capitalist system as a combination of oligopolies, free competition and active state interference. This “three-tiered” system is passed off as a new type of capitalism. In the United States it has been named the “mixed economy.” It is alleged that the US economy is mixed, that to a certain extent it is directed by the government and that it is partly based on private economic initiative. (13) In France it is called the “coordinated economy.” (14)

It is highly symptomatic that the theory of the “coordinated economy” has been elaborated by people who belong to the big bourgeoisie and occupy important posts: F. Bloc-Lenet, the son of one of the partners of the Lazare Bank, is also a director of the “Caisse de depot et Consignation,” and A. Chalandon, the former Secretary-General of the UNR (de Gaulle’s Union for the New Republic) is a director of a number of large capitalist concerns.

Recently there has appeared the theory of so-called convergence of the two systems — socialism and capitalism. (15) (Incidentally, even this is evidence of the involuntary recognition of the successes of the socialist system. For until quite recently, when the ideologists of the bourgeoisie firmly believed in capitalism, such a theory would have been regarded as heretic.) According to this theory, economic and technological changes may lead to the establishment of a single industrial society. This hybrid society will be based on capitalism and will have three of the four capitalist elements: 1) private property, 2) economic incentives and the profit motive, and 3) a market system, but it will not preserve the principle of state non-intervention. It will also take over three of the four elements of socialism: 1) a greater degree of equality, 2) worker control over production conditions, and 3) economic planning, but it will not preserve public property. (16) On closer scrutiny,

this hybrid turns out to be the same state-monopoly capitalism, which has nothing in common with socialism.

W. Rostow also has the false idea of the convergence of the economic systems of capitalism and socialism. His “stages of growth theory” is designed to disprove socialism’s superiority and to substantiate some sort of automatism of the economic development of society irrespective of its socio-economic structure. Rostow opposes his “stages of growth” (“traditional society,” “preconditions for takeoff,” “takeoff,” “drive to maturity,” and “mass consumption”) to the socio-economic formations identified by Marxism: primitive society, feudalism, capitalism and communism.

Since, according to Rostow’s absolutely arbitrary periodization, the United States entered the period of “high mass consumption” in the early 1920’s and was followed by Canada, Britain, Australia, Sweden, West Germany, France and Japan, while the Soviet Union is now in the stage of “technical maturity,” it follows that these capitalist countries have achieved the abundance required by communism. It is precisely for the sake of this absurd “conclusion” that the whole “stages of growth theory” has been elaborated. The unscientific nature of Rostow’s conception may be seen in the fact that for him the criterion of economic growth is the level of development of the productive forces, taken without regard to the relations of production. The revisionists, of course, would not have been revisionists if they had not seized upon this theory of hybridization. (17)

“Mixed,” “coordinated,” “hybrid” economy — each of these conceptions reflects in its own way one of the characteristic features of modern imperialism, which consists of the fact that the bourgeois state is no longer only a weapon of coercion used solely for maintaining the capitalist system, but also plays an ever-growing role in economic life as monopoly capital’s weapon of exploitation and plunder of the population. These conceptions arose as reflections, in the ideology of the ruling class, of the conversion of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism.

State-monopoly capitalism is a phase within the imperialist stage of capitalism; it is a new, more developed form of monopoly capital. Its distinguishing features are as follows:

(a) the forces of the monopolies (the financial oligarchy) combine with the forces of the bourgeois state machinery, they merge — with the monopolies assuming control over the economy and the state machinery — into a single mechanism to save the capitalist system and at the same time to increase the profits of the imperialist bourgeoisie;

(b) the reproduction of capital and, consequently,

the appropriation of surplus value are effected by capital through the direct utilization of the state, which also exercises direct economic functions;

(c) the bourgeois state emerges as the overall capitalist, it assumes the role of an instrument of capitalist accumulation, it accumulates capital, pumping money out of the working people and distributing it among the monopolies;

(d) the irreconcilable conflict between the social character of the productive forces and the capitalist relations of production manifests itself with unprecedented sharpness;

(e) social relations are bared with particular force and clarity and the role of the state as a committee of the monopoly oligarchy becomes obvious;

(f) the general crisis of capitalism becomes more acute and the struggle of the oppressed peoples against all forms of colonialism and the struggle of the working class and the masses against monopoly capital become intensified;

(g) the socialization of labor and production reaches such a high level that the long matured historical inevitability of the replacement of capitalist relations of production by socialist relations becomes a vital necessity.

State-monopoly capitalism is the modern form of motion of capitalist relations and the attempt to preserve them. Capitalist reality fully reveals that the imperialist state rules in the interests of the monopoly oligarchy. And the greater its role in economic life, the more it emerges as the overall monopoly capitalist, directly exploiting an increasing number of workers and helping the monopolists in every way possible to derive superprofits.

Measures of control and regulation by the state do not alter the capitalist nature of production. It is for the purpose of preserving private monopoly capital and ensuring superprofits for the monopolies that the whole economic policy of the bourgeois state is designed: taxes, financial, monetary, and foreign economic policy, the entire system of economic regulation. (18)

With the organic composition of capital growing, the further expansion of production requires vast capital investments which cannot be attracted by the corporate form alone. Making use of the state machinery, monopoly capital mobilizes the greater part of social capital and appropriates a considerable amount of money from the workers for the needs of the dominant monopolies and for supporting capitalist reproduction on an expanded scale. The state redistributes a substantial part of both the overall capitalist profit and the incomes of the working masses in favor of the monopolies.

It should be particularly stressed that the growing successes of the world socialist system, the great

popularity of socialist principles of planning among the toiling masses everywhere, the increasing instability of capitalist development and the fear of overproduction crises and other economic upheavals cause the monopoly bourgeoisie to strive all the more for state-monopoly forms of economy and economic policy. (19)

All the assertions of the bourgeois economists to the contrary, the development of state-monopoly capitalism does not at all eliminate the basic features of the capitalist system, the aim of which is to produce surplus value and whose motive force is an unquenchable thirst for surplus labor. It is directed at intensifying the exploitation and oppression of the working people. The spread of monopoly domination and the greater role played by the state merely show how far the process of socializing production has gone. But this is a process of socialization on the basis of capitalism, on the basis of exploitation; appropriation remains private inasmuch as the social means of production are still the private property of a small group of monopolists or are used by them in their own interests.

It is apparent that the relations of production are subordinated to the laws of dialectics and change within the framework of capitalist society. The transformation of private monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism also means the modification of the relations of production within capitalist society. The character, types and nature of the basic, fundamental relations of production of modern imperialism are still the antagonistic relations of the rule of capital and the economic enslavement of the proletariat. At the same time, however, some of the relations of production have undergone certain changes.

First, there has emerged as a major economic factor another form of exploitive, capitalist ownership — state-monopoly ownership — and consequently the exploitation of a certain section of the working class directly by state-monopoly capital. From the fact that state property is growing, the apologists of capitalism draw the conclusion that capitalist property is disappearing. But nationalization under capitalism does not at all mean socialization of property: the appropriation of the results of labor remains private. Old forms of appropriation remain, new forms appear, but so long as the bourgeoisie retains power it continues to exploit the workers and appropriate the results of surplus labor. In this connection it is worth citing Marx's ironic words that "the only part of the so-called national wealth which is really shared by the people today is their state debts." (20)

But if, on the one hand, monopoly capital derives advantages from the existence of nationalized enter-

prises, we should not forget the other side of the problem. It should be recalled that the nationalization of a number of branches of industry in the capitalist countries in the postwar years was to a certain extent a concession to the masses. Today, in demanding extensive nationalization the working class regards it as a measure which to a certain degree undermines the "sacred principle" of private property, as one of the slogans of the democratic, anti-monopoly struggle which facilitates the subsequent inevitable socialization resulting from the socialist revolution.

Second, the greater concentration of production and centralization of capital, in which the state played an important role, have affected not only the productive forces but also the relations of production, to a considerable extent turning small and middle entrepreneurs into an appendage of big monopoly capital.

Third, complicated and contradictory relations have arisen between the state and private monopolies within the system of state-monopoly capitalism.

There are two lines that may be observed in the apologetics of modern capitalism. The first is the assertion that the nature of capitalism has changed. The "proofs" given by the political economy of monopoly capital regarding the changes in the nature of capitalism may be reduced to the following four: diffusion of property, changes in the nature of state power, revolution in management, and greater social equality.

The defenders of monopoly capital, and the reformists and revisionists who follow them, allege that the development of the system of joint-stock companies has led to the "diffusion of property," "workers' participation in ownership," the appearance of a "corporate owner" instead of private owner — in other words, to a change in the structure of capitalism. (21)

The claim that there has been a "democratization of capital" as a result of the wide distribution of shares is refuted by the fact that, even in the United States, where the pseudo-theory of the "diffusion of property" is most publicized, two-thirds of all shares, according to the Brookings Institute of Social Research, are held by only 1% of all families. In Japan 96% of the shareholders own 35% of the shares and 0.2% of the shareholders own 48%. The difference is still more striking in the case of the 100 largest companies: 31% of their shares are owned by 0.03% of their shareholders.

Among the pseudo-theories designed to prove the "democratization of capital," one of the most widespread is the anti-scientific theory of the "government's democratic control over the economy." It purports to prove that changes have taken place in

the nature of power and the state in the West and that the government controls the country's economy in the interests of the entire society. In actual fact, however, it is the same sham government control over the monopolies which ensures huge profits for the capitalists.

The "managerial revolution" is a favorite theme of the apologists of monopoly capitalism. They claim that the "managerial revolution" has eliminated autocratic management at capitalist enterprises and "eliminated the risk of bad management," that there are allegedly no bosses in industry but only "economic managers," that the period when the Western countries were really capitalist has ended and that there is now an apparatus which is not connected with the ownership of industrial enterprises, and that "diehard capitalism is dead."

Marxism has established the nature and direction of the evolution of private ownership of the means of production, which replaced the petty ownership of the simple commodity producer. The accumulation of capital led to the creation of joint-stock companies. The creation of joint-stock companies, as Marx pointed out, meant "the elimination of capital as private property within the framework of the capitalist mode of production." (22) In other words, we observe the development of social capital owned by the associated capitalist. Further evolution led to the appearance of state property, that is, aggregate property owned by the associated monopoly capitalist. A trait common to all forms of capitalist property is the exploitation of hired labor. Does the creation of joint-stock companies and then state monopolies lead to the loss by capitalist property of its private exploiting character? Of course not! Marx wrote that "capitalist production is essentially private production even when the place of the individual capitalist is taken by the associated capitalist." (23)

As for the so-called technocracy, it is a fact that the top layer of the technical intelligentsia is closely linked with the monopolies. This top layer to a certain degree constitutes the technocracy. It would be inexcusable to ignore it, not to see the role it plays in modern capitalism. Through its place in the process of production and in its living standard, it is part of the ruling exploiting class, following behind the monopolists, the high-ranking state bureaucracy and the militarists. Technocracy thus does not replace the monopolists, still less does it oppose them.

The greater the polarization of capitalist society, the more its defenders clamor about "the increase in social equality." What is more, as befits bourgeois economists, they do not concentrate on the distribution of ownership of the means of production, but on the distribution of incomes. In recent years

bourgeois economists and philosophers have been working hard to spread the notion that there has been an increase in social equality in the West, a narrowing of the gap between the incomes of the rich and the poor, a "fair distribution of wealth." That there is no truth in these allegations is obvious: the national income in the imperialist countries is being redistributed before the eyes of the world, but only in the interests of big capital.

Social antagonisms are growing even while wages rise, despite the claims to the contrary by the opponents of Marxism. In the capitalist society of today the worker feels increasingly dissatisfied. (24)

The other line in the apologetics of modern capitalism involves the view that capitalism has overcome its past shortcomings. The "theory" of the stability of the capitalist economy is being presented in every possible variation. It is called now "balanced economy," now "stabilized economy" and now "regulated economy." The theories of "organized capitalism" and the elimination of the anarchy of production and crises under capitalism are in themselves not new. They have long been propagated by bourgeois political economy. What is new is that, contrary to science and actual experience, the economists of monopoly capital seek to prove that interference by the bourgeois state in economic life is capable of creating "crisis-free capitalism" and overcoming anarchy in production.

Criticizing the CPSU Program, the ideologists of the monopoly bourgeoisie claim that the anarchy of production, crises, unemployment, etc., are the consequence of free competition and have disappeared together with it, that these phenomena have been solved thanks to the state's regulating activity in the modern "welfare state" system. Seizing upon superficial and insignificant facts, the reformists and revisionists follow the example of the bourgeois ideologists and repeat the bourgeois-apologetic praise of state-monopoly regulation.

Although anti-crisis measures do influence economic activity to a certain extent, they cannot alter the cyclical character of capitalist production. Under capitalism, enrichment as such is an end in itself. That is why any regulation in capitalist conditions is linked with the problem of profits. Capitalist production reacts only to profits, and regulation naturally is not aimed directly at influencing production and reproduction but at creating special conditions permitting monopoly capital to receive superprofits. This alone shows that regulation does not mean planned economic management, the organization of production on a national scale, nor does it set itself such a task.

Despite the allegations of the apologists of capitalism, the system of regulation under conditions of

imperialism does not constitute government control over capitalist concerns or serve to regulate the activities of monopolies. This is also shown by the mechanism of control and regulation. It aims, first, at establishing a whole number of monopoly unions with the participation of representatives of the state and under its supervision and, second, at establishing state institutions in whose activities the representatives of monopolies will participate and in which the monopolies will play a decisive role.

In France, for instance, regulation appears on the surface as a purely technical and almost scientifically substantiated process which allegedly serves to develop the national economy and which is being conducted by government institutions. In reality, however, the direction of state investments is determined under the influence of monopoly capital united in the so-called "grand patronage." It is determined as a result of the struggle among the monopoly groups for government credits and subsidies, notably in the commissions set up for individual branches and sectors on which the planning commissariat relies.

The interference of the bourgeois state in economic life merely intensifies the chaos and anarchy of production. There is a bitter struggle in process among the different monopoly groups for the upper hand in the various sections of the state machinery, and especially for responsible posts in government bodies that handle orders, subsidies, credits, etc. At the same time the contradictions between the current interests of the state machinery and the interests of various monopolies are increasing.

The apologetics of modern capitalism cannot conceal what is most important: that is that the nature of capitalism has not changed and that the antagonistic contradictions of this mode of production have grown all the more acute.

"Refuters" of Marxism

"The destruction of Marxism" is one of the main tasks set by monopoly capital for its learned servants. The most shameless fables, utter nonsense — anything goes to achieve this aim. The representatives of monopoly capitalism deny the inevitability of the replacement of the capitalist system by the new, socialist system and the possibility of the scientific organization of the social system. In the past bourgeois economists claimed that socialism was unachievable, and that was that. Today, when socialism has been translated into life, the "refuters" of Marxism have become more subtle and demagogic.

With sickening monotony the bourgeois economists repeat in all their writings the same few ideas which, they believe, can "refute" Marxism. Bour-

geois political economy attempts to prove that Marxist political economy is "obsolete." (!) With this aim in view, it lumps together Ricardo, the Austrian school and Marxist political economy. In the sphere of the general theory of political economy the theoreticians of monopoly continue the line followed by all bourgeois political economy of justifying unearned incomes. The strongest attacks are directed against the Marxist theory of surplus value, the general law of capitalist accumulation, the law of value, the law of the tendency of the average rate of profit to fall, the theory of crises and the theory of class struggle. And this is natural. For it is a matter of the very essence of the capitalist mode of production.

The ideologists of monopoly capital declare that the laws of development of the capitalist economy have changed fundamentally and, what is most important, that Marx's law of surplus value is no longer valid because the modern entrepreneur is compelled to reckon with "national interests" arising from the interdependence of the various branches of the economy. What a convincing argument! Bourgeois economists persist (though quite awkwardly) in attempting to "prove" that profit is not a result of surplus value, which they negate completely. Among the many "arguments" adduced, one that is especially popular is the view that profit is the result of innovations. (25)

At the same time certain bourgeois economists hold that the significance of profit as a factor stimulating production has decreased, that while profit played a rather important role in the past, now that there are big corporations with large numbers of shareholders who do not directly influence business, while management is omnipotent, the stimulating role of profit in production has declined. Actually, however, the pursuit of profit has not ceased to be the main stimulus in the capitalist mode of production. It is the decisive criterion in introducing technical innovations, expanding enterprises, capital investments, etc. There are, of course, additional factors which influence the volume of investments: the common interests of the monopolistic oligarchy, militarization, the foreign policy interests of the monopolies. But even here, for each monopoly the main stimulus is profit and only profit. (26)

However, what is new in the operation of the law of surplus value? What is new is that the working class is now exploited by monopoly capital with the direct participation of the state. The higher level and degree of exploitation of the working class is also new.

Despite the allegations of anti-Marxists, the general law of capitalist accumulation continues to operate as implacably as ever. The distinguishing

feature of its operation in present conditions is that the tendencies opposing the absolute impoverishment of the working class have been intensified, especially the struggle of the working class which now relies on the successes of the world socialist system.

The law of value, against which the bourgeois economists have taken up arms, determines the nature of capitalist production. In his Critique of Political Economy, Marx pointed out that it was Franklin who formulated the law of value — the basic law of modern political economy. (27) Engels also wrote in Anti-Dühring that "the law of value is the basic law of commodity production..." (28) What is new in the operation of the law of value under conditions of state-monopoly capitalism is that it exercises its function of distributing the aggregate social labor not only directly, but also through intermediary links inasmuch as the capitalist state redistributes the national income.

For Marxists there is no doubt that the law of surplus value in various stages of the development of capitalist commodity production manifests itself in profit, in average profit and in the price of production, in monopoly superprofits. How are the monopoly superprofits created?

1) The monopolies possess the greatest possibilities for employing the latest technology and, consequently, for reducing production costs. Despite the general decrease in costs as a result of technological changes, prices drop only in the case of certain commodities and less than costs drop. In the case of many other commodities they remain unchanged and even rise. In short, a new dynamics of a monopoly type appears in the sphere of the relation between costs and prices. The policy of the monopolies influences production costs in the same direction: the high monopoly prices as a whole increase production costs for the non-monopoly enterprises, especially for the dependent small and medium enterprises. To this one should add the burden they have to bear because the monopolies, taking advantage of their power, influence and privileges (in the sphere of raw material supplies, electric power, finance, taxes, etc.), deliberately lower the costs of their production to the detriment of the non-monopoly enterprises which do not possess such possibilities. The monopolies constantly attempt to raise or maintain the level of production costs for the non-monopoly enterprises, although the high prices simultaneously reduce consumption demands. The monopolies thus strengthen their control over the economy of the capitalist countries.

2) The monopolies set high prices for their output. They succeed in this because of their domination of the market both in the sphere of supply and

demand, as well as their ability to make use of the bourgeois state. It is characteristic of monopoly that it is not the market which imposes its prices upon it, but the monopoly which is in a position to impose definite prices on the market. The result is a change in the normal conditions of trade to the detriment of the weaker, non-monopoly sectors of production. Inasmuch as under monopoly domination the price hardly depends on cost, the monopolist reacts in a completely different manner to changes on the market: when demand grows, he tries to curtail production without lowering price. The economic and political power of monopoly capital is so great that he is in a position to impose on the small and medium enterprises the whole burden of competition, crises and economic upheavals.

3) The monopolies receive superprofits from the export of capital as well as a result of the intertwining of the capital of the monopolies of different imperialist countries, which in turn leads to the establishment of aggressive economic blocs (the Common Market, etc.).

4) Monopoly superprofits, finally, also result from the redistribution of profits within the bourgeois class in favor of the monopolistic oligarchy through the state's financial, tax and credit mechanisms. This method of receiving superprofits arose together with state-monopoly capitalism.

The redistribution of profits in favor of the monopolistic oligarchy through the medium of state interference profoundly disturbs the laws of capitalist reproduction, which is based on commodity production with its free competition and average profits. Lenin wrote in this connection that "the development of capitalism has reached a point where, although commodity production still 'reigns' and is considered the basis of the entire economy, it is actually undermined, and the main profits go to the 'geniuses' of financial deals." (29)

In addition to "refuting" the Marxist laws of the capitalist mode of production, the political economy of monopoly capital attacks Lenin's theory of imperialism. The main blow is directed at his thesis concerning monopoly domination. Seeking to refute it, the bourgeois theoreticians claim that there are no monopolies and that competition prevails. They admit, it is true, that there is no "perfect competition," that the forms of competition have changed. (30) Nonetheless the existence of competition allegedly proves that there are no monopolies.

What is the actual role of competition under state-monopoly capitalism, in what sense is the "free" competition of the former type preserved and what are the new forms of competition which have emerged?

State-monopoly capitalism not only does not elim-

inate competition, but engenders new forms of competitive struggle: between monopoly and non-monopoly enterprises; between the monopolies themselves; (31) between the monopolies for influence over the various sectors of the state machinery; and between the private monopoly and state enterprises. Nationalized enterprises compete with one another just as any other capitalist enterprises. The combination of the domination of monopolies which control the state machinery with all forms and types of competition, including free competition, is characteristic of modern capitalism.

"Theoretical" Substantiation of the Economic Measures of the Bourgeois State

It would be wrong, and it would seriously hamper the struggle against bourgeois policy and ideology, not to see that the modern economic theoreticians of monopoly capital are engaged not only in vindicating state-monopoly capitalism and "refuting" Marxism, but also in substantiating the economic measures of the bourgeois state. In doing so they pursue two aims: to strengthen the dominant position of monopoly capital and ensure superprofits for it. The ideologists of monopoly capital are worried by the phenomena which Marxists characterize as the general crisis of capitalism. They do not recognize the general crisis of capitalism, although they actually take it as their point of departure.

A struggle, a real struggle among the various schools of monopoly capitalism, is being fought over the question of which methods to apply to save the moribund capitalist system. From the point of view of this struggle the economists of monopoly capitalism may be roughly divided into two groups: one, consisting of Keynesians, and the other, of those who in Western Europe call themselves neo-liberals and who are called representatives of economic conservatism in the United States.

On the basic issues of US domestic economic policy a clear-cut line may be drawn between the Keynesian economists — Democrats (32) — and the "conservative economists" — Republicans. (33) The former are adherents of "cheap money" and affirm that the policy of "tough credit terms" was the real cause of the economic crises in the past decade and that to stimulate the rate of growth and employment it is necessary to make credit terms easier. They hold that most of the economic difficulties of the US stem from insufficient investment in the state economic sector as compared with that in the private sector. They also seek to prove that a budget deficit and inflation are "not a high price" to pay to achieve "the more important aims of economic growth" and "full employment." Their program

of "economic prosperity" is to increase government expenditures, reduce taxes, and make credit terms easier. With the aid of these measures demand will presumably be raised to a level which will make it possible to use the entire economic potential and accelerate the rate of growth of the economy.

The adherents of the Keynesian methods resort to an old trick: they create an artificial market with the aid of a deficit financing program which leads to an increase in the government debt and to "financing the buyer" through widespread installment sales. As a result of this program the US debt, especially the internal debt, has grown enormously in the past few years. The total sum of the US government and private debt has increased from \$406.3 billion in 1945 to \$1,027 billion in 1961. The incurrence of these huge debts has the effect of making important stimulating injections into industry and trade, as the result of which profits have risen to a new record high. But there is no doubt that such financing cannot continue indefinitely, that it will ultimately reach a dangerous limit. Large-scale deficit financing widens the gap between production and the effective purchasing power of the population.

Unlike the Keynesian economists, the conservatives uphold the policy of "tough credit terms," that is, the policy of limiting the funds available for loans, and thus stand for an increase in the interest rate. They believe that it is the abundance of credit funds that leads to booms attended by inflationary trends and ultimately to economic crises. From this premise they conclude that it is necessary to regulate credit in such a way as to smooth out the economic cycle. At the same time the conservatives hold that inordinately high government expenditures entail inflationary booms and cause crises. That is why they emphasize the imperative need to balance the budget and attach particular importance to maintaining price stability. Their program of "economic prosperity" boils down to the following: keeping wages at a low level, reducing government allocations for public needs, observing a stringent regime in the sphere of credit, and lowering taxes on corporations and the well-to-do.

Despite these seemingly fundamental differences, the two groups are unanimous on three questions: 1) the question of the offensive against the working class. Both, as economists of monopoly capital, explain all economic difficulties by high wages, as the result of which labor power "becomes inaccessible because of the high price on the market." In this false argument the rise in prices is caused by increases in wages; 2) the question of ensuring high profits for monopoly capital. Both are for subsidies, for grants to big capital, for accelerated depreciation and other means of "stimulating" capital invest-

ment, for lower taxes on monopolies on the grounds that "excessively high taxes deprive the capitalists of the necessary funds for investment"; 3) the question of the militarization of the economy. The political economists of monopoly capital hold that the huge government expenditures on arms constitute the main means of preventing a profound economic crisis and of maintaining the present superprofits.

It should be pointed out that there exists the incorrect conception that the Keynesians are not adherents of the arms race. In actual fact, the modern Keynesians, defending war production on the grounds that it is necessary to ensure employment, create dangerous stimuli for justifying the preparation and launching of war.

In Western Europe there are two main economic schools of monopoly capital which are best known — the champions of regulated economy and the neo-liberals. The first ("dirigists," interventionists) base their economic policy proposals on the same principles as their intellectual colleagues in the United States. In addition, since industry in Western Europe is nationalized to a considerable degree, the West European economists also devote much attention to the problems of nationalized industry.

As for the neo-liberals, it is wrong, in our view, to portray them as defenders of "free enterprise." Regarding itself as the successor of the old, orthodox (and vulgar, in our opinion) political economy, neo-liberalism eulogized free competition in the early stages of its existence and held that its mechanism automatically ensured the best conditions for economic progress. But later neo-liberalism underwent a marked metamorphosis, and the only thing left of it is its name, which deludes some people. The present-day neo-liberals admit the necessity of state interference in the economy and, unlike their predecessors, they agree that the mechanism of free competition cannot be ensured automatically, and that, consequently, it should be constantly supported by government measures.

Both Keynesian theory and neo-liberalism are modern theories of big monopoly capital, now at the level of state-monopoly capital. The difference between them is one of demagogy. The idea that Keynesian theory is the economic theory of the non-monopoly circles, the theory of the petty bourgeoisie and trade union bureaucracy, the contrasting of the allegedly liberal views of the Keynesians with ultra-reactionary views, the idea that monopoly capital is against Keynesian theory, are absolutely wrong. Keynesian theory is a more subtle theory of saving capitalism, it is a defense of monopoly capital as a whole as opposed to the narrow, selfish (from the viewpoint of the Keynesians) theories, views and proposals of individual monopoly groups.

Keynes, according to Lenin, was an "inveterate bourgeois, a merciless opponent of Bolshevism," (34) a deadly enemy of the working class. It is, therefore, all the more surprising that the demagogic screen which this ideologist of monopoly capital used to conceal his frankly imperialist views at one time deluded certain progressive economists who hoped to find shades of "liberalism" in his views. It is equally wrong to divide Keynesians into reactionary and left-Keynesians. This obscures the social and class essence of Keynesian theory, masks its danger and gives it a halo of progressiveness.

Reactionary bourgeois economic theories are opposed by Marxist-Leninist political economy, whose scientifically substantiated theoretical tenets have been confirmed by history. Marxist science, relying on the achievements of world socialism, works out plans for the struggle for the ultimate aims of the working class in all countries, for the socialist revolution, for the victory of socialism and communism.

The world communist movement holds that it is not enough only to outline the general Marxist economic theses and then step aside to await the inevitable collapse of capitalism. Communists consider that the working class and the working people of the capitalist countries must be shown what is actually occurring in the economy of the capitalist world. This is absolutely essential to free the population of the imperialist countries from the dangerous economic illusions fostered by the expansion of state-monopoly capitalism and the apologetic economic theories it engenders. One should not ignore the fact that the modern economic science of monopoly capital is openly waging an ideological offensive against the labor and communist movement in the Western countries.

The fraternal Communist parties have worked out extensive economic programs to defend the vital interests of the working class. They presuppose a systematic struggle for higher wages, for shorter workdays, with simultaneous increases in hourly wages, for expanding the whole system of social insurance, limiting the profits of the capitalists and shifting the tax burden onto them, for increasing trade between East and West.

Marxist-Leninist political economy has given a profound analysis of modern imperialism and bared the essence of state-monopoly capitalism. All allegations by bourgeois economists to the contrary, the Marxists have never raised the question as to whether or not state-monopoly capitalism is progressive. Such a posing of the question for Marxists is excluded by its undialectical nature. Marxists have never doubted the objective inevitability of monopoly capitalism replacing the petty-bourgeois "paradise"

of free competition. But objectively inevitable is not a synonym of progressive. What is more, the objective not only does not exclude struggle, but creates a basis for the proletariat's struggle against imperialism. Marxist-Leninists differ from anti-Marxists not only by their precise, scientific analysis of the social and economic processes occurring in capitalist society, but also by their effective program of struggle against monopoly capital.

The new relationship of class forces in the world arena offers the Communist parties new opportunities for solving the historic tasks confronting them in the struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism. That is why some of the specific traits of today cannot be formulated in the usual way. It is clear that even the best, the most thorough book cannot replace the book of life. Lenin stressed this very pointedly. "There is no doubt," he said, "that a textbook compiled according to Kautsky was a very useful thing in its day. But it is time, anyway, to give up the idea that this textbook provides for all forms of development of world history." (35) There is no substitute for the study of the traits of new, living reality on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and the CPSU Program.

In the new historic situation the working class in the West can achieve aims that transcend the bounds of ordinary reforms even before the overthrow of capitalism. For the more monopoly capital uses the state machinery to exploit the working class and prepare a new world war, the more actively will the proletariat, rallying around itself all the other classes and strata oppressed by the monopolies, oppose its policy. At the same time, as state-monopoly capitalism develops, the proletariat's struggle will shift more and more onto the political arena and be directed at monopoly capital as a whole. The anti-monopoly struggle is a struggle for general democratic reforms, for the restriction of the economic power of big capital, for the nationalization of the leading industrial branches and banks, for disarmament and the utilization of the economy for peaceful purposes, for better living conditions for the people — and all this with a view to bringing the masses to the stage of the socialist transformation of society.

The vital strength of Marxist-Leninist political economy lies in the fact that it arms the working class and the working masses with a knowledge of the laws governing society's economic development, and gives them clear perspectives and confidence in the victory of socialism throughout the world.

Footnotes

- 1) There is no doubt that bourgeois theories are

the "empty boxes" of science, but we may apply to them V. I. Lenin's characterization of philosophical idealism: "a barren flower without doubt, but a barren flower growing on a live tree..." (V. I. Lenin, *Soch.*, Vol. 38, p. 361).

2) The revisionists object to bourgeois economic thought being characterized as vulgar and apologetic. They hold that the Western economists of today have a different socio-political orientation and that those regarded as followers of Keynes uphold the idea that the socialist economy is superior to the capitalist.

3) "The Malthusian principle of population, the law of historically diminishing productivity, the analysis of the stimulant for accumulation and the analysis of wages — all these are empirical hypotheses, some of which were valid only in those days and some of which could generally be challenged" (W. Baumol, *Economic Dynamics*, New York, 1952, p. 19).

4) "The economy by itself is incapable of producing sufficient energy to ensure fully all possible growth. Without the aid of the mighty financial power of the federal government it is incapable of achieving, in the words of the 1946 Employment Act, 'maximum output, employment and purchasing power'" (A. Hansen, "Growth or Stagnation in the American Economy," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, November 1954, p. 412).

5) Thus, the defenders of French monopoly capitalism allege that anarchy of production, crises, unemployment, low rates of growth of production, etc., are all developments bound up with "liberal capitalism" and that "these contradictions find their solution in state capitalism" (*Populaire de Paris*, October 11, 1961).

6) The bourgeois economists' claim that the earlier political economy was microeconomic, that is, it was based on the analysis of individual firms, and that it is now macroeconomic, that is, it is based on the analysis of production as a whole, is expressive of the new development in modern capitalism — the establishment of state-monopoly capitalism.

7) Marx ironically formulated the principle of vulgar political economy, according to which "it is not permissible to go from the surface down." See K. Marx, *Theory of Surplus Value* (*Capital*, Vol. IV), Part III, State Publishing House of Political Literature, 1961, p. 128 (Russian edition).

8) "Although the economic and social structure of the Federal Republic of Germany bears capitalist traits," the West German journal *Der Volkswirt* wrote on December 23, 1961, "this capitalism is subordinated to new laws. Without full employment and mass well-being it would lack vitality...."

9) "The West no longer consists of capitalist countries." It is a "family of socialist countries and

countries of free enterprise" (R. Strausz-Huppe, W. Kintner and S. Possony, *The Forward Strategy for America*, New York, 1961, p. 267).

10) West German Minister of Economics Erhard claims that the "nature of capitalism has changed." He alleges that the Communists have in mind a "capitalism that has long become history and avoid historical reality, which for its part is becoming a fact giving an effective answer to socialism" (*Der Volkswirt*, December 23, 1961).

11) The theoreticians of the "welfare state" define it very ambiguously. The "welfare state," they say, is neither a method of "sliding into socialism" nor a stage of "moribund capitalism," but a sort of attempt to overcome the shortcomings of the modern bourgeois state.

12) "We indignantly deny that we are collectivists, but it can be proved that more than 2/3 of our business activity is possible only because it is 'collectivist' in nature" (A. Berle, *Power Without Property. A New Development of American Political Economy*, New York, 1959, p. 27).

13) President Kennedy's adviser, Professor Arthur Schlesinger of Harvard University, writes: "Marxist theory asserted that (a) capitalism would fall victim to the process of modernization and that (b) communism would inevitably be the end result of this process. Proceeding from this, the Communists aver that the victory of communism is predetermined by history. But history reveals unambiguously that (a) in the process of its modernization, the mixed society can overcome the internal contradictions which, Marx said, doomed it to destruction and that (b) communism, from the historic standpoint, is rather the initial and not the final phase of the process of modernization" (excerpt from Schlesinger's new book, published in the *Saturday Evening Post* of May 19, 1962).

14) "The coordinated economy," says F. Bloc-Lenet, "is a regime in which the representatives of the state (or local organs of power) and the representatives of enterprises (whatever their status) unite in an organized manner to exchange information and compare plans for the future as well as for the purpose of taking joint decisions or advising the government. This is a regime in which the main options concerning investment, production and trade do not depend completely, in the appropriate spheres, either on the managers of enterprises or the representatives of the government, but follow from permanent cooperation in which the division into private and state sectors does not result in two series of autonomous, isolated and unconnected actions" (cited in *Economie et Politique*, September 1961). A. Chalandon writes in an article entitled "For Coordinated Economy": "There must emerge

a new-type economy which, without being liberal, remains free, without being dirigist, becomes disciplined, without being collectivistic, is a result of collective efforts. It makes use of competition, but at the same time presupposes constant cooperation and contact between various economic and social forces.... The state's role does not consist of hampering initiative, of invading this sphere, for in the final count nothing is so Malthusian in nature as imperious dirigism at enterprises. Its role is to make use of all the different means at its disposal to encourage the enterprises to act according to the plan outlines. And only when private initiative fails to achieve the aim should the government intervene directly — either to do what should be done or to punish for what has been badly done" (Le Monde, June 8, 1960).

15) "Actually all the so-called capitalist systems contain considerable elements of 'socialism,' while all the so-called socialist systems, even those proclaiming themselves communist, include clearly capitalistic institutions" (W. Buckingham, Theoretical Economic Systems, New York, 1958, p. 27).

16) Ibid., pp. 485-487.

17) They assert that modern economic theory reveals a tendency to scientific integration, along with the integration of the world economy in the direction of socialism.

18) The American economists W. Adams and H. Gray, speaking for the interests of the non-monopoly bourgeoisie, expose the real nature of state interference in the economy: "Under the influence of economic power...public regulation has turned into an instrument for creating, protecting and subsidizing private monopolies." The regulatory commissions become "errand boys for the owners of the branches they are supposed to regulate." "The policy of state expenditures, as well as tax policy, is implemented so as to eliminate competition and strengthen monopolies" (W. Adams and H. Gray, Monopoly in America. The Government as Promoter, New York, 1955, pp. 54, 97).

19) We find an interesting admission in the official documents of the US government: "The vital requirements of the day and the continued threat of communist aggression demand much higher taxes and a greater government role in economic affairs than those known to former generations" (Economic Report of the President Transmitted to the Congress, January 1956, p. 8).

The same admission is made by Chalandon: "The coordinated economy is the only way in which the Western countries can acquire the economic dynamism necessary to resist the communist countries" (Le Monde, June 8, 1960).

20) K. Marx and F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol.

23, p. 764 (Russian edition).

21) "In replacing the walls and the machines of a factory by a simple packet of shares, the capitalist process eliminates life from the idea of ownership. ... This evaporation of what we may call the material substance of property — its visible and tangible reality — influences not only the conduct of shareholders, but also that of the workers and the position of the public in general" (J. Schumpeter, Kapitalismus, Sozialismus und Demokratie, Berne, 1946, p. 230).

"The entrepreneur in the old sense of the word has on the whole disappeared from industrial activity, and his functions ... are exercised by different categories of people: a) capital is represented by the holders of bonds and privileged shares; b) the capital risk is taken by holders of ordinary shares; c) the companies are directed by managers of different types and categories" (P. S. Florence, Ownership, Control and Success of Large Companies, London, 1961, p. 21).

22) K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., Vol. 25, p. 479.

23) Ibid., Vol. 24, p. 275.

24) "Any visible increase in wages presupposes a rapid growth of productive capital. A rapid growth of productive capital entails just as rapid a growth of wealth, luxury, public needs and public pleasures. Thus, although the pleasures to which the worker has access have grown, the public satisfaction they give has decreased as compared with the pleasures of the capitalist, which are out of reach for the worker, and generally as compared with society's level of development. Our needs and pleasures are engendered by society; that is why we measure them by a social gauge and not by the things which serve to satisfy them. Since our needs and pleasures are social in character, they are relative" (K. Marx and F. Engels, ibid., Vol. 6, p. 446).

25) W. Baumol writes that "no profit is possible without innovations. We regard innovation as a change which falls into one or several of the following five categories: 1) introduction of a new commodity or new type of commodity; 2) introduction of a new method of production; 3) opening up of a new market; 4) utilization of a new source of supply of the factors of production; 5) reorganization of a branch, several branches or part of a branch ("monopolization")... In introducing a new process which makes production cheaper, the entrepreneur will make a profit by selling at a price sufficient to remain in business. But as the new inflow of capital is used more widely and production increases, this profit disappears. And then only an additional innovation can yield profit (W. Baumol, Economic Dynamics, pp. 23-24).

26) The American bourgeois economist, Professor

L. Weiss of Minnesota University, admits: "The big businessmen's thirst for profit is hardly less than was that of the robber-barons at the end of the last century" (L. Weiss, Economics and American Industry, New York, 1961, p. 24).

27) See K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., Vol. 13, p. 42.

28) Ibid., Vol. 20, p. 324.

29) V. I. Lenin, op. cit., Vol. 22, p. 195.

30) J. Miller believes that the neo-classical interpretation of competition is too limited (it concerns only the allocation of resources) and is unsuitable for today. He declares that perfect or free competition is a thing of the past. But competition as a "thoroughly planned system" is an important element of the modern economy. This is the broader interpretation of competition. Government policy must also facilitate the further development of com-

petition in this broad sense (American Economic Review, May 1954, pp. 22-25).

31) The Brookings Institute has kept track of the 100 largest industrial companies over the past four decades, since 1909. Only 36 of the original group remained among the largest concerns in 1948. By 1955 the number dropped to 29. Some of the original 100 disappeared entirely. Others still remain, although they have been outpaced by rapidly growing rivals.

32) Paul Samuelson (his book Economics. An Introductory Analysis is a very popular economic textbook published in almost one million copies), Seymour Harris, J. Galbraith, Richard Lester, W. Rostow, A. Hansen, A. Schlesinger, Jr., etc.

33) A. Burns, A. Wallis, W. Feckler, etc.

34) V. I. Lenin, op. cit., Vol. 31, p. 195.

35) Ibid., Vol. 33, p. 439.

Mirovaia ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye
otnosheniia, 1962, No. 10

A. Bechin

SPECIFIC FEATURES OF REPRODUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES

The peculiarities of the US post-war economic development are manifested primarily in the low rate of production growth and in more frequent crisis-caused curtailments of industrial output, which consequently have gradually reduced the US share in the

The author is a Senior Researcher at the Institute of World Economics and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences. He is a member of the Editorial Board of Mirovaia ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia.

industrial production of the capitalist world. As the Party Program points out, the United States "has passed its zenith and has entered the stage of its decline."

The specific features of the US economic development testify to the further intensification of the general crisis of capitalism, now in its third stage. They reflect the acute aggravation of the conflict between powerful productive forces, created by the progress of contemporary science and technology, and capitalist relations of production which have

outlived themselves. They are a natural outcome of the profound internal changes that have taken place in the structure and forms of US reproduction during the past three to four decades.

Main Changes in Economic Structure

Attention must be directed, first of all, to the fact that the share of net accumulation in the national income as well as the share of gross investment in the gross national product, which were growing up to a certain period, started to fall. In his day Marx set forth theoretically the inevitability of this process; his conclusion is fully corroborated today by the US statistics on investment and national income.

To illustrate, net accumulation in all economic branches, including housing and the non-productive sector, absorbed about 14% of the gross national product in 1869-78, as against 9.2% in 1919-28; 1.6% in 1929-38. Between 1946 and 1955, the rate of accumulation rose to 4.1%, but it was still relatively low. The share of gross investment in the gross national product gradually decreased as follows: 25.1% in 1889-98; 20.6% in 1919-28; 17.3% in 1946-55. (1)

In addition, basic productive fixed assets were growing to a lesser extent than the non-productive. According to the calculations of experts from the US National Bureau of Economic Research, production equipment, buildings and structures — excluding farmers' dwellings and structures — constituted 33% of the US national wealth in 1900, as compared with 35% in 1910; 31% in 1930; 29% in 1940 and as little as 26% in 1950-58. (2)

The share of manufacturing industry in the capital accumulated within the material production branches, sharply increased — from 9.1% in 1880 to 33.5% in 1948. The share of agriculture declined from 32% to 18% and that of transport, power and other public utility enterprises — from 57.2% to 43.6%, respectively. (3) These figures are very approximative, of

course. However, they suffice to illustrate the changes that have taken place in the structure of the US economy.

What caused the percentage of gross and net investment in the gross national product to diminish? Why does the percentage of the capital accumulated in the material production branches fall in the total reproduction of the national wealth?

As is known, the development of large-scale machine production, leads to a sharp growth of labor productivity and to a greater output per unit of accumulated capital. The coefficient expressing the ratio of fixed assets used to the annual output has been changing in the US economy as indicated in Table 1.

"Capital-product" ratio was growing in industry until 1919-29. The volume of capital per unit of labor was increasing faster than the output per unit of labor. Consequently, industrial output was growing slower than the volume of fixed assets. In the decades that followed the trend reversed, and industrial output increased faster than the growth of fixed assets.

Between 1900 and 1957 output per man-hour increased by approximately 240%, the volume of fixed assets per man-hour worked by 150%, whereas "capital-product" ratio went down from 1 to 0.69. (4) This growth in the productivity of labor, equipped with modern machinery, together with a higher intensification of labor whose rate is forcibly accelerated by machine production had the following results:

firstly, the rate of the surplus value and the surplus product sharply increased;

secondly, the share of the production accumulation in the national income started to decline, as did the share of the production workers in total labor force;

thirdly, industry began to allocate more and more of its product for the accumulation in the non-productive sector and for the maintenance of the workers who create no material values.

All these factors provided an economic basis for a gradual increase in the share of the non-productive sector in the US economy.

Table 1*

	1880	1900	1922	1948
Agriculture	1.19	0.98	1.45	1.03
Mining	1.06	1.39	2.06	0.92
Manufacturing	0.21	0.33	0.44	0.27
Transport, power, and other public utilities	15.53	6.64	3.69	1.64
All branches	1.33	1.07	1.06	0.58

* Source: S. Kuznets, *op. cit.*, p. 199. Fixed assets exclude the price of land.

The Growth of the Non-Productive Sector

Parallel with the growth of the share of the non-productive sector in the national wealth, its share of wage and salaried workers was simultaneously increasing in the total labor force.

Thus, employment in the US productive sector (lines 1 through 5) decreased from 55% to 40.1% of the total employed labor force between 1929 and 1960. By including workers in trade, whose operations are partly a continuation of the material production process (lines 1 through 6), this share

Table 2
Structural Changes in Employment in the US Economy

Branches	percentage of basic incomes of the employed, including proprietors				by share of hired labor	
	1870	1900	1930	1940	1929	1960
Agriculture	49.7	36.8	21.5	17.4	21.3	8.0
Mining	1.5	2.6	2.4	2.1	2.2	1.0
Manufacturing	17.4	21.8	22.5	22.7	21.4	22.1
Construction	5.8	5.7	6.2	6.6	3.0	3.7
Transport and public utilities	4.0	5.3	6.8	4.8	7.1	5.3
Trade	6.1	8.5	12.4	13.2	12.9	15.9
Finance	0.3	1.0	2.9	2.8	3.0	3.4
State	1.9	2.8	4.9	5.5	6.5	14.9
Services, and miscellaneous	12.0	14.3	17.8	18.9	22.6	25.7

Source: for 1870-1940, S. Kuznets and R. Goldsmith, Income and Wealth of the United States. Trends and Structures, Cambridge, 1952, p.107; for 1929-1960, The Handbook of Basic Economic Statistics, October 16, 1961, pp. 12, 13, 16, 17.

would increase to 67.9% and 56%, respectively. Of total non-agricultural employment — mining, manufacturing, construction, transport, communications, and public utilities (power, gas, municipal economy, etc.) constituted 55% in 1929 and 44.7% in 1960. It is also noteworthy that the share of the manufacturing industry in total nonagricultural employment, which was increasing substantially until about 1900, later stabilized, and started to fall after World War II. Similar structural changes are reflected by US data on distribution of national income, private incomes, etc.

Thus, there is no doubt whatsoever of these changes in the economic development of the United States. Still more imperative, therefore, is a socio-economic analysis of this phenomenon which is of major importance for the theory of reproduction.

What relationship does the growth of the non-productive sector have to expanded reproduction and to the rate of the production growth? Bourgeois economists, as is known, calculate the volume of the gross national product by totalling the output of different branches of material production and services which is, of course, incorrect. Only Marxist-Leninist theory provides a correct scientific explanation

of the significance of non-productive labor for the progress of material production.

Services are a special form of use value which satisfies the material and spiritual requirements of people. (5) With industrial progress and growing per-capita output in the capitalist world "... the division of labor turns non-productive labor into an exclusive function of one part of workers, and productive labor into an exclusive function of another part of workers." (6) A corresponding portion of the income is exchanged in part for commodities and "... in part for services which as such are consumed as use values." (7)

The exchange of activity proceeds beyond material production, and it grows between productive and non-productive labor. Of course, in a capitalist society, non-productive labor is used chiefly by the bourgeoisie, higher-paid employees and intel-

lectuals who exploit production workers or live at their expense in some other way. At the same time, certain services — for example, services provided by teachers, physicians, etc. — are a means of reproducing labor power, and their costs are included in the value of the latter. (8)

Karl Marx pointed out that at every given moment "articles of consumption include articles of consumption existing in the commodity form, and a certain quantity of articles of consumption in the form of services." (9)

Only productive labor, properly coordinated, creates the material product and the national income, a part of which is allocated to maintain the non-productive sector. The latter can, therefore, develop only in line with the growth of labor productivity in the productive sector and increase in per-capita output.

A question arises in this connection: does the non-productive sector promote additional effective demand, insofar as it does not create national income nor material product. Can it be presumed that the consumption of a part of the income in the non-productive sphere correspondingly curtails the opportunities for expanding material production?

Of course, at the lower stage of the development of productive forces the growth in the non-productive consumption of the exploiting classes, reduced the possibilities of accumulating capital for expanding production. But, in a developed capitalist economy,

— for instance, in the United States, whose volume of production at present is large — high prices for goods and services, taxes and relatively low wages either limit the consumption of services or expenditure on essential services restricts effective demand on goods.

We should not limit ourselves only to these facts in assessing the role of the non-productive sector in the reproduction process. The economic basis for the growth of the service sector is not only the high level of per-capita output but also the high degree of the exploitation of the working class and the high rate of the surplus value. The wage-bill of the production workers engaged in material production does not exceed 25% of national income. (10) Consequently, the rate of the surplus value in the United States amounts to 300% or even more. This economic basis of the existence of the non-productive sector determines peculiar forms of its development in the United States. The service sector caters, in the main, to the bourgeoisie and other well-to-do strata. Large-scale expenditure of these strata on services cannot reduce their consumption of material values. On the contrary, a considerable portion of the material product is consumed additionally in the service sector in the form of fixed assets, materials, power, and goods consumed by the service workers. The surplus product is used precisely for this purpose, which otherwise would not have been consumed under the social system and political regime existing in the United States.

The service sector has become an important field of capital investment. The subordination of the non-productive sector by capital has determined special features for realizing the product consumed here as well as the conditions of non-productive labor. The product of material production enters the service sector as an element of the capital invested in the corresponding enterprise. Before reaching the consumer, services created on the basis of this capital have to pass through the hands of the capitalist. The same is true of the labor privately employed in services. If we were to exclude the small group of managerial staff, the people employed here are the most exploited section of the proletariat, often lacking even class organization.

It follows from the above that the monopolies which have investments in the non-productive sector, appropriate a part of the value created in the productive sector. It cannot be considered, therefore, that the value as a whole is realized in trade: a part of it

goes into services.

The peculiarities of the US service sector also explain why, in the years of the crisis-induced curtailments in post-war production, expenditure on services did not decrease but, on the contrary, increased considerably both in constant and current prices. For example, in 1958 total expenditure (in constant prices) on private consumption of goods rose by 2.5 billion dollars and expenditure on services, by 4.0 billion dollars. The situation was practically the same in 1948 and 1954. (11) Expenditure of the capitalist and higher-paid employees on services could grow even if the working people reduced their purchases of goods.

Reproduction and State Expenditures

The service sector and non-productive consumption in general owe their growth in the US not to private enterprise alone. A constantly growing portion of the national product is being consumed by the state. In 1958 total state expenditure on goods and services exceeded 92 billion dollars, the federal government accounting for over 52 billion and local government for more than 40 billions thereof. If we are to include here transfers of monetary assets resulting from the redistribution of incomes, total expenditure of the US government will amount to 131 billion dollars. Total state expenditure on goods and services comprises 43.2 billion dollars, expended from the budget for payment of wages and salaries, and 48.8 billions for purchases of goods and services, assigned to private monopolies. (12)

State purchases increase sales of military materials and other goods at high prices. Huge means, paid out by the tax-payers, are pocketed by the monopolies engaged in the production of weapons, contract construction, etc. This utilization of budget resources in many ways determines the structure of material production and its one-sided military development. Thus, in 1958 private expenditure on equipment totalled 22.9 billion dollars in all economic branches, as against 17.1 billion dollars for state purchases of military technology.

Beginning with 1950, total state purchases of goods and services significantly exceeds total gross private investment (by an average of 64 to 66% during 1953-58). Private expenditure on new plant and equipment in all economic branches amounted to one-third of state purchases in 1953, and was even smaller in 1960. In recent years state purchases have been equal to the wage-bill in all branches of material production. (13)

It is difficult to overestimate the impact of state expenditure on the reproduction process. About one-fourth of the gross national product is redistributed

through the budget in the interests of financial oligarchy. A considerable portion of the necessary product, earned by the working people, is taken from them in taxes and goes to the military-industrial monopolies in the form of orders and subsidies. More than eleven million people are employed in the state machinery or serve in the army. Besides, millions of workers are engaged in the production of military equipment and materials necessary for its manufacture. Military expenditure absorbs over 85% of the federal purchases of goods and services. About 60% of the means are expended for the purchase of goods and services from the monopolies, and less than 40% for the payment of wages and salaries.

Advocates of militarism and aggression are using false arguments in support of military production. They claim that the abolition of military production will allegedly curtail production and increase unemployment. In the majority of cases bourgeois economists include military consumption in "aggregate demand" depicting it as an integral and necessary condition for the growth of production.

However, in reality, military production diverts means from civil production, while military consumption, which constitutes a threat to the very existence of the human race and does irreparable harm to civil consumption. This is especially so in the less-developed countries where the consumption of a substantial part of the national income for military purposes seriously hurts the accumulation of capital for expanding production, and slows down the rate of economic development.

In the developed countries military expenditure does not always reduce the accumulation for expanding production. Under certain conditions, in the United States for example, growing military production can, for a time, increase factory work, accumulation, employment, and monetary and real wages and, consequently, stimulate temporarily non-military production. But, the arms race always diverts from personal consumption a substantial portion of the material product, raises prices, deprives civil branches of millions of workers, aggravates economic contradictions, ousts civil production whatever the level of production of means of production and consumer goods. Military production always stands opposed to civil production, leading the economy to bankruptcy, let alone an increased danger of war.

Thus, the general situation appears rather contradictory: the role of the state in the economy has grown considerably; on the one hand, state expenditure secures employment for many millions of workers, on the other hand, their labor and a substantial portion of the national product are used counter to the vital interests of the working people

and conflict with the needs of society.

Bourgeois economists propagate the theories of "mixed economy," "affluent society," "welfare state," etc. In reality the U.S. economy is an economy of state monopolistic capitalism, whose production as well as distribution and consumption of national product are determined by the financial oligarchy and promote further enrichment of the monopolies. More and more workers cannot provide for their subsistence unless engaged in the production of means of destruction and human annihilation or in services catering to the parasitic bourgeoisie. This provides a solid economic basis for the fight for disarmament, and for rallying a broad antimonopoly front of the democratic forces.

Changes in the Forms of Reproduction and Circulation

Changes in the structure of capital and investment, the reduction of capital-product ratio and the growth of the non-productive sector have led to far-reaching consequences for the entire mechanism of the reproduction and circulation of capital. The share of net accumulation in the national income has dropped, as has the share of gross investment in the gross national product. The share of amortization rose in gross investment and net accumulation showed an increase in the undivided profits. This accounts for monopolies using a growing share of their own means to finance investment as well as for a declining role of loan-capital market. As far back as 1900-1914 as much as 79% of net investment in mining and manufacturing were financed from the corporate undivided profits.

Undivided profits exceeded the volume of net investment by 130% in 1914-1919; 390% in 1938-1946; 30% in 1945-1953. (14) As a result, private savings commenced flowing not so much to the money market as to a growing extent to insurance and other funds. Insurance companies and pension funds began to play a more important role in the credit sphere, while commercial banks started to reduce their allocations for production investment.

Lastly, the abolition of the gold standard has greatly changed the market mechanism of reproduction and circulation. The gold standard imposed strict limits for credit and money circulation. If in the stage of cyclical expansion these limits could be ignored, as it were, and commercial and bank credit stimulated, then the more painful was the forceful liquidation of the excessive indebtedness in the course of crises, which was inevitably accompanied by mass-scale bankruptcies of enterprises and banks, stock exchange crashes and devaluation of stocks.

An entirely new situation has arisen in all fields of the reproduction and circulation of capital due to the changes in the financing of investment, the structure of credit and financial institutions, and the abolition of the gold standard. The flow of money capital has changed; it flows not only to major banks but also to insurance companies, pension funds and the state budget. All this has resulted in a greater centralization in the field of circulation and credit.

Inflationary methods of financing state expenditure have also become entirely different. The United States does not resort to the emission of treasury notes, which is prohibited by law. Paper money emission has proved totally inadequate for covering the deficit which assumed almost a chronic nature. Besides, the emission of paper money to the sum of deficit would result in a large-scale devaluation of money; the state also has to make irregular payments which can be financed through sporadic issue of bank notes. For this reason, the budget deficit is covered by loans. Money is used both to purchase goods and to pay wages and salaries. The corresponding sums create secondary demand arising from the expenditure of salaries by the government employees and by the workers and employees engaged in the production of military equipment, construction of military projects and other structures. All this radically differs from the relatively short-term purchases of military equipment which were made in times of war in the past century. The expenditure of huge means by the state has grown, as it were, into the economic life of the country and has become an integral part of the reproduction process.

Today it would be wrong to raise the question of cutting down all state expenditure. However, no efforts should be spared to intensify the fight against war preparations and for greater expenditure on public needs of the working people. The fight for peace and disarmament is a first major step in this direction. The reduction of military expenditure would raise real wages even if the present level of taxes is temporarily maintained. Military consumption is tantamount to a portion of national product being burned or dumped in the sea. But the production of this product weighs heavily on the entire economy. The discontinuation of the armaments drive would surely lead to price reductions and, with the given sum of prices, to an increased consumption even if production and employment remain at the same level.

New Forms of Aggravation of Contradictions in Capitalist Reproduction

The above structural changes have still further

aggravated the basic contradiction of capitalism as well as the contradiction between production and consumption. This was manifested in the changes which occurred in the private capitalist market mechanism for the reproduction and circulation of capital, in the development of the state-monopolistic forms of economic relations, in the growing consumption of output which is realized through the budget.

It is often written that the redistribution by the state of the national income does not increase the aggregate demand, because private demand in this case is allegedly cut down by the sum equalling total state expenditure. As we have already shown, this interpretation of the problem has nothing to do with reality. Military expenditure, indeed, replaces, and ousts expenditure for personal consumption and civil, socially useful needs. There is no reason, however, to consider that state expenditure, as a whole, replaces private expenditure.

First, the state budget accumulates a part of the national income which might not have been expended if it remained in private possession. This includes a part of profits and incomes of the higher-paid employees and persons of free professions. These means come to the budget in the form of taxes and loans, which make it possible to absorb, to some extent, the excessive loan capital that could not be put to profitable use.

Secondly, the analysis of the peculiarities of economic development cannot be conducted within the limits, and according to the formula, of "aggregate demand." The concrete forms of economic relations are vitally important for the national economy. If the surplus value cannot be used in full for accumulation to expand production and for private accumulation in the non-productive sector, then it can be used in part to finance the state-sponsored construction of military and non-military projects. In this latter case the surplus value is taken from one group of capitalists to be given, at a later date, to another group in the form of payments for the supplies and contract construction. This shows among other things the essence of state-monopolistic capitalism: the capitalist state has become a tool of mercenary deals in the hands of the financial oligarchy, and of the major military-industrial monopolies.

Thirdly, taxes reduce the purchasing power of the working people, which limits the possibilities of the consumer goods' production. The state, however, allocates definite sums to be used both for military and civil consumption. On reaching the capitalists — these suppliers of the state — these means start a chain of exchanges of capital for capital, and capital for labor in other economic branches. If they are invested in promising, and growing branches

that use new technology, the total of private economic activity promoted by state expenditure may stimulate growth of production greater than the losses due to the reduction in effective demand for goods by the workers. No doubt, such operations by the state aggravate the contradiction between production and consumption though the consequences of this will not become apparent at once but only in the long run, i.e. several years later. The same also happens when individual capitalists appropriate surplus value and a part of the necessary product of the worker. If the value appropriated is used for accumulation or for some other purposes, the diminished purchasing power of the workers will cause production to decline not immediately but at the end of the cycle.

Post-war US economic development is characterized not only by a growing share of private enterprise in the non-productive sector, but also by a great increase in the part of the national income redistributed by the state. This has intensified the differentiation of capital, the growth of new branches, and accelerated changes in the economic structure.

Marx and Lenin repeatedly pointed to these most important circumstances defining the concrete conditions of the actual process of reproduction. For example, pointing to mistakes of Ricardo and Barton, Marx wrote that in different countries the mode of realization of the gross national product is "a result of the immanent laws of capitalist production." (15) A portion of the product consumed by the workers is diminishing, whereas consumption of the capitalists, landlords and their servants (the state, the Church, etc.) is growing. Should the productivity of labor increase, "... then a smaller portion of the value of the product can completely replace the constant part *in natura*. The excess may then be employed to form new additional capital, or a larger portion of the product may be given the form of consumer goods, or the surplus-labor may be reduced." (16) Specially analyzing the structure of the gainfully employed population, Marx wrote: "Also without consideration is the actual structure of a society which by no means consists of only the class of the workers and the class of the industrial capitalists and in which, therefore, the consumers and the producers are not the same: the first category, that by the consumers (whose incomes in part are not primary but secondary, derived from profits and wages) is considerably larger than the second (i.e. the category of the producers) and, therefore the manner by which it spends its income as well as the size of the latter cause rather big alterations in the economic procedure and especially in the process of the circulation and reproduction of capital." (17) Marx then put a special emphasis on the fact that only real economic relations constitute all the prerequisites for the

actual process of reproduction.

In connection with the above propositions it should be noted that Marx exposed the apologetic essence and unscientific basis of the Malthusian theory of non-productive consumption. He subjected the theory of Sismondi to scientific criticism. He invariably opposed the apologetic aspects of Ricardo's views, against his theory of production for the sake of production, which claimed that production itself is the only limitation on demand. Marx wrote that capital was the limitation on consumption "in the negative sense." (18) Having pointed to the contradictions in which Ricardo was floundering, Marx wrote: "What he forgets to note is the considerable growth in the middle classes standing between the workers, on the one hand, and the capitalists and the landlords, on the other—the middle classes, which to an ever-growing degree mostly live directly at the expense of income, place a heavy burden on the workers constituting the basis of society, and they increase the social stability and strength of the upper ten thousands." (19)

It is well known what level of consumption of the national income is attained at present by the military-state machinery of modern imperialist powers, and what complicated problems of class struggle have arisen from the expansion of the non-productive sector in the United States and other countries. The non-productive sector develops in the capitalist economy, as does the productive sector, on the basis of antagonistic contradictions. The non-productive sector is fully subordinated to monopoly capital. Monopolies are channelling a constantly growing portion of the surplus product into the non-productive sphere, i.e., the surplus product is capitalized in the consumption sector and is not used for expanding production.

The necessary product is also redistributed in the non-productive sector in the interests of the monopolistic bourgeoisie to the degree to which: a) the necessary product is withdrawn through taxes and high prices, b) the necessary product is expended for personal services which have to be bought from capitalist enterprises.

Owing to all these processes the total of buyers of the material product grows by the number of workers employed in the non-productive sector. It follows therefrom that the realization of consumer goods is not limited by the wage-bill of production workers and by capitalist outlays for the purchase of goods. Buying services, the capitalists and other persons, living at the expense of the redistributed product, consume the services put out by the workers of the non-productive sector, while the reproduction of the labor power of the workers employed here requires the expenditure of material product.

All that has been said here can explain the specific features of the post-war production growth in the United States. Bourgeois economists interpret the economic changes so as to prove that capitalism has undergone radical "transformation," as a result of which the basis has allegedly disappeared for profound and acute crises of overproduction, crises in the credit and monetary system, etc.

In reality, nothing of the sort has happened. New forms of the development of contradictions in capitalist reproduction could only alter the course of the cycle.

The contradiction between production and consumption has not disappeared as a result of growing state consumption and increasing share of the non-productive sector. This circumstance could only delay the eruption of the contradiction and alter its form. And, indeed, the contradiction between production and consumption resulted in crisis-caused curtailments of production in 1948-49, 1953-54, 1957-58, 1960-61. In every case private production, investment, employment and incomes were decreasing in the material production sector, though the total realized product and personal incomes did not decline in a single case. The growth of state expenditure and military production, interrupting as it did the further development of the crisis, more than compensated for the drop in civil production and incomes in the productive sector. Production continued to grow upon the increase in consumption.

Most significant in this connection is the movement of the industrial output index, which proceeded as follows (1947-49 = 100):

Table 3

	1953	1957	1960	1961
<u>By branches</u>				
Durable goods	156	162	169	167
Non-durable goods	122	141	160	164
<u>By end-use</u>				
Consumer goods	124	141	161	166
Equipment, including military technology	182	189	195	195

Source: The Handbook of Basic Economic Statistics, August 15, 1962, p. 78.

It is noteworthy that the capitalist outlays for equipment in all branches constituted (in constant prices) 22.8 billion dollars in 1948; 25.0 billion dollars in 1956; 24.6 billion dollars in 1957. (20) Consequently, the production index of equipment points

primarily to the growing production of military technology. The rise in the production of equipment since 1953 has been insignificant, notwithstanding increased expenditure on new plant and equipment in all branches. The durable goods index has grown very little. At the same time the expansion of consumer goods' production has been accelerated considerably.

The above indices followed similar trends in the cycle of the thirties. How can this be explained? First, the consumer demand grew in connection with increasing state expenditure and expanding non-productive sector. Secondly, the greater part of consumer goods was sold only formally and was not realized economically. Dwellings and durable goods were sold on credit terms. The consumer debt has assumed colossal proportions. An absolutely abnormal situation has emerged between expenditure on consumption and the consumer debt, between the growing gross national product and the increasing overall debt.

The state debt has grown about 13 billion dollars in total internal indebtedness of the United States. It follows, therefore, that especially high increase has been shown by private debt, resulting from the growth of the non-productive sector, financial operations, credit sales, and capitalization of excessive production capacity. All this, naturally, decelerates the turnover of capital.

Table 4

	1948	1953	1957	1960
	(billion dollars)			
Consumer expenditure on goods	121.4	150.9	178.1	196.7
Consumer debt, including dwellings (except farmers' dwellings)	42.1	98.9	152.4	197.0
Gross national product	259.4	364.8	442.5	503.2
Overall debt (net)	433.6	586.5	739.4	882.9

State expenditure, and the growth of the state and private debt could promote expenditure on consumption and in this way encourage the production of consumer goods. However, this cannot continue without end. By the present time the credit and monetary system has already exhausted the possibilities lent to it by the changes that took place.

Price inflation, gold drain, great excess of the short-term indebtedness of the United States to

foreign countries over the available reserves of gold, — all this has already undermined the dollar position both in the country and on the world market. Having freed itself from the gold standard inside the country and credit restrictions imposed by the exchange of bank notes for gold, the United States like any other capitalist country is nevertheless unable to remove the limits for the expansion of credit and growth of state expenditure, which are determined by gold in its function of world money. The experience of France and England shows that in every case a balance-of-payments deficit and diminishing resources of international media of payments forces a resort to the policy of imposing restrictions on domestic consumption, investment and imports, which caused a suspension of production growth.

At the present time the United States cannot provide for the expansion of exports large enough to liquidate the balance-of-payment deficit and to reduce the volume of the short-term indebtedness, at least to the extent of the available resources of gold. That is why crisis-preventive measures of the US government in every particular case aggravate still more the currency position of the country, increase inflation and instability of the whole credit and monetary system.

Historically, periodical crises of overproduction developed through the field of circulation and credit. Until recently it could hardly be expected that a profound crisis would result from the bankruptcies of investment banks, stock exchange crashes and the like. All changes that have occurred in the mechanism and forms of reproduction and circulation pointed to the slight degree of probability of crisis developing along these lines.

But under other conditions, even the modern credit and monetary system will not be able to withstand the disturbances in the reproduction process, caused by the main contradiction of capitalism. Therefore, the possibility cannot be excluded of such a development of reproduction crisis, which would be accompanied by a deep crisis or even collapse of the entire credit and monetary system. Drastic fall in shares on the stock exchanges in the United States, Britain, Western Germany and other countries, balance-of-payments crises, feverish, speculative movements of money from country to country, — all these and other factors indicate that a profound world crisis is highly probable in the not-too-distant future.

Summary and Conclusions

1. Changes in the structure, proportions and forms of reproduction and circulation have altered the general conditions of the US economic development. On the one hand, they have intensified

the basic contradiction of capitalism and the problem of markets. On the other hand, they have created new forms of the development of contradictions in reproduction.

2. Large-scale accumulation of fixed assets and the growth of output per unit of capital have led to the point where further accumulation and current renewal of fixed assets do not play their previous role in the cyclical expansion in the United States. This has become evident in the cycle of the thirties and in the period following World War II.

3. The importance of the non-productive sector has grown, which caused a considerable portion of capital and labor force to shift into it. Demand for equipment and consumer goods is determined to a growing degree by the non-productive sector and state expenditure and not by the development of production for the sake of production.

4. The circulation of capital and the distribution of the national income have also changed their forms, which point to further socialization of production and distribution on the basis of the growing monopolization, especially in the state-monopolistic forms.

5. The above changes have stimulated the growth of production, and the contradictions of reproduction have acquired greater scope for development. This explains why the disturbances in the process of reproduction could not, for some time, lead to profound and prolonged crises as in the past.

6. As far as the entire economy of the United States is concerned, none of the crisis-caused curtailments of production, which took place since the war, has solved any contradictions making crisis inevitable. Crisis-preventive measures, while alleviating the crisis, caused economic processes which could secure only a short-run recovery and insignificant growth of production. At the same time, the accumulation of forces and intensification of contradictions, which could not be checked with previous means, were growing in all sectors of the US economy.

7. The essence of the problem, therefore, is not merely the slackening effect of the factors which promoted some production growth frequently interrupted by crises. The situation is much more serious. The crisis-preventive policy is confronted with the increasing force of several factors inevitably leading to profound dislocations in the US economy.

Footnotes

1) S. Kuznets, Capital in the American Economy. Its Formation and Financing, a Study by the National Bureau of Economic Research, Princeton University Press, 1961, p. 93.

2) Based on the estimates of the American economist, R. Goldsmith, published in Statistical Abstract

of the United States, 1960, p. 327.

3) S. Kuznets, op. cit., p. 198.

4) Based on S. Dobrovolsky, D. Creamer and others, Capital in Manufacturing and Mining, Princeton, 1960, p. 4.

5) Non-productive labor in a capitalist society should be divided into two parts: 1) the labor serving the military and police machinery of modern imperialist powers and satisfying parasitic requirements of the capitalist class; 2) the labor employed in socially useful branches; education, health, and other services which satisfy personal requirements of people.

6) K. Marx, Teorii pribavochnoi stoimosti, Part I, p. 274, Moscow, 1955.

7) Ibid., p. 133.

8) Ibid., p. 137.

9) Ibid., p. 138.

10) Survey of Current Business, July 1959, p. 11. In 1957 wages and salaries of all workers and employees, including managerial staff of corporations, constituted in all producing branches 102 billion

dollars of total personal incomes amounting to 350 billion dollars.

11) Survey of Current Business, July 1959, p. 18.

12) Ibid., pp. 7, 12.

13) The Handbook of Basic Economic Statistics, October 16, 1961, pp. 152, 224-225.

14) S. Kuznets, op. cit., p. 251. The data published on page 121 of Capital in Manufacturing and Mining show that internal means of all corporations operating in manufacturing and mining greatly exceeded total expenditure on fixed assets during 1946-1953.

15) K. Marx, Teorii pribavochnoi stoimosti, Part II, p. 584, Moscow, 1957.

16) K. Marx, Kapital, Vol. III, Moscow, 1959, p. 863.

17) K. Marx, Teorii pribavochnoi stoimosti, Part II, p. 498, Moscow, 1957.

18) Ibid., p. 525.

19) Ibid., pp. 577, 578.

20) Survey of Current Business, July 1961.

* * *

O. S. Ioffe

THE NEW CODIFICATION OF CIVIL LAW AND PROTECTION
OF THE HONOR AND DIGNITY OF THE CITIZEN

I

With the issuance of the Principles of Civil Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics, the first, but very important, stage in the new codification of Soviet civil legislation to correspond with the needs of the period of the comprehensive building of communism has been realized. What must now follow is the adoption of civil codes by the union republics, in which the general, fundamental and primary propositions of the Principles will be appropriately concretized and detailed, developed and augmented.

In addition to solving problems related to socialist property and its various forms and regulating planned economic relationships among socialist organizations, the Principles give considerable attention to the person of the Soviet citizen - his multifold interests and needs, and the various forms of satisfying and protecting them. This is an entirely natural and understandable phenomenon. As the Program of the CPSU indicates, "the transition to communism will mean all-out progress with respect to the freedom of the person and the rights of Soviet citizens." That is why the Party presents, as a programmatic demand in the field of public law, the further improvement of juridical norms facilitating the all-round flourishing of the personality.

Protection of the rights and interests of citizens is furthered in a number of directions by the Principles of Civil Legislation of the USSR and Union Republics.

In the first place, the Principles confirm the right of private property, which, being a derivative of socialist property, has the function of serving the direct satisfaction of the material and cultural needs of the citizenry (Art. 25). The same ends are served by the various forms of disposition of personal property by agreements of purchase and sale (Arts. 39-43), property rental (Arts. 53-54), contract (Arts. 64-66), and by inheritance through bequest or in accordance with the demands of the law (Arts. 117-121).

Second, the Principles establish legal forms of mediation of the relationships involved in utilization

by citizens of public property and in servicing their daily needs by the appropriate socialist agencies. Particular interest attaches in this connection to the norms for rental of durable goods to citizens (Art. 55), housing rent (Arts. 56-63), contracts for consumer needs (Art. 66), etc.

Third, a number of the norms in the Principles have the purpose of stimulating the creative initiative of Soviet citizens in science and technology, literature and the arts, and of assuring protection of their property rights and personal non-property rights arising as a consequence of their creative activity. These include, particularly, the norms covering rights of authorship (Arts. 96-106), the rights to scientific discoveries (Arts. 107-109), and rights to inventions (Arts. 110-116).

Through all these and other norms, the Principles consistently implement one of the most important principles of socialism, a principle being further reinforced and developed in the period of the comprehensive building of communism - the principle of proper combination of personal interests with those of society as a whole. A considerable expansion of citizens' rights has taken place in accordance with this principle. Thus, according to Articles 4 and 9, citizens may avail themselves not only of rights listed in the law but of rights not directly specified therein if the content of the rights in question does not contradict the requirements of law. There has been an expansion of the opportunity to recover personal property (Art. 28), a considerable reinforcement of the legal position of housing tenants (Arts. 56-63), the establishment in law of the freedom to bequeath (Art. 119), etc. At the same time, the Principles place definite limits on the right to private property, prohibiting its use for the purpose of extracting unearned income (Art. 25). They refuse protection of citizens' rights if they are employed in contradiction to their purpose in socialist society, and require that the implementation of such rights and duties accord not only with

the law but with the rules of the socialist community and the moral principles of a society which is building communism (Art. 5).

One of the most important features of the Principles is that, for the first time in the history of Soviet civil law, they provide for protection of the citizen's honor and dignity. Proposals to include provisions of this nature in Soviet civil legislation were put forth in the literature even before the war. However, they could not be realized by the issuance of individual laws as it was important to define precisely the place of this new institution in the general system of Soviet civil law, as well as its relationship to other institutions in civil law. This could be done only in the process of codification work. However, inasmuch as codification of branches of Soviet law was inhibited under the conditions of the personality cult, this also prevented the elaboration of norms on the protection in civil law of personal non-property rights.

After the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the situation underwent a fundamental change. Reinforcement of the principles of socialist legality in all fields of public life, revision of the legislation in force by codification, and elevation of the public's role in implementation of the norms of Soviet law made possible the incorporation into our civil law of a number of new institutions. Among these, the protection of honor and dignity through civil law is now acquiring the place it deserves.

Article 7 of the Principles, which is devoted to this question, deals with the protection of the honor and dignity both of citizens and organizations. However, here we are interested in the provision only within the limits in which it has to do with the problem of protection of the interests of the personality of the Soviet citizen. Within these limits, this provision merits special analysis primarily because it embodies legal concepts new to Soviet civil law. As a consequence of its inclusion in the Principles, there are at least two questions that demand immediate solution: the concept of Soviet civil law, and the conditions and procedure for defense of the honor and dignity of citizens in accordance with the provisions of Article 7.

II

The Soviet literature of civil law in recent years reveals a preponderance of support for the view that civil law regulates property relations involving value and related personal non-property relations on the principle of equality of the parties. This concept is based on defining both the subject matter and the method of regulation in civil law. Its subject matter embraces property-value and related personal non-property relationships, while the method is the

equality of the parties in relationships under civil law. This definition has now attained recognition in law. With respect to the subject matter of regulation in civil law, Article 1 states that "Soviet civil law regulates property relations and personal non-property relations related to them....," and the preamble takes special note of the fact that it does not regulate all, but only those property relations that are the result "of the employment of the commodity-money form in communist construction." Despite the lack of any direct reference to the method of regulation in civil law in the Principles, it is expressed there nonetheless in a unique negative form. The fact is, as indicated in Part 3 of Article 2, that civil legislation is not applicable to property relations based on administrative subordination of one party to the other. It follows that only those property relations come under civil law that arise not on the principle of subordination but on that of the equality of the participants.

However, there are two types of personal non-property relations. Some have to do with property relations, while the others are independent thereof. The personal rights of authors and inventors fall into the former category, and the right to one's name, honor, dignity, and the like, fall into the latter. In making this classification, one possible misunderstanding must be warned against. It is sometimes stated, for example, that the rights of an author with respect to the inviolability of his work, to his identification as author, and the like, are also of value to him independent of the right to obtain royalties, and therefore there is no foundation for regarding such personal relationships as being related to property relationships. But no one has even attempted to deny the independent significance of the personal rights pertaining to the authors of works of science, literature and art. The essence of the matter is that authors' personal rights form a single complex with their property rights and are a part of the same system of legal relationships. This cannot be said, however, of the right to name, honor, dignity, and the like. Only from this point of view are personal non-property relations subdivided into those related to property relations and those not so related.

Until the adoption of the Principles of Soviet civil legislation, only the former type of personal non-property relations were subject to regulation. With the issuance of the Principles this question found a different type of solution. As is stated in Part 1, Article 1, in cases covered by the law, civil legislation also regulates other (i.e., not related to property relations) personal non-property relations, and one of the most important of these — the protection of honor and dignity — is directly specified in

Article 7. It is therefore necessary to determine whether Soviet civil law may also in the future be regarded as a branch of law regulating only those personal non-property relations that are involved with property relations or, on the other hand, whether the traditional definition must now be subjected to certain corrections in that respect.

In replying to this question it is necessary to make a clear distinction between the concepts of legal regulation and of legal protection. Needless to say, in the broad sense of the word the very regulation of any social relation signifies its protection by law, just as protection by law embraces the concept of legal regulation in the same broad sense of the word. But there can be no doubt that, for example, criminal law protects socialist property relations, but does not regulate them. Employing the same concepts in their special significance, one cannot fail to recognize that legal regulation is expressed in the definition of the rights and obligations of participants in the relationship being regulated, and legal protection — in the application of sanctions to lawbreakers. Let us examine, from this point of view, the possibilities available to civil law in the field of regulation and protection of personal non-property relations not involving property relationships.

One can point to the following personal values with respect to which such relationships may be established: honor and dignity, name, right to pictorial representation, privacy of correspondence. Article 7 of the Principles deals only with honor and dignity, and refers not to regulation but to protection. Nor could it be otherwise inasmuch as honor and dignity are, by their very nature, not susceptible to standardization in law, and law as a whole, including the civil law, has the function only of assuring their protection. The right to one's name is regulated by Soviet law, which resolves questions of the procedure for acquiring a name, changing it, and so forth. However, the norms pertaining to these matters are incorporated in administrative law, while civil law can be employed for struggle against such violations of law as the appropriation of someone else's name, or appearance under someone else's name, i.e., again for the purposes of protecting this right. Specific methods of protection in civil law (for example, sanctions by fine) may be employed to facilitate the struggle against violations such as illegal employment of someone else's picture, publication or other issuance of the contents of letters without the agreement of author and addressee, etc. But here, too, the necessary prerequisites for regulation by civil law of the relations involved are lacking.

Thus, both the self-contained personal non-property relations covered in the Principles and those not embraced thereby but susceptible to incorporation

in the civil codes of the union republics are, by their very nature, subject only to protection by civil law, but not to regulation. But the essence of any branch of law is determined not by the field to which it gives its protection, but by that which it regulates. Thus, criminal law protects the greatest variety of socialist social relations. In defining its concept, however, it is not these social relations that are considered, but those involved in the commission of crime and the application of punishment to the criminal, constituting the relations regulated by criminal law. In accordance with Article 6 of the Principles, "in cases specially provided by law, protection of rights in civil law is carried out by administrative means." But it goes without saying that this does not place these rights in the category of administrative relationships and does not transfer them from the civil branch to the branch of Soviet administrative law.

Definition of the concept of Soviet civil law must be approached in exactly the same fashion. Article 1 of the Principles reads that in the cases indicated in the law, civil legislation "also regulates other personal non-property relations." But it is clear that the concept of regulation is here employed in the broad sense as one that also includes legal protection. This also follows from the content of Article 7, which defines only the procedures for protection of honor and dignity. On the other hand, in the special sense in which the concept of the matter to be regulated is employed in defining the essence of a branch of law, it may be stated with respect to these self-contained personal non-property relationships that they will henceforth be safeguarded by Soviet civil law but will not come within the scope of the subject matter it regulates. One must therefore conclude that the definition of the concept of civil law developed by Soviet civil jurisprudence and firmly ensconced both in school texts and the monographic literature not only remains in force after the adoption of the Principles but is wholly confirmed by them.

However, if we turn from the subject matter to the method of regulation in civil law, it becomes clear that it remains unchanged even after certain purely personal rights of the citizens have come to be among the matters protected by the civil law. The fact is that what is specific to the method of civil law is manifested in the structure of the relations of civil law, which are built on the principles of equality of the parties. This determines the specific nature of the measures of civil responsibility by means of which restoration of violated relations is provided through performance, by the lawbreaker, of acts he is ordered to undertake. But this same restorative method is also applied for the purpose of protecting personal non-property rights.

The protection of honor and dignity, provided in Article 7 of the Principles, is expressed in refutation of damaging information disseminated about a person. Only within these limits—those of the restorative function of civil law — are personal rights as such susceptible to protection under civil law.

Here we see the reciprocal influence of the method employed in regulation under civil law upon its subject matter. The method of Soviet civil law is determined by its basic subject matter — socialist property relations expressed in the form of value. Having made its appearance, this method has also proved to be suited to regulation of personal non-property relations connected with property relations. Subsequently, it became clear that it was possible also to employ this method for the protection of personal relations of an independent nature. The fact that the Principles realize this possibility represents a considerable step in the further development of Soviet civil legislation.

III

Now let us turn to an analysis of the conditions and procedure for the protection of the honor and dignity of citizens under the rules formulated in the Principles. Let us recall the words of Article 7 in this respect: "A citizen or organization has the right to demand at court retraction of information defamatory of their honor and dignity, if the party responsible for its dissemination fails to prove that it corresponds to the facts.

"If this information has been disseminated in the press, and it is fallacious information, the retraction must also be in the press. In other cases, the mode of retraction is specified by the court.

"If the court order is not obeyed, the court has the right to impose a fine payable to the government. Payment of the fine does not free the violator from the duty of performing the act ordered by the court."

It follows from this excerpt that the prerequisites for satisfying the citizen's claim are: a) dissemination of the information specified in Article 7; b) that the nature of the information disseminated be such as to defame the honor and dignity of the citizen; and c) that this information be fallacious.

Dissemination is to be understood as communication of this information to any third party in any form — oral, written, etc. It follows that the basis for finding that such information has been disseminated is all the greater when it is communicated not to one person but to several or a large number, and when such information is published in the press—periodical, duplicated or wall-bulletin papers, etc. The legal position of the persons to whom this information has been communicated is not of significance

to a finding of the acts specified in Article 7 of the Principles. Take, for example, a false report to the agencies of police or preliminary investigation that a crime has been committed. If the factors listed in Article 180 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR are present, such an act is evidence of crime, and involves application of measures of criminal punishment to the criminal. However, this circumstance does not prevent initiation of a civil action under Article 7 of the Principles. In the first place, a false report may be made under conditions eliminating criminal responsibility (for example, when there is no direct intent), and in such a case the only means of protection available to the injured party for complete rehabilitation of public reputation is that under civil law. Second, even if the criminal is held to account under Article 180 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR, the interest of the injured party in having the fact that his reputation has been restored become generally known, has not been eliminated and he has the right, for this purpose, to present the corresponding civil suit in the criminal case.

Thus, information is held to be disseminated if it has been communicated to some third person, regardless of whether this third person is a private citizen, a state agency or other organization, or an individual official. On the other hand, communication of the same information directly to the person whose honor and dignity are concerned cannot be regarded as dissemination. In such a case it is permissible to pose the question of criminal action for contumely if the other attributes specified in Article 131 of the RSFSR Criminal Code are present. But the necessary basis for initiation of a civil suit to restore defamed honor and dignity would be lacking in such cases.

Further, to satisfy the claim presented, it is necessary that the information disseminated in one of the ways described defame the honor and dignity of the citizen. Here it is necessary to differentiate between information relative to facts and information evaluating them. If someone disseminates information (acts, deeds) about things that a given citizen actually did, but also contends that they merit negative moral evaluation, one cannot compel the disseminator to abandon this evaluation by court or other compulsory procedure. Moral evaluation of things that have actually occurred is a matter for the free personal conviction of each individual, and differences in this respect between the individual who performed the acts in question and one who has formed a judgment on it cannot be a matter for adjudication by a court. If the information communicated about the facts as such is correct, the Soviet general public may make its own evaluation of it.

For the right to honor and dignity is nothing but the right of the citizen to demand that the public moral and political evaluation of his person be founded and shaped on the basis of accurate knowledge of what he did or did not do. That is why there can be no question of infringement upon honor and dignity under these conditions. Honor and dignity are infringed upon only when damaged in the dissemination of information about specific facts pertaining to the given individual.

However, not all facts about individuals, even when of negative significance, are defamatory to the honor and dignity of a citizen. If it is said of someone that he lacks an ear for music or fears the water, it is clear that this has no bearing whatever on honor and dignity. A citizen's honor and dignity are involved only in matters that are subject to moral and political evaluation by society, and these, consequently, are evaluated as positive or negative from the moral point of view. Such facts pertain to a person's labor activity, to his behavior in the family, in daily life, in his work group, and so forth. In other words, only conscious acts of will performed by an individual as a participant in particular social processes, acts embodying his moral character, can serve in a socialist society as factors shaping concepts of the honor and dignity of the individual. Consequently, information on negative facts must fall into this category if they are to be subject to challenge in court.

It has already been noted above that for an action to be initiated under Article 7 of the Principles, what is of significance is someone's dissemination of information, and not his evaluation thereof. At the same time, it is quite obvious that only information with respect to alleged facts deserving of negative evaluation can defame the honor and dignity of a citizen. In such a case, who is it that enjoys the right to evaluate facts so as to assure that a proper decision will be taken in the case?

Inasmuch as the right to honor and dignity is the right to a deserved judgment by society, it is only this judgment that can be of significance to proper decision in cases of this type. The individual evaluation of the facts made by the person disseminating information thereon is not considered at all. The evaluation placed on these facts by the injured party acquires legal significance only in the sense that it moves him to initiate action in court and requires the court to consider the case. But this evaluation, too, is not binding upon the court. The court's judgment must be based upon evaluation of the facts provided in the information disseminated, and this is made by the court acting as surrogate for Soviet society as a whole. If the court concludes that the data, information on which has been disseminated, is capable of defaming the honor and dignity of the citizen

not only in his personal opinion but in that of the public, his claim must be satisfied, given the presence of all the other conditions specified in Article 7.

Finally, one must conclude that a finding that the disseminated information is defamatory to honor and dignity requires that this information pertain to facts and not to evaluation of them, that the facts be such as may be the object of moral and political evaluation, and that they merit a negative evaluation from the social point of view.

Lastly, a necessary condition for satisfying a claim presented in accordance with Article 7 of the Principles is the fallaciousness of the information disseminated about the citizen which serves to defame his honor and dignity. The formulation of this condition in the law needs no special commentary, inasmuch as if the information about the negative facts characterizing the individual is true, his honor and dignity are, of course, damaged. This is not, however due to the information having been disseminated, but to his own behavior deserving such condemnation. Such behavior should be presented to the court of public opinion both in the interests of society as a whole and for the purpose of educating and re-educating the individual in question and, in this sense, in his own interests, too.

These are the conditions that constitute, under Article 7 of the Principles, the necessary prerequisites for its application. At the same time, the Principles do not make a court finding favorable to the plaintiff dependent upon the guilt of a lawbreaker or upon the statute of limitations. With respect to the statute of limitations we read, in Article 17, that it does not apply to claims arising from the violation of personal non-property rights except as specified by law. However, inasmuch as Article 7 makes no exceptions in this respect, it follows that the statute of limitations does not apply to cases involving protection of honor and dignity. With respect to guilt, it must be borne in mind that in Section I of the Principles, where Article 7 is found, there is no general provision holding that sanctions under civil law are applicable only for culpable behavior. We find this only in Chapter 1 of Section III (Article 37), and it is of general validity for violations of liability law. Therefore, the provisions of Section I require the culpability of the lawbreaker only when they bear direct reference thereto, as is the case, for example, in Part 6 of Article 14 for cases of responsibility for the making and implementation of invalid deals. Inasmuch as Article 7 contains no such reference, culpability on the part of the lawbreaker cannot be considered a necessary condition for the application of this provision.

These features of Article 7 are due to factors of a dual nature. On the one hand, the means of

protecting personal rights provided in the Principles are not measures of civil responsibility, but methods for restoring the damaged honor and dignity of a citizen. Therefore, their employment cannot in any way be dependent upon whether the person who has broken the law is guilty or innocent. In the second place, the specific nature of the values protected here is such that one cannot fail to consider the fact that an individual has a serious interest in his rehabilitation in the eyes of public opinion, no matter how much time has passed since the time when his honor and dignity had been damaged, and whatever the reasons — accidental or intentional — that caused it. Therefore, neither the guilt of the lawbreaker nor the time that has elapsed can or should be taken into consideration.

However, the conditions which, under the specific directions of Article 7, must be met in order for it to be applicable, require proof.

Soviet courts have the power of initiative and themselves take all the necessary steps to determine the truth in every case before them. However, the initiative of the court must be combined with that of the parties, upon which duties are imposed with respect to the presentation of the appropriate proofs. As we read in Article 18 of the Principles of Civil Procedure of the USSR and the Union Republics, each party must prove those facts upon which it bases its claims and objections. With respect to cases in the category under consideration, this means that the plaintiff must prove the very fact of dissemination of information damaging to his honor and dignity. However, the law frees him of the obligation to prove, in addition to that, that the information disseminated is not true. This is an expression of the principled attitude taken by Soviet law to the individual. People must be approached with confidence and respect. In accordance therewith, Article 7 of the Principles introduces a presumption under which information damaging to the honor and dignity of an individual is assumed not to correspond to the facts unless the opposite is proved. Therefore, failure to satisfy a claim can occur only if the individual disseminating such information proves that it is true.

The parties to such an action are the person whose honor and dignity have been infringed upon (as the plaintiff) and the person who spread the damaging information and has therefore been called to court as defendant. According to the specific provisions of Article 7 of the Principles, it is citizens who classify as plaintiffs in cases of this type. The question as to the protection of the honor and dignity of socialist organizations is outside the scope of this article. From a practical viewpoint, what is of particular significance here is the fact that it is specifically to citizens that this opportunity is afforded.

Leaving aside the procedural side of the matter,

that is, the procedure for presentation of the action (directly or through a representative), we must conclude that, under the meaning and object of the provisions of the material law, there is no obstacle to the initiation of an action under Article 7 of the Principles in connection with denigration of the honor and dignity not only of a citizen enjoying legal capability, but also of legally incapable or partially capable citizens. As has been repeatedly emphasized, under the conditions of socialist society the honor and dignity of the person are established as a consequence of various forms of activity carried out in various social processes. But inasmuch as participation in these processes begins considerably earlier than the attainment of the age of legal majority (18), it would be wrong to refuse protection of personal rights for reasons pertaining to the civil capability of the party endowed with these rights. For example, there is no doubting the fact that if someone declared the work of a young poet or composer to be plagiarism, the latter is just as concerned with the recovery of his reputation as author as is another (adult, legally capable) Soviet citizen.

An action in court may also be instituted to protect the honor and dignity of a deceased person. One cannot rule out interest in initiation of such action by the close relatives of the deceased, inasmuch as defamation of his person is wounding to their dignity. But the presence of such an interest cannot be regarded as an essential condition to the initiation of an action. The good name of a deceased person, which has been placed in doubt as a result of the dissemination of untrue information about him, merits the adoption, when necessary, of measures to protect it for reasons of a public nature. And it is specifically the concern of society that the image of the personality of a deceased person accord with his true merits and shortcomings that justifies and validates the instituting of such actions not only by close relatives but by organs of the procuracy, the latter acting not in the interests of individuals but in the interests of society as a whole.

The suit is presented against the person disseminating the information in question. If the information was disseminated in any way other than by publication in the press, the only possible defendant is the citizen from whom this information emanated. The question of the defendant is more complicated in cases in which the information was disseminated by publication in the press. The Principles provide no direct solution of this problem. From the provisions in Part 2 of Article 7 to the effect that, if the information was disseminated in the press, it must also be refuted in the press, it would appear that the opportunity arises to level the suit directly against the given publication. But Part 3 of Article

7 stipulates that a fine is imposed for failure to carry out a court decision, and that such a measure is applicable only to a publication which possesses its own property and is endowed with the rights of a juridical person, which is not the case with wall-bulletin newspapers, duplicated factory papers, etc.

It would appear that this question might be resolved as follows. Upon publication in the press of fallacious information that damages a Soviet citizen, the action would be initiated directly against the author of the published materials. The court would also summon a representative of the publication in which this material was published, regardless of whether or not the publication has the rights of a juridical person. If the publication does not possess this status, its representative participates in the case as a witness. The representative of a publication possessing the rights of a juridical person would be a party to the defense. A court decision in favor of the plaintiff would be subject to execution both by the defendant (in the form of submission of a retraction) and by the given publication (by publication of this retraction). Should the court decision not be fulfilled, it would be the defendant not performing the act ordered by the court who would be subject to fine. Imposition of a fine on a publication would be permissible if it appeared on the defendant's side as an independent juridical person. Execution of the court decision by other publications not constituting juridical persons would be implemented through the public organizations guiding their operations.

Deciding of this same question becomes more complex in cases in which information is published under a pseudonym or anonymously. It would be desirable to establish the rule that under these conditions the injured party has the right to initiate action without being required to name the defendant, by referring to the fact that the information damaging to his honor and dignity had been published under a pseudonym or anonymously. At the same time, it is necessary to require publications or the public organizations operating them to inform the court, upon its written inquiry, as to the author of the materials published. Upon receipt of this data the case may then proceed in the same manner as it would if the material had been published under the author's proper name.

The procedure for defense of honor and dignity is defined in Article 7 in the sense that, under its provisions, the injured party has the right to "demand through the court" retraction of the information damaging to him. Consequently, the Principles provide for procedure through the courts in consideration of such cases. However, under Part 2 of Article 6 of the Principles, protection of civil law rights in cases and under the procedure provided by the legislation of the USSR and union republics is also implemented

by comrades' courts, trade union and other public organizations. Specifically, Paragraph 4 of Article 5 of the Regulation on Comrades' Courts, approved by a decree of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on July 3, 1961, provides that cases of dissemination of fabrications damaging to a member of a group shall be considered by a comrades' court if this is the first offense. This means that, if a case is to be initiated in the regular legal channels, it is necessary that the fabrication be disseminated more than once by the given person, except that court action is possible in a first offense if the injured party and the offender do not belong to the same organized group (place of employment, education, etc.). It should also be recognized that when fabrications are disseminated by publication in organs of the press published outside the given group, the case must be considered not by a comrades' court but by a people's court, even if this was a first offense in the dissemination of fabrications, and even if offender and injured party work at the same enterprise, study at the same institution or live in the same housing unit.

Despite the fact that, under existing legislation, cases of this kind are decided by comrades' courts, it seems to us that other public organizations might, nonetheless, play a larger role in adjusting such conflicts and thereby preventing the initiation of a number of court cases. It is clear, for example, that discussion of the question at a Party or trade union meeting, or at a meeting of the editorial board of a wall-bulletin newspaper in which a challenged article has appeared, and the adoption of a proper decision on the matter in question would eliminate any need on the part of the injured party to take the matter to court. The judicial agencies themselves have the right to refuse demands for action if they find that, as a consequence of measures taken by the public, the honor and dignity of the citizen have been restored and therefore do not require special protection by the court.

However, if court action has been initiated, and the circumstances elicited by the court lead to the conclusion that the plaintiff's claim should be satisfied, the court decision is required to define, among other things, the means of refuting the disseminated information. The Principles specify only one such means, the use of which is envisaged in cases in which fallacious information has been disseminated in the press. They require that refutation must also be presented in the press, and this is to be stated in the operative portion of the decision. The procedure for refutation in other cases shall be established by the court itself (Part 2 of Article 7). Refutation of information disseminated by the offender may be held to be fully realizable without any participation

by him, through such means, for example, as dispatch of the court decision to the place of work of the injured party, where the other members of the work collective may then be familiarized with it. But there are occasions, particularly when educative values are involved, in which it would be desirable to place upon the offender himself the responsibility for retracting the erroneous information he has disseminated by such means as a public statement before the same group in whose eyes the honor and dignity of the citizen had been damaged by his acts.

When the responsibility to take specific acts to refute the information disseminated is placed upon the offender, the need arises to ensure execution of the court decision. Part 3 of Article 7 states that if the court decision has not been fulfilled, the court has the right to fine the offender. It follows that the fine is levied after failure to fulfill the court decision has been determined, i. e., it may be applied only when the injured party again applies to the court and examination of his statement shows that the court decision has not been fulfilled. The Principles do not define the size of the fine. Inasmuch as the fine is levied here not for the violation of the law itself, but for failure to fulfill a court decision, its maximum amount has to be stated not in the civil codes, but in the codes of civil procedure of the union republics. This fine has one very distinctive feature. Its purpose is not that of satisfying the damaged interests of the injured party, but of assuring implementation of the court order. This is why the fine accrues to the state and not to the injured party. Therefore it does not become a special form of recovery in property for moral loss, something which is excluded in principle by our legislation. But inasmuch as the exaction of the fine does not itself satisfy the interests of the injured party, the Principles provide that payment of the fine does not free the offender of the obligation to perform the act provided by decision of the court.

However, it must be recognized that measures of public influence would be far more effective than fines in causing the offender to carry out the act specified in court decisions in cases of this type. For example, one cannot disregard the circumstance that, even after having paid the fine, the offender might sometimes strive to avoid performance of the acts ordered by the court. But if steps are taken to shape public opinion in favor of the court decision (and public opinion is a continuing factor and not an act performed once and done with), it becomes possible to surround the offender with an atmosphere of moral condemnation capable of making execution of the court decision not merely an obligatory thing for him, but an unavoidable and irreversible act. That is why public organizations are called upon to par-

ticipate actively not only in consideration of disputes involving defamation of the honor and dignity of citizens, but in assuring the actual implementation of the decisions that court agencies take in such cases.

Until recently, the citizens' honor and dignity were protected only by criminal law. This was specifically the purpose of Articles 130 and 131 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, providing criminal responsibility for slander and contumely. After adoption of the Principles of Civil Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics, which introduced protection of the same personal values by civil law, the question arose as to the means for delimiting them from the corresponding means of protection under criminal law. In practice this pertains only to differentiation of Article 7 of the Principles of Civil Legislation from Article 130 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, which specifies criminal responsibility for slander, i. e., for dissemination of fabrications damaging to another person and known to be false. However, with respect to Article 131 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, it must be borne in mind that it provides punishment for contumely, which does not involve dissemination of information damaging to the citizen and therefore may not under any conditions fall within the scope of the illegal act under consideration in Article 7 of the Principles of Civil Legislation.

However, if we confine ourselves to Article 130 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, we find that under its provisions it is necessary, to demonstrate slander, that the defendant must have disseminated fabrications known to be false, in other words, that he have acted with direct intent. As distinct from this, initiation of a civil suit under Article 7 of the Principles bears no relationship to guilt on the part of the lawbreaker; this is simply not considered. This means that in the absence of the conditions necessary to institute criminal prosecution under Article 130 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, the injured party is given the opportunity to seek rehabilitation in the public eye by civil action under the requirements of Article 7 of the Principles. On the other hand, when the matter at issue is the dissemination of consciously false fabrications defaming another individual, the basis exists for both criminal action and a civil suit. However, inasmuch as, under Article 130 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, criminal action may be instituted only on the initiative of the injured party, it is he who must make the decision as to the defense of his rights under criminal or civil law. Hence, despite the existence of slander as defined by law, the injured party has the right to demand restoration of his honor and dignity by civil suit, without calling the guilty party to criminal responsibility. Under the same circumstances he may make the other choice, initiating criminal action against the

law-breaker, in which case the sentencing of the guilty party to the appropriate criminal punishment will, in the overwhelming majority of cases, suffice for the complete rehabilitation of the injured party. Then the need for a civil suit will naturally be eliminated.

However, the circumstances of a given specific case may turn out differently. Thus, Part 2 of Article 130 of the RSFSR Criminal Code specifies that slander in the press is punishable by deprivation of freedom for up to three years or by corrective labor for up to one year. However, sentencing to any of these measures of punishment does not in itself assure complete satisfaction of the interests of the injured party. Inasmuch as fallacious fabrications about him have been disseminated in the press, the injured party is concerned that they also be refuted in the press. And such a result is attainable only if the opportunities deriving from Article 7 of the Principles of Civil Legislation are employed. Therefore, if the fact of slander comprises acts expressed in the publication of consciously false fabrications, and the injured party believes it necessary to bring the lawbreaker to criminal responsibility, he must be recognized to have the right to initiate, either in the same criminal case or independent thereof, a civil action to compel the law-breaker and when necessary, the

publication, to publish retractions of these fabrications.

Thus, the means of protection of honor and dignity available in civil law, either alone or in conjunction with measures of criminal punishment, are quite adequate to assure the inviolability of personal rights in this area of socialist social relationships, the field of the moral ties between the individual and other citizens and society as a whole. This is a sphere of relations particularly important to the Soviet citizen, inasmuch as society's opinion of him is expressed therein.

In our country the various law codes are now supplemented by the moral code of the builder of communism incorporated in the CPSU Program. This code must become the basic law by which Soviet people are guided in their relations with each other, with the state and with society. But in order for these laws to become a matter of habit and to be strictly observed in every act by every Soviet person, a major educational effort is required, in which the provisions of the law also are called upon to exercise a necessary influence. "Man is to man a friend, comrade and brother," it is said in the moral code of the builder of communism. Let him also have proper respect for the honor and dignity of the other person: this is the moral principle of Soviet society; these are the demands of Soviet law.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION <i>(Act of October 23, 1962; Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code)</i>		Publisher: File two copies of this form with your postmaster.
1. DATE OF FILING October 24, 1963	2. TITLE OF PUBLICATION THE SOVIET REVIEW	
3. FREQUENCY OF ISSUE Quarterly		
4. LOCATION OF KNOWN OFFICE OF PUBLICATION <i>(Street, city, county, state, zip code)</i> 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10010		
5. LOCATION OF THE HEADQUARTERS OR GENERAL BUSINESS OFFICES OF THE PUBLISHERS <i>(Not printers)</i> 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10010		
6. NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF PUBLISHER, EDITOR, AND MANAGING EDITOR		
PUBLISHER <i>(Name and address)</i> Myron E. Sharpe, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10010		
EDITOR <i>(Name and address)</i> Myron E. Sharpe, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10010		
MANAGING EDITOR <i>(Name and address)</i> none		
7. OWNER <i>(If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual must be given.)</i>		
NAME		ADDRESS
Bookfield House, Inc., T/A		
International Arts and		
Sciences Press		156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10010
Myron E. Sharpe		156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10010
8. KNOWN BONDHOLDERS, MORTGAGEES, AND OTHER SECURITY HOLDERS OWNING OR HOLDING 1 PERCENT OR MORE OF TOTAL AMOUNT OF BONDS, MORTGAGES OR OTHER SECURITIES <i>(If there are none, so state)</i>		
NAME		ADDRESS
none		
9. Paragraphs 7 and 8 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner. Names and addresses of individuals who are stockholders of a corporation which itself is a stockholder or holder of bonds, mortgages or other securities of the publishing corporation have been included in paragraphs 7 and 8 when the interests of such individuals are equivalent to 1 percent or more of the total amount of the stock or securities of the publishing corporation.		
10. THIS ITEM MUST BE COMPLETED FOR ALL PUBLICATIONS EXCEPT THOSE WHICH DO NOT CARRY ADVERTISING OTHER THAN THE PUBLISHER'S OWN AND WHICH ARE NAMED IN SECTIONS 132.231, 132.232, AND 132.233, POSTAL MANUAL <i>(Sections 4355a, 4355b, and 4356 of Title 39, United States Code)</i>		
	AVERAGE NO. COPIES EACH ISSUE DURING PRECEDING 12 MONTHS	SINGLE ISSUE NEAREST TO FILING DATE
A. TOTAL NO. COPIES PRINTED <i>(Net Press Run)</i>	3,704	3,000
B. PAID CIRCULATION		
1. TO TERM SUBSCRIBERS BY MAIL, CARRIER DELIVERY OR BY OTHER MEANS.	2,905	2,148
2. SALES THROUGH AGENTS, NEWS DEALERS, OR OTHERWISE.	500	403
C. FREE DISTRIBUTION <i>(including samples)</i> BY MAIL, CARRIER DELIVERY, OR BY OTHER MEANS.	76	76
D. TOTAL NO. OF COPIES DISTRIBUTED. <i>(Sum of lines B1, B2 and C)</i>	3,481	2,627
I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete.		<i>(Signature of editor, publisher, business manager, or owner)</i> Myron E. Sharpe, Publisher

78A

The indifference of teachers is also attributable to the fact that it is school practice to transfer all pupils to the next grade. At the end of the year the teacher effects not a transfer but a so-called reorganization of the class. He writes a report on each pupil, similar to the following: "Williams reads poorly. He is poor in arithmetic. But his quotient is 80. In the 2nd grade he should be placed in the 6 (or 7) index group." And there he will study in accordance with an even lower level syllabus, with very low demands on the quality of his knowledge.

We were invited to a conference of teachers and parents in New York where pressing school problems were discussed. In their speeches many said: "The elementary school is the root of all evils. It does not provide the basic knowledge. The children cannot read, write or count. They are not prepared to continue their studies in the secondary school."

To get a complete understanding of the American elementary school we must become familiar with yet another part of it — the work with "I. G. C."

I. G. C.

Those three letters — I. G. C. — were to be seen on classroom doors. They are constantly being mentioned in conversation by American teachers. The children also say: "We are from the I. G. C. class." They are the initial letters of three words — intellectually gifted children. According to American standards these are children with an intelligence quotient higher than 110 to 120. They are assigned to separate classes where the content and methods of instruction are very much different from the ones described above. Attending these classes and talking with the children gave us the impression that their knowledge is at the level of knowledge of our good pupils.

In the I. G. C. classes we saw real exercises and serious work in arithmetic and the native language. When at these classes we almost felt as if we were back in our own school. Class 4-1 had 22 pupils, including only seven Negroes. A spelling lesson was in progress. The teacher would pronounce a word and the pupils would name its letters. From time to time the teacher would ask them to make up a sentence with this or that word, change the tense of its verb, and explain the forming of tenses.

The pupils found the prefix and root of the word "triangle," and discussed the origin of the prefix. The teacher imperceptibly moved from grammar to mathematics. The pupils discussed various geometric figures and determined their properties.

Class 6-1 has 24 students, five of them Negroes. The arithmetic lesson is progressing at a quick tempo. The teacher reads the problem and the pu-

pils make brief notes on their sheets. One boy is at the blackboard. Two or three minutes pass; several persons raise their hands and supply the answers. The next problem follows; brief notes; answers. There is no waiting for the late ones; the solutions are arrived at quickly, without explanations, without long notes, and almost orally. The syllabuses in I. G. C. classes are rich and serious. The teaching of mathematics, for instance, is conducted in accordance with a new syllabus, the basis of which is the theory of numbers. The teaching of arithmetic has been reorganized to accord with this theory, beginning with the 1st grade.

Foreign language instruction is introduced in the I. G. C. classes of the 3rd and 4th grades, with the broad utilization of television and radio. Independent work by pupils plays a large role in these classes.

Just as in the grades for the "slow," the teacher plans a series of integral themes for the year. But while studying these themes attention is concentrated on independent work in reading and the writing of reports and compositions.

Reference books, encyclopedias, and dictionaries are prominently displayed in these classes. The pupils utilize this literature in class or in the library when writing reports. Once a week a class is held in the library. The children are taught to use catalogues, to find needed information, make notes, etc.

Pupils in the higher — 5th and 6th — grades, while studying the natural sciences, do two or three so-called projects per year. The project is a small "research" paper on a subject selected by the pupil and usually related to the syllabus. We saw finished projects by 6th-graders on the subjects of "Space," "Atomic Energy," "Man's Nervous System," and others. These reports present material gathered from books, reference works, and museums. They include charts, diagrams, drawings, and descriptions of small experiments conducted by the children. Bibliographic information is attached to the reports. It is interesting to note that American teachers, as a rule, do not evaluate the pupils' responses in the classroom. Only tests and independent "research" papers are evaluated.

The school year is divided into three or four periods. The evaluations of schoolwork are recorded on a special card for parents at the end of the year.

When one moves from a class for the "slow" to an I. G. C. class one gets a literally physical sense of the difference in the level of knowledge, the demands made by the teacher, and the atmosphere prevailing in the classroom. We also felt this

Education in the USSR

Volume II

SECONDARY EDUCATION: The Statute on Secondary General-Education Labor Polytechnical Schools with Vocational Training; The Statute on Evening (Shift) Secondary General-Education Schools; E. I. Monoszon, The Content of Education in the Secondary School.

HIGHER EDUCATION: V. P. Eliutin, The Higher School at a New Stage; Selection and Training of Scientific Personnel — An Important State Task; A. D. Aleksandrov, Let There Be More Enthusiasts.

PROLONGED-DAY SCHOOLS AND GROUPS: Piotr Simakov, The First Experience of Schools with a Prolonged Day.

BOARDING SCHOOLS: E. I. Afanasenko, Five Years of the Boarding Schools; M. N. Kolmakova, School for the Rounded Development of the Individual (On the Fifth Anniversary of the Boarding Schools).

MATHEMATICS EDUCATION: A. S. Pchelko and M. I. Moro, The Arithmetic Program; Olga I. Grineva, The Work of the Mathematics Teachers of Lipetsk Region; On the State of Mathematics Instruction and Measures for Improving It in RSFSR Schools.

PHYSICS EDUCATION: A. V. Peryshkin, The Study of Physics in the 7th Grade with the New Syllabus and Textbook: 1. Mechanical Motion; V. V. Krauklis, The Study of Physics in the 7th Grade with the New Syllabus and Textbook: 2. Addition of Forces. Equilibrium; The Atom Knocks at the Classroom Door; M. S. Khrushinskii, Education in Scientific Atheism in Physics Lessons.

CHEMISTRY EDUCATION: Measures for Improving the Pupils' Knowledge of Chemistry in RSFSR Schools; G. P. Khomchenko, Coordination of the Teaching of Chemistry in Secondary Schools and Higher Educational Institutions.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION: O. I. Moskalskaia, The Development of Foreign Language Study in the USSR.

TEACHING LITERATURE: G. I. Belen'kii, The Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Some Problems in the Teaching of Literature.

HISTORY EDUCATION: A. T. Kinkul'kin and I. Ia. Lerner, A New Stage in the Teaching of History in the School.

POLITICAL EDUCATION: E. I. Monoszon, On Teaching the Course on the Principles of Political Knowledge.

POLYTECHNICAL EDUCATION AND PRODUCTION TRAINING: N. V. Solov'ev, The Principle of Polytechnical Education in Action; D. A. Epstein, Basic Trends of Production Training in Secondary School; V. A. Sukhomlinskii, Labor and Morality.

CRITIQUE OF AMERICAN EDUCATION: Z. Mal'kova, In the Schools of America (Notes of a Soviet Educator): Part I, Part II; V. Strezikozin, Why Does Ivan Know More Than Johnny?

* * *
* * *

(See Back Cover for Contents of Volume I)

INTERNATIONAL ARTS AND SCIENCES PRESS
156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10010

Education in the USSR

2 Volumes, \$12.00 per volume

A COLLECTION of articles drawn from the translation journal SOVIET EDUCATION over the past five years, which provides a comprehensive picture of the goals, content and methods of the Soviet educational system. The collection indicates the general direction and results of Soviet education over the past 45 years, while highlighting the tendencies of the Khrushchev period.

Volume I

GOALS: F. F. Korolev, Rounded Development of the Human Personality — The Paramount Task of Communist Construction; S. Strumilin, The Effectiveness of Education in the USSR; The School — An Ideological Institution.

STATISTICS: Public Education in Figures; Central Statistical Administration Under the USSR Council of Ministers: The Educational Level of the Population of the USSR According to the 1959 Census; G. Kharat'ian, The Number and Composition of Scientific Personnel and the Training of Scientists and Teachers in the USSR.

POLICY: Law on Strengthening of the School's Contact with Life and Further Development of Public Education System in USSR; E. I. Afanasenko, Concerning the Progress in Implementing the Law on Strengthening the Ties of the School with Life and Further Developing the System of Public Education in the RSFSR.

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION: K. Zolotar', Intra-School Control and Direction of Instruction.

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY: P. M. Iakobson, Studying the Moral Attitudes and Judgments of Children of Different Ages; Iu. V. Idashkin, Some Deviations in the Development of the Personality of the Schoolchild and Ways of Overcoming Them; D. B. El'konin, Psychological Study of the Learning Process in the Elementary School; V. A. Artemov, Some Problems of Speech Psychology in Teaching Students to Speak a Foreign Language; G. S. Kostiuik, Psychological Problems in the Combination of School Learning and Productive Work.

RESEARCH ON EDUCATION: The Plan and Research Problems of the RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences for 1962.

TEACHER TRAINING: F. Maksimenko, The Teacher — The Decisive Force in the School Reorganization; Nikolai P. Suvorov, Highly Educated Teachers for Schools; Iu. L. Kastorskii, The Content of Practice Teaching in the First Three Years of Study and How to Guide It.

PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION: K. A. Alekseeva, Teaching Six-Year Olds the Three "R's"; A. P. Usova, Draft Program of Education in the Kindergarten; M. M. Skudina, The Gifted Child; I. Alifanov, Payment for Maintaining Children in Kindergartens and Nurseries.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION: The Statute on Eight-Year Schools; N. Solov'ev, What One Should Know About Study Programs for Eight-Year Schools; G. Vorob'ev, How the Lipetsk Teachers Conduct Their Lessons. * * *

(See Inside of Back Cover for Contents of Volume II)

INTERNATIONAL ARTS AND SCIENCES PRESS
156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10010